THE SENATE

**Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 14 April 2010
in the Hub 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)
Dr Simon Bromley, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
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 Phil Potts, Dean, Faculty of Science
Mr Jeremy Roche, Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care
Ms Anne Howells, Director of Learning and Teaching Solutions
Mr Will Swann, The Director, Students
Mrs Nicky Whitsed, Director, Library Services

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

Professor Richard Allen	Dr Lynda Prescott
Dr Graham Harvey	Dr Robert Wilkinson

Faculty of Education and Language Studies

Mr Uwe Baumann	Mr Pete Smith

Faculty of Health and Social Care

Dr Sandy Fraser	Dr Jackie Watts
Dr Verina Waights	

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr Judy Ekins	Mr Anthony Meehan
Professor Joyce Fortune	Dr Sally Organ
Mr Derek Goldrei	Ms Linda Robson
Professor Uwe Grimm	Dr Helen Yanacopulos

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Bob Kelly	Dr Diane Watson
Dr Martin Le Voi	

Faculty of Science

Professor Simon Kelley   Dr Terry Whatson
Dr Payam Rezaie   Professor Ian Wright
Dr Peter Skelton

Open University Business School

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

Institute of Educational Technology

Dr Robin Goodfellow   Professor Eileen Scanlon

Regional/National Centres

Mr Gordon Lammie   Dr Liz Manning

3) Associate Lecturers

Dr Isobel Falconer   Mr Dave Horan
Mr Bruce Heil   Dr Michael Isherwood
Dr Meg Hopkins   Dr Clare Spencer (alternate)

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association

Ms Marianne Cantieri   Mr David Reed (alternate)
Mrs Roz Evans   Ms Tania Rogers (alternate)
Mrs Nikki Hadjipanteli   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   Mr Derek Sheills
Mrs Lynda Juma   Mrs Gill Smith
Dr Christina Lloyd   Ms Elaine Walker

6) Co-opted members

Mr Andy Harding   Mrs Lucy MacLeod
Mr Rob Humphreys   Mrs Veronica Summers

In attendance

Mr Fraser Woodburn, University Secretary
Ms Jane Duffield, Senior Assistant Secretary (Central Secretariat)
Mrs Julie Tayler, Assistant Secretary (Central Secretariat)
Miss Teresa Coyle, Administrative Assistant (Central Secretariat)
Dr Kate Clarke, Director, Open University Validation Services
Mr Michael Street, Head of Planning and Resources, Strategy Unit (Present, minutes 1 - 10)

Apologies:

1) Ex officio

Professor David Rowland, Dean, Faculty of Arts
Professor Josie Taylor, Director, Institute of Educational Technology

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts
Dr Richard Brown   Professor John Wolffe

Faculty of Education and Language Studies
Dr Jane Cullen   Dr Frank Monaghan
Dr Regine Hampel   Dr Peter Twining
Professor Mary Kellett

Faculty of Health and Social Care
Mrs Sue Cole   Dr Sarah Earle

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology
Professor Anne de Roeck   Dr Tony Nixon
Professor Hazel Johnson   Dr Toby O'Neil

Faculty of Social Sciences
Mr Robert Clifton   Dr Timothy Jordan
Dr Troy Cooper   Professor Sophie Watson

Faculty of Science
Mr Robin Harding   Dr Andrew Norton

Open University Business School
Ms Lin Smith

Institute of Educational Technology
Mr Alan Woodley

Other Central Units
Dr Derek Child

Regional/National Centres
Ms Celia Cohen   Dr Rosemary Hamilton

Associate Lecturers
Mr Paddy Alton

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association
Mr Sandy Gibson   Mr Derek Naysmith

5) Academic-related Staff
Mrs Sheran Burge   Ms Beverley Stewart

6) Co-opted members
Dr Peter Scott

In attendance
Dr Sally Crompton, Head of Open Broadcasting Unit

1   WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS

The Chair welcomed some new members to their first meeting of the Senate: Dr Simon Bromley, who had become Dean of the Social Sciences Faculty on 1 March 2010; and Mr Jeremy Roche, who had become Dean of the Health and Social Care Faculty on 1 April 2010; Mr Derek Sheills, Course Manager in the Faculty of Arts, who had been approved by the Senate Membership Panel to fill the casual vacancy created by the secondment of Mr Michael Street to the Strategy Unit until 30 September 2010; and Mrs Lucy MacLeod, Depute Director (Students) and Acting Director Designate, who had been co-opted to this meeting of the Senate to ensure continued representation for Scotland following the retirement of Dr Peter Syme, Director, Scotland.

2   MINUTES   **S/10/1/M**

The Senate **approved** as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 27 January 2010.

3   REPORT FROM AND QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR

3.1   Distance Learning Medical Centre (DLMC)

The Open University had been awarded £200,000 for its Distance Learning Medical Centre (DLMC) programme in Ethiopia. Ethiopia has a severe shortage of doctors. Currently around 95% of medical students leave the country after qualifying, leaving fewer than 700 doctors to serve the country's population of 80 million. The funding – which had been awarded by Ethiopiaid and Open University alumni – will enable the Medical Centre to assist the Ethiopian government to achieve its target of producing 11,000 additional doctors.

3.2   e-Skills UK – *Professional Programme*

Mr Kevin Streater (Executive Director – IT & Telecoms, Employer Engagement) had received confirmation last month from e-Skills UK of the final sign off on the *Professional Programme - Subsidised Places*. This provided a solid commercial basis for future work with e-Skills, who were managing the employer input into future stages of the programme, which was a critical part of the engagement process. Colleagues across the University had made an invaluable contribution to the development and sign-off of this contract, particularly from MCT, Corporate and Employer Services (Marketing and Sales), and Commercial and Legal Services. In addition to the 70 students already studying the programme with the OU, the University had recently had confirmation of a further 31 students for the April presentation.

3.3   e-Tutor of the Year

OU tutor Dr Anne Heyworth had been named e-Tutor of the Year at the Inspire Adult Tutor and Mentor Awards. The awards, organised by NIACE Dysgu Cymru, celebrated the commitment, knowledge and communication skills that inspire adult learners every day across Wales. Dr Heyworth, from Bangor, delivered the U122 *'Make your experience count'* programme, which asked students to reflect on their experiences as part of the course.

3.4   Digital Emmy award – *The Virtual Revolution*

The OU/BBC co-produced programme *The Virtual Revolution* had received a Digital Emmy award at a ceremony in Cannes that week. *The Virtual Revolution* had been an ambitious

project that explored the profound impact of the worldwide web on almost every facet of people's lives. It had been launched last July with a call to the web community to join in an open debate with the production team, helping to shape the production of a four-part BBC Two series that had been broadcast earlier this year. In a BBC first, the team had made rushes available online for users to download and edit themselves, months before the series was broadcast. They had also shared some of their key arguments, inviting comment, input and story leads from the web community.

3.5   *Postgraduate Certificate in Clinical Leadership*

The London Deanery was sponsoring 48 people to study the full programme of courses which made up the *Postgraduate Certificate in Clinical Leadership.* In total this would bring in over £330,000 of income to the University. The London Deanery was responsible for postgraduate medical and dental training in London and represented a very significant organisation in the sector at which this programme was targeted. They were seen as thought leaders and others tended to watch and follow what they did, so this was great news for the programme.

3.6   **Mozilla Foundation "Jetpack for Learning Design" special award**

KMi researchers had received a Mozilla Foundation "Jetpack for Learning Design" special award. The Jetpack for Learning Design Challenge sought international project ideas that could turn the open web into a rich social learning environment and explore new possibilities for learning online. The Jetpack SDK enabled anyone who knows the tools of the web—HTML, CSS, and JavaScript—to build powerful Firefox add-ons and was a part of Mozilla's new Drumbeat initiative. Michelle Bachler and Laurian Gridinoc received the award, presented at the international South by South West interactive technology festival in Austin, Texas, USA in March 2010

3.7   **Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)**

The Open University had received excellent feedback following a re-accreditation visit by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) in the US. The MSCHE was an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. If The Open University was successful in gaining MSCHE re-accreditation, it would be one of only two UK higher education institutions to have done so. Independent reviews of this kind validated the work of the OU and were particularly valuable when approached from a different angle, as in the case of the MSCHE.

3.8   **The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)**

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) Maintenance of Accreditation Committee and the Board of Directors had confirmed the recommendation of the Peer Review Team that the OU be reaccredited for another six years from 2011. ACSB was the premier accrediting agency of collegiate business schools and accounting programs worldwide.

3.9   The Chair congratulated Professor James Fleck and his colleagues in the Business School for their achievement. He also congratulated all those involved in the other activities that had been described, as well as the many that there had not been time to mention.

3.10   **Independent Review of Higher Education and Student Finance**

The Vice-Chancellor reminded the Senate that the composition and remit of the Independent Review of Higher Education Funding and Student Finance had been described at the last meeting. The Review had been charged with analysing "the

challenges and opportunities facing higher education, and their implications for student financing and support" and was wide-ranging in its scope. Professor David Vincent, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs), together with staff from the Strategy Unit and Birkbeck, had since submitted an excellent joint submission to the Review. As part of the Review, the Vice-Chancellor and Professor Vincent had also given oral evidence at a hearing in January, and had taken 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. Subsequently, they had met privately with the Review Secretariat and individual members of the Review Panel to focus on the OU's thoughts on future Higher Education funding policy, in particular the University's thoughts on future funding models. The outcome of these discussions had been fed into the second round of the Panel's analysis.

3.11 Reduced funding for HE

Since the last meeting of the Senate, HEFCE had sent out the annual grant letter and over three-quarters of English and Northern Ireland universities had seen cuts in their grant. The OU had received the good news – at least in the short term - that the University's funding grant for England would increase in 2010/11 by 2%, mainly due to the OU's success in student recruitment. In Wales, the news had been even better, with an increase in grant for 2010/11 of 6.4%. In Scotland the increase had been only 0.7%, but this was in the face of a very difficult environment.

In his Budget statement, the Chancellor had announced a one-off allocation of £270m to fund an extra 20,000 STEM places across the sector, as well as a £35m university enterprise capital fund to support innovation and help new graduates to start up companies. However, he had also said that universities would have to make efficiency savings –so in the longer term, the University was still faced with a number of significant financial challenges. These include:

- the loss of ELQ funding in England
- the national impact of pay awards in excess of grant increases
- additional pension contributions and
- increased national insurance contributions.

Consequently, the delivery of the University's planned net savings remained extremely important. However the University remained in a strong position, punching at its weight and doing the right things in preparation for the next set of announcements.

3.12 Student recruitment

After the February 2010 intake of students, it was forecast that the University would have 8.7% more students in 2009/10 than it did in 2008/09. This represented an increase of 6,289 full time equivalents. This increase was larger than some universities' student populations.

The University had grown well above target in every UK nation, the Republic of Ireland, and the rest of Europe. It had also grown well above targets for undergraduate and postgraduate numbers, and well above targets for every faculty.

3.13 Next steps in implementing *OU Futures* 2010-2013

Further to Professor Vincent's presentation of the proposed revisions to *OU Futures* at the last meeting of the Senate, the revised strategy had been endorsed by the Council at its meeting in March. Work was now underway to deliver the changes that would allow the University to exploit future opportunities. In order to bring the work on the three phases of the strategy into sharp focus, a Fit for the Future area of the staff intranet site would be

launched in April to keep colleagues up-to-date with what was happening around the University to deliver *OU Futures* between now and 2013. Colleagues were encouraged to feed back ideas and successes that could be featured on the site. Video case studies would showcase projects that were well advanced in delivering the kind of efficiencies that were described in Fit for the Future and would provide an insight into what others were doing.

4 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE (SPRC)   **S/10/2/1**
    Meeting on 10 February 2010

4.1   With reference to paragraph 8 of the paper, a member asked for an update on the Pearson project. It was understood that the pilot would not be extended, but it would be helpful to know whether any lessons had been learned that would have a bearing on *OU Futures* and the International Strategy. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs), Professor David Vincent, responded that the purpose of the pilot had been to explore areas of uncertainty without commitment. The pilot would not be continuing because the second of the pilot global MBA had not attracted a sufficient number of student registrations. The project director, Mr Nick Watson, and representatives from Pearson had started work to gather the institutional learning from the pilot exercise.

4.2   Referring to paragraph 4.12, a member asked whether there had been any shift in the government's treatment of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) subjects. Professor Vincent replied that there had recently been an additional allocation of funding for STEM subjects, and he was unaware of any potential withdrawal of funds in this area.

4.3   The Senate **noted** the unconfirmed minutes from the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee (SPRC) held on 10 February 2010.

5 CURRICULUM, AWARDS AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE (CAVC)   **S/10/2/2**

5.1   With reference to paragraph 5, a member commented that programmes such as engineering had been designed to encourage continuous progression through the various levels, and that this structure had been crucial to getting the programmes professionally accredited. This should be recognised in the development of a postgraduate strategy. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards), Professor Alan Tait, undertook to ensure that this fact was understood by the working group.

Action: AT

5.2   Referring to paragraph 4, a member expressed concern over the reference to the new Natural Sciences qualification offering "increased practical work", as this was misleading if the increase included IT based virtual exercises. Whilst such virtual exercises offered a useful supplement to real practical work, they could not cover the full spectrum of skills associated with real experience, which involved the direct handling of specimens and field based activities. The change might be forced by current financial constraints, but the University should not pretend that this would represent a pedagogical improvement in relation to practical experience.

5.3   Professor Tait, responded that CAVC had thought that the proposals, which had been endorsed by the Science Faculty, offered an improvement on the current Science degree. Named awards had not attracted many students, so the number of students experiencing practical science had been small. The restructuring would allow more students to achieve practical experience of science than had done so previously. The Dean of Science, Professor Phil Potts, added that there was no suggestion that anyone in the Faculty was trying to be misleading with regard to the revised curriculum. However, the wording was

ambiguous and required clarification before the CAVC minutes were approved. The challenge was to decide how the Science curriculum should evolve, not just in the financial context, but also in terms of stimulating greater registrations on the programme. Many colleagues had expressed their satisfaction with the new curriculum, as it would offer advantages to a wider range of students than before. An open discussion had been conducted in the Faculty, where nothing had been held back with regard to risks and opportunities, and all members had been invited to contribute. The proposal had been approved with an overwhelming majority. The Chair suggested that the member's comments be sent to Professor Tait, who would ensure that these concerns were addressed.

Action: PS/AT

5.4 The President, OU Students' Association asked that an accurate description of the type of practical work in a course be included in the course description.

5.5 A member remarked that the discussion in paragraph 6 on the development of a strategy to work with the Further Education (FE) sector did not recognise the work currently being done by the regions and nations. Professor Tait acknowledged the omission in what was a very brief report on this matter.

With reference to paragraph 14.4, a member commented that one of the most important things that a university did was to award and validate degrees. It was therefore important to be clear on what was required. The alignment of the new validated award of a taught M.Phil with guidance on the amount and level of credit points provided by the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) was only one aspect of the QAA's requirements. The framework also provided guidance on the character of such awards*.*

Professor Tait confirmed that the MPhil complied with QAA regulations. The member said that he understood that the request for the addition of an MPhil to the list of qualifications offered by the OU came from the Architectural Association and that its integrity was unlikely to be questioned.   However, if the University was to be including taught MPhils in the schedule of awards that it could validate in future, more clarity for the general principle that the OU should be explicit in both the amount and level of the credit points of a qualification and its character would be welcome. The Director, OU Validation Services assured the Senate that every proposal for validation went before a validation panel to ensure that it met and included all of the QAA's requirements.

5.6 A member enquired whether the Code of Practice for Student Assessment would refer to "modules" in due course, rather than "courses". Professor Tait acknowledged the oversight and confirmed that the terminology would be amended.

Action: AT

5.7 The Senate:

a) **noted** the report of the meeting of the Curriculum, Awards and Validation Committee (CAVC) held on 16 March 2010;

b) **approved**:

i) A new validated award of taught Master of Philosophy (MPhil)

ii) The changes to the revised Code of Practice for Student Assessment as requested by the Senate in October 2009 (attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes).

6   LEARNING, TEACHING AND STUDENT SUPPORT COMMITTEE (LTSSC)   S/10/2/3

The Senate **noted** the report from the meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Student Support Committee (LTSSC) held on 22 February 2010.

7   RESEARCH COMMITTEE   S/10/2/4

The Senate **noted** the report from the meeting of the Research Committee held on 17 March 2010.

8   QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE (QAEC)   S/10/2/5

The Senate **noted** the report from the meeting of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) held on 12 February 2010.

9   HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

HONORARY AWARDS 2010   S/10/2/6

9.1   The Senate **noted** the arrangements for the conferment of the award of honorary degrees at degree ceremonies being held in 2010.

HONORARY DEGREES 2011   S/10/2/7

9.2   The Vice-Chancellor emphasised that the paper was confidential: Senate members were allowed to take the paper away with them, but should not discuss it with anyone outside of the meeting. Any comments should be directed to the secretary of the Honorary Degrees Committee within three weeks of the meeting.

9.3   The Senate **noted** details of the nominations recommended by the Honorary Degrees Committee of the award of honorary degrees of Doctor of the University (DUniv) and Master of the University (MUniv) to be conferred in 2011.

CRITERIA FOR THE AWARD OF HONORARY DEGREES   S/10/2/8

9.4   The Senate **approved** an additional criterion for the award of Doctor of the University (DUniv) covering nominations for business, entrepreneurship and innovation.

10   INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY   S/10/2/9

10.1   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs), Professor David Vincent, introduced the paper, which documented the second phase of the process to redesign the University's international strategy. The paper had been discussed by the Deans and the Vice-Chancellor's Executive, and also the Council, which had welcomed the document and engaged in some debate about the boundaries between the for-profit portfolio and the philanthropic not-for-loss portfolio.

10.2   A third phase in the process was being launched with the intention that the work would be taken forward by the incoming Director of Business Development. External consultants would not be used during this phase as the OU now had substantial internal resource to

progress this work. Moreover, the University was in the process of appointing a new Director, Strategy and a new Director, Europe and these posts would also contribute to the formulation of the strategy. Four work streams were proposed, the first of which would review the five business models to clarify their academic, financial and operational potential. The second work stream would review costing methodologies and recommend how these might be improved for international business, whilst a third would look at potential markets and undertake further research into them. The fourth work stream would review and develop a not-for-loss strategy to determine the scope, management, outcomes and interface of that area with the for-profit approach. Depending on the progress made with these four work streams, a fifth might be able to produce some recommendations in relation to the scale and priorities between and within models and delivery mechanisms before the Council meeting in July.

10.3   Many members commended the paper, which was considered to be one of the most exciting and important ever to be presented to the Senate in terms of the future development of the University. The depth of analysis and the clear way in which options had been identified was welcomed, as was the fact that it had come before the Senate at a relatively early stage in its development thereby enabling members to make a significant input.

10.4   Referring to paragraph 1.2, which mentioned a project team consisting of internal OU staff and external consultants, a member sought confirmation that associate lecturers (ALs) were included as internal staff. Prof Vincent confirmed that ALs were considered to be internal in this regard and should be consulted where they had expertise.

Philanthropic efforts and investment criteria

10.5   The member commented that he fully supported the philanthropic approach to Africa, but felt that it should be treated separately from the more profit-orientated approach. Professor Vincent responded that there was now a separate work stream to review not-for-loss activity, but suggested that the two areas should not be kept entirely separate. For-profit activity was still driven by the University's commitment to education, despite the emphasis on the bottom line. Similarly, not-for-loss philanthropic work had to observe the same kind of business rigour as other activities. It could not waste money and had to observe the appropriate disciplines. It also had to engage with University processes, some of which would need to be reformed. There were connections between the two types of activity that should not be lost, even though they would be addressed separately in the process.

10.6   Another member said that it would be worthwhile considering the benefits of the philanthropic not-for-loss work, separately from the investment criteria. These benefits included the OU brand, staff development and new business models that could be brought back into the domestic market. This was another reason for not treating the two areas separately.

10.7   A member asked whether the University had philanthropic or ethical strategy that was part of taking forward its international work. The OU would not want to make a loss, but would the work stream on the OU's philanthropic engagement in Africa take the ethical issues of investment into account as well as the financial ones? Professor Vincent said that the specific distinction was between those activities that the University engaged in for the value of their impact on the countries and communities in which they took place without seeking to make a return profit to the university (not-for-loss), and those where the prime motivation was to make a profit for the University (for-profit). Everything that the University did was value driven and had an ethical dimension.

10.8 A member requested more information about the search for private equity, and asked whether this was an appropriate way of financing not-for-profit activity. Professor Vincent again stressed the University's commitment to the value of education throughout the world. Venture capitalists were just one possible means of raising funds for what could be expensive international activity, but there was no specific commitment to use them. The University was seeking scale of effect in its international strategy, which may in some circumstances mean scale of investment. The University would have to think carefully about where that investment came from during a stressed period for the University's finances.

Generation of net income and mode of operation

10.9 Another member observed that the six main issues identified in paragraphs A to F (page 5) illustrated how different this approach to international activity would have to be. Point D indicated that different courses would be necessary to meet local needs, which was clearly not a marginal cost activity. Point E pointed to true profitability and the need for activity costs to be attributed and not allocated, and indicated how seriously the University would have to look at profit. Point F suggested looking for alternative funding sources, including private equity. This was very different to the way in which the OU had operated in the past, and it was uncertain whether the OU structures could manage something of this kind. Clarification was sought as to whether the establishment of separate, more nimble business was being suggested in order to develop this approach. Professor Vincent said that this was not the case at present. The University was in the process of recruiting a Director of Business Development, who would have specific responsibility for this area and who would also chair the OU Worldwide Board. It remained to be seen whether that person would make recommendations for new structures in due course. However, the third report of the project, which was due to go to the Council in July, was unlikely to be recommending a completely separate organisation. It would be preferable to see faculties more fully engaged in the international arena.

10.10 A member said that the future of the University depended on it being a player in the international arena and this would not be achieved without a clear and effective international strategy. For some time, one of the aims in *OU Futures* had been to reduce the University's dependence on UK tuition funding, but this had not been achieved. The University had the opportunity to gain independent income outside the UK that would allow freedom of movement in what it did. International models that suggested employing people in every country in the world were unlikely ever to be profitable because of the associated additional costs. Similarly, many partnership agreements appeared to offer more advantage to the partners in terms of sustainability than to the OU. The University's business acumen in this area was poor and its knowledge of what its competitors were doing in the international arena was weak. The OU was in great danger of pricing itself out of the market by using a high cost presentation model, or of underselling itself and giving away its expertise to partners. However, there was a unique opportunity for the OU to exploit its expertise in supported distance learning by offering a UK qualification globally, with largely online support and the option for students to buy in additional tuition support for an extra cost. This would provide students with the chance to have an equivalent experience where they live, rather having to reside and study in the UK for 3 years, which was the standard option offered by most of the OU's competitors.

10.11 Another member agreed that the market for the electronic delivery of UK qualifications abroad should be investigated. Whilst there were issues with setting the right price, it was notable that overseas students would pay a lot of money to come and study at a UK university. Another member commented that there were current examples of UK qualifications being taken outside Europe, such as EDIS (Environment, Development and Internationals Studies), and the University should consider how this could be done better

and cheaper. It was also possible to be profitable in Africa by selling courses: philanthropic programmes were not the only option.

10.12 A member remarked that the Business School had been looking at markets around the world and had noted the huge deficit in educational opportunity and provision in almost all of them. The OU was well equipped to address that deficit with its quality at scale methodology. However, operating internationally was not easy and attempts to do so from across the University had achieved varying degrees of success. The project should bring a level of analysis and focus to the OU's experience and existing models and get to grips with their pros and cons, rather than prematurely considering a new model. A clear focus on streamlining operations could yield huge savings in the cost burden of much international activity. Other members agreed that there was a plethora of units and groups within the University already engaging with international work, and it would be worth considering whether these were efficient, whether there was any duplication and whether there were possible gaps in communication. The University should learn from its mistakes and analyse the difficulties it had encountered previously.

10.13 Another member remarked that a paradigm shift needed to be made not only with regard to the University's international business, but also in recognising that learning could go back into the UK business. The idea of a pay as you go pricing policy should be discussed in the UK. Moreover, some of the work done in the UK, such as the student support review, could be tested through the international activity. It was necessary to recognise that a big culture change would be necessary with regard to the way in which staff and processes provided services to students.

10.14 Another member suggested that there was some confusion in the paper. Paragraph 2.2 indicated that the OU could not readily cost its business activity and yet it was generating £18m from Business-to-Consumer Direct Teaching, which was the standard OU model in the UK. However, this did not appear to be offered as one of the possible international business models in section 4. Professor Vincent responded that the remarks about costing were not to do with accounting for the overall value of business, but rather to do with understanding the true cost of such activities to the University and therefore the net profit. With reference to delivering the OU model elsewhere in the world, the second phase of *OU Futures* would build on existing business, part of which included Europe. A Director, Europe was soon to be appointed, so rather than neglecting this area, the University was prioritising it and moving it forward whilst debating how it could enter new markets.

International competitors

10.15 Referring to Paragraph 2.2, a member commented that the key international competitors were now challenging the OU's core business in the UK and gaining credibility. The Apollo Group (Phoenix University), Laureate Education and Kaplan University were all demonstrating very impressive returns, which they would not be able to achieve were they not successful in attracting and retaining large numbers of students. The OU could learn much from their operations, for example the more assertive approach to students and the level of service provision. The adoption of best practice in these areas, combined with the OU's superior quality model, would allow the University to compete successfully both at home and internationally.

10.16 Another member observed that several of these competitors, based in other countries and operating in the UK, already had business models that were fit for purpose overseas. Whilst there were some big players, many others had very lean business models like Amazon and were able to survive with quite small populations of students on courses spread around the globe. The OU suffered from a monolithic business model that was expensive to run, both internationally and in the UK. It was very successful for large Level

1 and Level 2 courses, but at higher levels, particularly on the postgraduate programme, it was inappropriate. Even when there were large numbers on a programme, it was difficult to meet the targets within the current business model, such as contribution rates. Any business model that was streamlined for international activity should also be available within the UK so that the University might serve markets that it had not been able to previously. Faculties would have to accept that course content would not necessarily be produced internally, but would often come from external sources. The ungainly production processes in Learning and Teaching Solutions (LTS) would have to be streamlined, as would student services.

Competitive advantage and potential models

10.17 A member observed that the terms "sacred cows" alongside "secret sauce" were well worth using, not only in terms of the international strategy, but also in the context of how the OU shaped itself to survive financially and deliver quality education in the UK. The difficulty was in working out what "secret sauce" was, particularly in an international context. It was not just the excellence of the course team written materials that should be considered, but also the support system for students that involved ALs and other staff, the assessment system that provided teaching and learning through assessment, and the validation of the qualification.

10.18 With reference to paragraph 3.5, a member suggested that the OU's "secret sauce" might be defined by the sentence "it's secret competitive advantage is in how to structure content for Supported Distance Learning, the team-produced learning experience and the editorial consistency and voice". Model 3, B2B Educational Consulting, seemed to be the most consistent with this approach. Models 1 and 4, which allowed the option of decoupling tuition from course provision, did not appear to be equally compatible with this statement.

10.19 Also referring to Model 3, a member remarked that the back-end systems behind ICT support had become extremely complex. Investment might be necessary to ensure that an ICT package could be implemented easily, depending on how customers planned to use it and the particular infrastructure they required to support it.

10.20 Other members thought there was real potential in Model 4, Tuition Provision through Network of Certified Local Providers, where the student choice element ranged from pure on-line delivery and support to the possibility buying additional support beyond the basic package. A student member particularly welcomed the idea of unbundling, which should also considered for use in the UK and Europe, as it might assist students affected by the Equivalent or Lower Qualification (ELQ) policy.

Global local issues

10.21 The Director, OU Validation Services, commented that complex issues arose when offering the OU's open and distance learning model internationally. The Arab Open University delivered the OU's learning materials in 7 different countries, but the accrediting and regulatory bodies in those countries had 7 different approaches to the level of face-to-face tuition required. Different countries had different pedagogical cultures, and the students and academics in those countries where the OU might wish to partner all had different expectations. The reference in paragraph 2.6 to brand awareness and the need to distinguish the quality of the OU offer from that of local imitators was significant, as accrediting and regulatory bodies could be influenced by the low standard of other provision. Although indicators of quality were often cited in defence of the OU, ministries of education often failed to understand that a university of quality could have an open admissions policy. As this was a point of principle for the OU, it would have to address the issue head on if it were to enter the international arena. The options for partnerships were

welcome: many of the issues around quality assurance revolved around which organisation owned the students and whose qualifications they were undertaking. The OU also needed to recognise that private providers were not all the same and to consider how it would engage with them.

10.22 A student member agreed that the open entry so valued by the OU caused confusion in Europe and the rest of the World. One of the problems that students had in getting OU degrees recognised was the fact that many of them did not have the basic Baccalaureate or A level qualifications on entry. This impeded the recognition of their qualifications and was an issue that should be seriously considered.

10.23 Another student member observed that there were many reasons why students were proud to be associated with the OU, but its openness and the ability for students to start from whatever level they were at were fundamental. Students were also proud to be associated with a university that considered its philanthropic efforts in Africa to be important.

10.24 A member acknowledged that the paper dealt explicitly with the fact that the OU's educational content was culture bound and needed to be transferred into a local context. However, it was not sufficiently explicit that the content was also language bound. There seemed to be a tacit assumption that the content would be delivered in English and this raised questions about whether this was a model that could work or whether there were other hybrid models that might be possible. The University should be cautious with regard to the issue of openness in international context. Unless it had a very clear policy with regard to the entry level of English required, the University would have to deal with the problems arising from students with an insufficient knowledge of the language in which they were supposed to study. The context, the mission and the vision of the OU were all UK based and it would only be successful internationally if it challenged the underlying UK based assumptions.

10.25 Another member observed that some countries wanted to raise the level of English competency throughout their population, for example Malaysia, where the minister of education had been trying to develop the practice of teaching in English from the age of 5. The exploration of markets that were ready to engage directly with English provision might provide an easier way forward than deciding whether or not to deliver in different languages. The idea of a professional learning kite mark was welcomed, but the University might consider a few areas to focus on initially, as the University of Cambridge had done with its successful English examinations.

10.26 A member said that the University needed to be clear about where its markets were, the culture within them, and the products they required. It would then be in a position to resolve the issues of language, openness, and the subjects to be taught. For example, business and mathematics might be easy to teach in India, but social sciences would probably be difficult from a UK perspective.

10.27 With reference to Model 1, a member urged caution when discussing work based learning programmes such as Social Work. Local regulatory requirements, even when the University was working with a local partner, could present big challenges and add to the expense.

10.28 Another member commented on the danger of using the word 'local', which could refer to both a group of students in South Shields or a group in Germany. The concept of a local tutor in these two areas was quite different, and the idea of 'localness' with reference to a day school was a challenge when covering a wide geographical area.

10.29 A member requested further clarity in the paper around those matters that concerned Europe and those that concerned the rest of the world. A student member also expressed some concern as to how students currently studying in Europe would be affected by the strategy.

10.30 A member commented that there was no mention of the Bologna Process in the document. Moreover, the paper was proposing that the University should not be UK centric, but it also referred to a kite mark that would only have a meaning in Britain. Professor Vincent commented that in his role as President of European Association of Teaching Universities he had been heavily engaged in the discussions around the Bologna Process and in trying to promote a virtual Bologna across Europe. The paper could make more explicit reference to the Bologna Process, although it belonged primarily to a European strategy where the success of the Bologna Process made it easier to export the OU's UK based model of delivery. The accord was international, but it was primarily a European project with some additional players.

Inaccuracies

10.31 A member observed that there were some inaccuracies in the paper, for example paragraph 2.3 said that most international services were provided from the UK, with the exception of some tuition in Europe. However, tuition was being provided on the ground in several countries in Africa and Russia, and local student support services were provided across continental Europe through the University's networks, and in Africa and Eastern Europe.

10.32 Referring to paragraph 2.1, the Director, OU Validation Services, commented that there was an inaccuracy with regard to the OU's validated programmes. There was only one case where the UK award was optional for students. In all other cases, students registered on the OU validated programme got the OU validated award. With regard to financial viability, this was important when it was the student registrations that generated income.

10.33 The Vice-Chancellor said that he was delighted that the paper had come to Senate early enough to get some significant input into it. The Senate should see the iterations of the document as the University moved forward and would get the chance to comment. In addition to the comments made in the Senate, there was the opportunity to send through comments and factual corrections via Professor Vincent or the working group.

11   NEW ASSOCIATE LECTURER REPRESENTATIVE STRUCTURE   S/10/2/10

11.1 A member remarked that whilst it was good for associate lecturers (ALs) to be more involved with the governance of the University, there was potential for a conflict of interest as for most ALs the OU was a minor employer and their major employer could be one of the University's competitors. Guidelines to ensure that there was no conflict of interest would be valuable.

11.2 The University Secretary commented that issues of conflict of interest were not limited to ALs. The current guidelines would be reviewed to ensure that they were robust.

11.3 The Director, Students, Mr Will Swann, commented that it was important for the University to access the expertise of 7000 ALs. It was important that there be a mechanism to protect the University, but it should not outweigh the chance for ALs to contribute.

11.4   The Senate **approved**:

a)   changes to the membership clauses of the Curriculum, Awards and Validation Committee (CAVC), the Learning, Teaching and Student Support Committee (LTSSC), the Awards Committee and the central academic unit (CAU) committees to reflect the different appointing arrangements;

b)   changes to the membership clauses of programme committees and the Senate (attached as Appendices 2 and 3 to these minutes).

12   **VISITING ACADEMICS**   **S/10/2/11**

The Senate **approved** the introduction of a new process for the appointment of individuals who have not held academic posts as visiting academics (attached as Appendix 4 to these minutes).

13   **EMERITUS PROFESSORS**   **S/10/2/12**

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

a)   Professor Alan Bassindale
b)   Professor Bob Moon

14   **COMMITTEE MATTERS**   **S/10/2/13**

The Senate **approved**:

a)   the recommendation to change to the membership of the Course Results Approval and Qualifications Classification Panel (attached as Appendix 5 to these minutes)

b)   the recommendation to change to the membership of the Validation Committee (attached as Appendix 6 to these minutes)

iii)   the following changes to committee titles, from:

i)   Curriculum, Awards and Validation Committee to Curriculum and Validation Committee
ii)   Awards Committee to Qualifications Committee
iii)   Vocational Awards Committee to Vocational Qualifications Committee

15   **REVIEW OF ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE – POST QAA AUDIT**   **S/10/2/14**

The Senate **noted** the changes in modes of operation that will be put into place for a number of committees further to the review of the Senate substructure following the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) institutional audit in 2009.

16	THE COUNCIL	S/10/2/15

The Senate **noted** the report on the Council's discussions at the meeting held on 2 March 2010.

17	COLLABORATIVE PROVISION AUDIT	S/10/2/16

17.1 A member commented that paragraph 2.2 mentioned to Pre-Registration Nursing, but should refer to the Faculty of Health and Social Care's KYP courses. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality), Professor Denise Kirkpatrick, confirmed that this had been dealt with.

17.2 The Senate **noted** the report on the preparations for the 2011 Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Collaborative Provision Audit of the OU, including the QAA Audit of UK Higher Education Institution Provision in Singapore.

18	REAPPOINTMENT OF PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE)	S/10/2/17

18.1 The Vice-Chancellor congratulated Professor Brigid Heywood on her reappointment as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise).

18.2 The Senate **noted** the decision of the Vice-Chancellor to extend Professor Heywood's term of office as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) for a final period of two years, to 31 March 2012.

19	ACTION BY THE CHAIR	S/10/2/18

The Senate **noted** the report on the action taken by the Chair since the last meeting of the Senate.

20	FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS	S/10/2/19

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

21	DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS

Meetings would be held on the following dates:

Wednesday 16 June 2010
Wednesday 13 October 2010
Wednesday 26 January 2011
Wednesday 6 April 2011
Wednesday 8 June 2011

Julie Tayler
Assistant Secretary
Central Secretariat
j.d.tayler@open.ac.uk
April 2010

Attachments:

Key:

AT   Alan Tait
PS   Peter Skelton

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
(CAVC/10/1/11)
(APC/10/1/8)

CURRICULUM AWARDS AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE

Code of Practice for Student Assessment

The Curriculum Awards and Validation Committee is asked **to approve** a revised Code of Practice for Student Assessment.

Changes to this document were approved by the Assessment Policy Committee (APC) in May 2009. Clarifications requested by CAVC and Senate have been made to this edition.

The document also reflects the change in course completion timescale from within 24 months of the course start date to within 13 months of the first examination or non-examined end of course assessment submission opportunity. This change is required to support Interrupted Study.

The document has also been revised as part of a Disability Impact Assessment, and now contains additional information relating to disability, additional requirements and special circumstances.

This version was approved by APC during its February 2010 meeting. Minor wording changes were made to ensure that points SA 4.3.2 through SA 4.3.4 all alluded to 'appropriate documentary evidence' for consistency.

Mrs Catherine Daniel
Senior Manager
Assessment Policy
February 2010

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
CAVC/10/1/11
(APC/10/1/8**)**

Code of Practice for Student Assessment

The Student Regulations (including the Code of Practice for Student Assessment and the Code of Practice for Student Discipline) apply to all students of The Open University.
These regulations define the basis of the registration agreement between you and us. Students who register for a specific academic award from the University are also governed by our award regulations which deal with registering for an award, completing an award and other matters about awards. The detailed assessment rules for each course appear separately as course rules.
The Code of Practice for Student Assessment should not be read in isolation. It is important that you read it in conjunction with the following documents.

- Introduction to The Award Regulations
- General Award Regulations
- the regulations governing your award
- Student Regulations
- Code of Practice for Student Discipline

If you wish to print the regulations governing your relationship with The Open University, you are advised to print all these documents.

DEFINITIONS
The terms used in this code of practice for student assessment are defined below.

Task
A task is the generic term for any assessment completed by a student. Tasks may be used in the determination of the level of achievement by the student and in the determination of the course result.

Assignments
These are the tutor-marked and computer-marked assessment tasks, together with any other assessment tasks included in the first (continuous) assessment component of a course. The scores for these are used individually, and also with the score achieved in any second (examinable) assessment component, in the determination of an overall course result.

End-of-course assessment tasks
These can be formal written, oral or computer-based examinations or any other assessment tasks that are approved as the second (examinable) assessment component. The scores for these are used individually and also with the score achieved in the first (continuous) assessment component, in the determination of an overall course result.

SA 1   ASSIGNMENTS

SA 1.1 How you will know about your assessment
We will tell you in the course rules how many assignments you need to complete for a particular course, how many of these we will use to work out your overall results (assignments used in this way are known as summative assignments), and how individual summative assignment scores will be combined.

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
CAVC/10/1/11
(APC/10/1/8**)**

SA 1.2 Submitting assignments

We expect you to submit every assignment in a course by the date we tell you. Unless it is specifically arranged otherwise, you must submit all parts of an assignment together.

SA 1.3 Assignments for assessment purposes

We will use the scores you have been awarded for all summative assignments and the assignment weightings given in the course rules to work out your overall continuous assessment score for the course. Any assignments you have not submitted (or that you submitted too late) will be counted as having a mark of zero. Some courses allow 'substitution' to increase one or more assignment scores that fall below your usual standard. This is done automatically and uses information about your assessment throughout the course (again weighted in line with the course rules).
Some courses have assignments (or groups of assignments) for which you must achieve a minimum (overall) score in order to pass the course. Failure to achieve the minimum score will usually lead to you failing the course with no entitlement to resit the examination or resubmit the ECA (whichever applies).
We will tell you in your course rules which assignments may be substituted, whether any are necessary for assessment purposes and whether any are subject to minimum-score requirements.

SA 1.4 Assignment score appeals

If you are not satisfied with the score awarded for a particular assignment, or want to ask about any comments that have been made, you must follow the procedure and timescales for appeals set out in your Assessment Handbook.

SA 1.5 Resubmitting assignments

You are not allowed to resubmit any marked assignment, whether tutor-marked or computer-marked, to try to improve the score for that assignment.

SA 1.6 Cheating in assessment

For the purpose of this regulation, cheating in assessment is defined as representing someone else's work as your own. This includes submitting an assessment or part of an assessment that has been written jointly or has been copied (either completely or partly) without acknowledging the other person's work. Such copying includes unacknowledged copying from published material. If you are found guilty of cheating, we will deal with you in line with our code of practice for student discipline.

SA 2   EXAMINATIONS

SA 2.1 Examinations

The following regulations apply to the conduct of formal examinations. We will provide more information about your examination in the Examination Arrangements booklet, which will be issued shortly before the examination.

SA 2.2 Eligibility
You are eligible to sit an examination of the University as long as you are registered for the course leading to the examination, or you have been allowed to resit the examination.

SA 2.3 How the examination will be run
Examinations will be run as set out by Senate. We will tell you beforehand the date, time and location of the examination, and will give you full information about how the examination will be

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
CAVC/10/1/11
(APC/10/1/8**)**

held. The timetable cannot be changed except in an emergency. You will be told in the Examination Arrangements booklet how long is allowed for the examination, and the time will also be shown on the question paper. No additional time will be allowed either for reading the question paper or to candidates who arrive late for an examination.

SA 2.4 Students overseas

On certain courses and for particular categories of student, we will try to arrange examinations overseas. If we have arranged this for you, you may have to pay a fee, in advance, for each examination.

SA 2.5 In the examination room

SA 2.5.1 Identification
You must identify yourself in the examination room by producing some valid identification (bearing both your photograph and your signature) that the senior invigilator accepts.

SA 2.5.2 Permitted materials
You may take into the examination room only those materials that are authorised in the Examination Arrangements booklet or in your letter confirming any additional examination arrangements.

SA 2.5.3 Late arrival within the first half-hour
If you arrive late for the examination but within the first half hour of the examination session, you will be allowed into the examination room to complete the examination in the time remaining.

SA 2.5.4 Late arrival after the first half-hour
If you arrive after the first half-hour of the examination session, the senior invigilator will decide whether to allow you into the examination room. However, we have the right to refuse to accept your examination paper for marking.

SA 2.6 Leaving the examination room

SA 2.6.1 Leaving within the first half-hour
You may not leave the examination room during the first half-hour or during the final 15 minutes of the examination session, except in an emergency.

SA 2.6.2 Leaving after the first half-hour
You are allowed to leave the examination room temporarily at any time after the first half-hour of the examination session and, as long as you are accompanied by an invigilator, you will be allowed back into the examination.

SA 2.6.3 If you finish your examination early
You are allowed to leave the examination room when you have finished your examination at any time after the first half hour of the examination session and before the final 15 minutes (you must give your question paper and answer booklets to an invigilator when you leave) but you will not be allowed back into the examination.

SA 2.6.4 Removing stationery
You may not remove the examination question paper, any answer book, whether used or unused, any part of an answer book, or any other examination stationery from the examination room.

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
CAVC/10/1/11
(APC/10/1/8**)**

SA 2.7 Conduct of students at the examination
While in the examination room, you must not behave in a way that, in the opinion of the senior invigilator, would annoy other candidates.

SA 2.7.1 Misconduct during the examination
For the purpose of this regulation, misconduct in the examination is defined as:

a taking into the examination room, or possessing while in that room, any books, notes or other similar material, except those which have been supplied by the invigilator or authorised in the Examination Arrangements booklet or your confirmation of additional arrangements letter;

b helping or trying to help another student, or getting or trying to get help from another student;

c consulting or trying to consult any books, notes or other similar material while temporarily outside the examination room during the period of the examination;

d having a mobile phone, or other communication device, at your desk or on your person.

SA 2.7.2 Disciplinary code
If you are found guilty of misconduct in the examination, we will deal with you in line with our code of practice for student discipline.

SA 2.7.3 Indiscipline in the examination
For the purpose of this regulation, indiscipline in the examination is defined as any socially unacceptable action or behaviour that comes within the terms of regulation SD 2 of the code of practice for student discipline.

SA 2.7.4 Serious cases
In serious cases of indiscipline, the senior invigilator may stop your examination and may ask you and anyone else involved to leave the examination room.

SA 2.8 Absence from the examination

SA 2.8.1 Ill health or other serious circumstances
If you (or your representatives) send your Regional or National Director relevant documentary evidence relating directly to the date of the examination and a written explanation of your absence, within five calendar days of the examination, you may be allowed to take the examination at a later date (deferral). You can find more details about this in your Assessment Handbook.
We will not offer you another examination if:

a you have not satisfied any residential school requirement or ALE associated with that course, or

b the date of the next scheduled examination would be more than 13 months later than your first examination opportunity..

The conditions covering resits and resubmissions (paragraph SA 6.2) will also apply to you.

SA 3   Non-examined End of Course Assessment Tasks

SA 3.1 Non-examined End of Course Assessment Tasks
The following regulations apply to other assessment tasks that are approved as the second (examinable) assessment component. We will provide you more information in the Information for Students Submitting Examinable Work booklet, which will be issued approximately six weeks before your cut-off date.

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
CAVC/10/1/11
(APC/10/1/8**)**

SA 3.2 Submission of Assessment Tasks

SA 3.2.1 Cut-off dates
You must submit your assessment task(s) by the published cut-off date unless you have been formally granted an extension or deferral.

SA 3.2.2 Ill health or other serious circumstances
On most courses, if circumstances beyond your control prevent you from meeting the submission date for your piece of work, you may be eligible to either:
• delay submission by up to three weeks (referred to as an "extension"); or
• defer submission of the examinable component until the submission
date for the following presentation of the course (a "deferral").
If extensions and deferrals are not permitted on your course, your course materials will indicate this.

SA 3.2.3 Applying for extension/deferral
You must apply for an extension or deferral in accordance with the instructions in the Information for Students Submitting Examinable Work booklet. You will need to provide relevant documentary evidence covering the date of submission or the final three weeks leading up to the submission period.
We will not offer you another opportunity to submit your assessment task(s) if:

a   you have not satisfied any residential school requirement or ALE associated with that course, or
b   the submission date of the next presentation of the course would be more than 13 months later than your first submission opportunity.
The conditions covering resits and resubmissions (paragraph SA 6.2) will also apply to you.

SA 3.3 Disciplinary code
If you are found guilty of misconduct or plagiarism in the end of course assessment, we will deal with you in line with our code of practice for student discipline.

SA 4 Students with Disabilities and Additional Requirements.

SA 4.1 Sources of Information
Information about support we can offer for assessment can be found in the documents Meeting Your Needs and Meeting Your Examination Needs for courses with an examination. You will be issued with these documents if you declare a disability to the University.

SA 4.2 Assignments
Your Assessment Handbook tells you how to submit your assignments and what you must do if you are unable to submit an assignment by the cut-off date. If you feel that your continuous assessment has been affected by your disability or additional requirements, you should submit a special circumstances claim form as detailed in Paragraph SA 5.1

SA 4.3 Examinations
If you have declared a disability, we will contact you before your examination to ask you about any additional arrangements you may need. If you have not declared a disability but have other additional requirements, you should contact your Regional or National Centre.

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
CAVC/10/1/11
(APC/10/1/8**)**

SA 4.3.1 If you are unable to get to an examination centre
You will be allowed to take the examination at home, in hospital or elsewhere if:

a   for reasons of ill health or other additional requirements, you cannot go to an examination centre; and

b   your Regional or National Director thinks this is justified.

You must produce a medical certificate to confirm your additional requirements or ill health. The examination will be held under the supervision of an invigilator appointed by us.

SA 4.3.2 If you are unable to write your answers
You will be allowed to record your answers in a different format if you have additional requirements that, in your Regional or National Director's opinion, prevent you from completing them in writing. You must produce appropriate documentary evidence to confirm your additional requirements.

SA 4.3.3 Format of question paper
You will be allowed to have your examination question paper produced in an appropriate format approved by us if you have relevant additional requirements. You must produce appropriate documentary evidence to confirm your additional requirements.

SA 4.3.4 Additional time
You will be allowed additional time in which to complete your examination if you have requirements that, in the opinion of your Regional or National Director or the Chair of the Exceptional Examination Arrangements and Special Circumstances Sub-Committee, justify it. You must produce appropriate documentary evidence to confirm your additional requirements.

SA 4.3.5 Notification of additional arrangements
When the Examination and Assessment Board meets to consider your course result, it will be provided with brief factual details of any additional arrangements which have been made for your examination. If you feel that the arrangements made for your examination did not adequately compensate you for your disability, you should submit a special circumstances claim form as detailed in Paragraph SA 5.2

SA 4.4 Non-examined End of Course Assessment Tasks

SA 4.4.1 Submission of Assessment Tasks
If you are unable to submit your assessment task by the cut-off date for reasons related to your disability, you should apply for extension or deferral as detailed in paragraph SA 3.2.3. If you complete your assessment but feel that your performance has been affected by your disability, you should submit a special circumstances claim as detailed in Paragraph SA 5.3

SA 5   Special Circumstances
If you think that you have studied your course effectively but that special circumstances have had a serious effect on your performance in either the examination, non-examined end of course assessment or the continuous assessment, you may bring information about this to the attention of the Examination and Assessment Board. You can find further guidance about this in your Assessment Handbook.

SA 5.1 Assignments
If you want to tell the University about circumstances which have affected your continuous assessment, you must submit form PT39 within fourteen days of the cut-off date of your final assignment.

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
CAVC/10/1/11
(APC/10/1/8**)**

SA 5.2 Examinations
If you want to tell the University about circumstances which have affected your examination, you must submit form E39 within seven days of the date of your examination. You can find more information and guidance about this in your Examination Arrangements booklet.

SA 5.3 Non-examined End of Course Assessment Tasks.
If you want to tell the University about circumstances which have affected your end of course assessment, you must submit form E39P within seven days of the cut-off date of your submission cut-off date. You can find more information and guidance about this in your Information for Students Submitting Examinable Work booklet

SA 5.4 Awarding aegrotat
(An aegrotat is an award of a pass that may be given if you are too ill to complete the assessment for the course.)
In exceptional circumstances, if you are unable, due to medical reasons, to complete the course assessment, you may be eligible for an award of aegrotat under a code of practice approved by the Senate. Aegrotat passes are limited to students who, for medical reasons, cannot continue with any further study and are registered on the final course which would qualify them for certain academic awards.

SA 6 Resits and resubmissions

SA 6.1 When resits and resubmissions are allowed
You may (in line with any relevant award regulations) be allowed one opportunity to resit the examination or resubmit other repeatable assessment tasks if you fail a course and:

a   have achieved an overall assessment score for that course of at least 40, or such other minimum level approved by Senate, in the continuous assessment component and (where this applies) have also achieved a certain score (known as a 'threshold requirement') on specified assessment tasks in the continuous assessment component; and

b   (for courses that have a residential school) have satisfied the appropriate residential school requirement or ALE for that course; and

c   (for courses that have an examination) have taken the examination and have achieved the minimum level set by Senate; and

d   (for courses with other end-of-course assessment that allow you to resubmit the work to pass) have achieved the minimum score for this assessment set by Senate for this purpose.

You must follow the conditions set out in paragraph SA 6.2.

SA 6.2 Conditions for allowable resits and resubmissions
The conditions for resits and resubmissions that are allowed under paragraph SA 6.1 are as follows.

a   Only one resit/ resubmission opportunity is permitted.

b   If you are resitting or have deferred an examination, you must take the examination when we tell you to.

b   You must normally resit/sit the examination or resubmit/submit assessment work that counts instead of or as well as the examination within 13 months of the original failure or deferral.

c   If you are resitting an examination or resubmitting other assessment work, we will consider you to have failed the course until Senate, on the recommendation of the appropriate Examination and Assessment Board, decides otherwise.

S/10/2/M
Appendix 1
S/10/2/2
Appendix
CAVC/10/1/11
(APC/10/1/8**)**

d   Courses for which you are resitting an examination, resubmitting other assessment work or have deferred your end of course assessment will count towards the total number of credit points or units of work, or a combination of these, for which you may register at any one time.

e   If you are resitting an examination or resubmitting other assessment work, you will have to pay a fee, in advance.

SA 6.3 Viva voce examination
You may be offered additional assessment tasks, such as an oral examination, if the appropriate Examination and Assessment Board thinks it is necessary before the course result is determined.

Revised February 2010

PROGRAMME COMMITTEES

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~17.03.2009~~ 14.04.2010

___

Purpose

To oversee the development and review of the programme in compliance with University parameters and established requirements for monitoring the quality and academic standards of its awards: to make recommendations to the Faculty Committee or Awards Committee as appropriate for the enhancements of its awards.

Terms of Reference

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

1.   To receive from the CAU committee of the lead CAU(s), the overall aims and objectives of the programme; and in the light of wider strategies, policies and initiatives, to devise and to implement strategies and plans to achieve those aims and objectives.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

2.   To review the overall cost effectiveness of awards already in existence, taking account of recent market intelligence and student uptake.

3.   To ensure that equality and diversity issues are addressed in new proposals, developments and reviews.

4.   For each existing award in the programme, to review the learning outcomes and assessment strategies and update the award specifications and to consider student pathways through and between awards.

5.   To keep under review the structure of each award. To identify those courses which are central to the award and review them and their associated credit transfer arrangements in relation to the curriculum map. To update the curriculum map by recommending new courses, replacements, and the excision of existing courses to the relevant CAU Committees.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

6.   To ensure that decisions and recommendations take account of information on the external environment, information on student performance, reports from External Examiners and External Advisers, and the resource implications of proposals for new courses.

7.   To take account of ongoing evaluation throughout each presentation, including tutor monitoring, recommendations from course life cycle reviews and external examiner reports of compulsory and core optional courses.

8.   For those courses offered in collaboration with another Institution, to feed into and to take account of the recommendations of the curriculum partnerships annual review.

Advising other governance bodies or management

9. For awards in development, to advise the gate-keeper of the academic coherence and strategic fit within the programme prior to the various stage/gate decisions.

10. To recommend as appropriate the development of new awards, significant changes to the structure of existing awards, the discontinuation of awards, the discontinuation or addition of new designations.

11. To advise the relevant University bodies on market research requirements.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

12. Interpretation and approval of regulations and exceptions relating to individual circumstances delegated to the Chair.

Membership

The membership of each programme committee should normally not exceed fifteen people.

1. Chair – Programme Director or nominee.

2. The Dean/Director of the lead CAU or their nominee.

3. Heads of departments/centres who have staff who contribute to the compulsory and core optional courses (depending on the structure of the awards), or the Course Team Chairs.

4. External Adviser(s), appointed by the lead Central Academic Unit.

5. At least one Staff tutor/Regional manager.

6. Practitioner representative where appropriate

7. One associate lecturer representative appointed by an appointment panel.

7.8. Up to a maximum number of three co-opted members as needed

In Attendance

The Programme Manager

Method of operation

1. The Committee shall be established by the relevant Central Academic Unit Committee and shall report to it in the first instance.

2. It shall normally meet three times a year, with meetings scheduled to fit the unit planning cycle.

3. Normally there should be an annual workshop run under the aegis of the programme committee for all academic staff involved in the programme and a representative of a related professional body where appropriate.

4. The Committee shall meet with the External Adviser(s) at least annually.

5.   The Committee shall make an annual report to the Awards Committee.

6.   With the agreement of the relevant Central Academic Unit Committee, the Programme Committee shall have the power to set up working groups as and when necessary.

7.   The Chair of the Committee shall have executive authority to act on its behalf in consultation with its Secretary.

THE SENATE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 13.05.2008 14.04.2010

Membership

1.0 *Ex officio* **members**

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

Appointed members

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

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

[1] Currently CHERI, COBE, KMi and OBU
[2] Currently comprises regional directors and some assistant directors

3.0 Six associate lecturers appointed by and from the Associate Lecturers Committee Executive.

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

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

---

[*] Namely, the Secretary, the Senior Assistant Secretary (Central Secretariat) and the Assistant Secretary (Central Secretariat).

Co-opted members

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

In Attendance

Staff 'in attendance' would include the Secretary, plus the Director OUVS, Head of the OBU, the Scottish and Welsh Directors and the Director for the Open University in Ireland, if they are not members.

The Open
University

Award of the title of visiting academic to individuals not holding academic posts at other institutions

Introduction

1.   The University welcomes the engagement of intellectual leaders drawn from the widest possible spectrum of professions in the development of its teaching and research activities. It is also aware that a number of senior, well-established individuals with a non-academic professional background would welcome their working association with the University being recognised through a senior honorary appointment.

2.   It is acknowledged that reviewing such cases against the normal academic criteria is not appropriate, given the established professional seniority and often 'public' profile of these candidates. The following procedures will therefore be used to consider such proposals for visiting status at the University.

Consideration of proposals for visiting status below the level of visiting professor

3.   Where the proposed title is below the level of Visiting Professor (or Visiting Research Professor) and the intended visitor does not hold or has recently held either a substantive or visiting academic post at a recognised and reputable university, the endorsement of the Dean and Director of Studies for the proposal will normally be sufficient to allow the title to be conferred on the individual. In providing such support for the application, the Dean must be satisfied that the individual could be appointed to a post at a similar level in the Faculty.

4.   Cases must comprise a proposal form with details of the visitor's role and a current CV. On receipt of such cases by the Central Secretariat, they will be forwarded to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) for consideration and approval.

Consideration of proposals for visiting reader or professor

5.   Where the proposed title is Visiting Professor, Visiting Research Professor or Visiting Reader, and the intended visitor does not hold or has recently held either a substantive or visiting academic post at a recognised and reputable university, then the proposal form must be submitted with a statement from the proposer (approved by the Dean and Director of Studies) giving the rationale for the application for visiting status with a current CV. On receipt, such cases will be referred to the Chair and Readership Subcommittee of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee for consideration.

6.   In considering the award of the title Visiting Professor, Visiting Research Professor or Visiting Reader to individuals who do not hold professorial or reader appointments, the Chair and Readership Subcommittee will consider appropriate evidence which exemplars suitable and relevant peer recognition through evidence of:

- professional standing acquired and recognised independently through practice, contributions and/or impact upon field;
- debate of, engagement with and dissemination of 'best practice' within and across professional communities;
- key note and/or equivalent authoritative communication(s) through publication and/or presentation to professional audiences both within and across professional communities;
- engagement with, and development of staff within a professional sector.

7. An application would also be measured in the context of the benefits to be secured both by the individual, and by the institution as a result of a formal, active association of the type defined by the award of a visiting title.

8. The Chair and/or Deputy Chair of the Chair and Readership Subcommittee shall have executive authority to act on its behalf in consultation with the Secretary of the Committee.

26 March 2010
ST

**COURSE RESULTS APPROVAL AND QUALIFICATIONS CLASSIFICATION PANEL
(CRAQCP)**

DRAFT CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 28.07.0814.04.2010

Purpose

The Panel is responsible for approving recommendations for course results and the award and classification of qualifications.

Terms of Reference

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

1. To act on behalf of the Senate to approve the award and classification of the BA and BSc Honours Degrees, the Advanced and Professional Diplomas and such other qualifications as may be approved by the Senate.

2. To approve on behalf of the Senate, the recommendations of Examination and Assessment Boards and Assessment Panels with regard to all course results with the exception of those relating to Higher Degrees by research.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

3. To be responsible, on behalf of the Senate, for monitoring the maintenance of standards in approved awards as in 1 above, in consultation with the Assessment Policy Committee.

4. To consider reports on the conduct of policy and procedures for the determination of course results from the Head, Assessment, Credit and Awards.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

5. To approve on advice of the Assessment Policy Committee, the award of aegrotat credit to individual students under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.

Membership

1   The Vice-Chancellor, Chair, *ex officio*

12.   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards), Deputy Chair, *ex officio*.

23.   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality) *ex officio*.

34.   Up to three members drawn from a panel of six members of the academic staff of the University nominated by the Chair.

45.   One external member, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor, for a four year period who shall be a member of the academic staff of a UK University.

Secretary

Mode of Operation

1. The panel shall meet as and when required.

2. There shall be a quorum of four for business to be transacted.

3. In instances where the panel exercises its discretion to withhold ratification, it shall consult with the Chair/s of the appropriate Examination and Assessment Boards and Assessment Panels to determine the result/s to be awarded.

4. The panel shall satisfy itself that arrangements are made for advising Chairs of Examination and Assessment Boards and Assessment Panels on the application of Senate approved guidelines.

5. The panel shall report each year to the Assessment Policy Committee, such reports to include statistical information on course results, together with any recommendations for changes to policies, procedures or guidelines.

6. The Chair of the panel shall have executive authority to act on behalf of the panel in consultation with the panel's secretary.

VALIDATION COMMITTEE

DRAFT CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 08.04.200914.04.2010

Purpose

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

Terms of Reference

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

1.   To approve the validation and re-validation of awards offered by associated and accredited institutions, taking into account the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) requirements relating to programme specifications, learning outcomes and subject benchmarking, and taking account of the University's taught awards.

2.   To approve the imposition of sanctions on associated and accredited institutions where the quality and standards of an award are at risk, including the approval of the close of entry to a validated award.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

3.   To monitor the number of associated and accredited institutions, the number of re-accreditations, the number of validated awards and applications for re-validation, and student numbers on the University's validated awards and to receive an annual report on these items.

4.   To monitor, in consultation with the Curriculum Partnerships Committee, the process for the annual review of validated awards, requiring evidence from associated and accredited institutions of effective management of the quality of provision and of the academic standards, reporting to the CAVC on the overall progression and completion statistics and referring any major issues arising from the reports to the CAVC.

5.   To monitor compliance with any conditions arising from the accreditation or re-accreditation of institutions, and the validation, re-validation or review of individual awards.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

6.   To maintain and monitor the University's procedures for the approval of institutions as suitable for the conduct of programmes leading to Open University awards by validation or other means of approval, ensuring that the quality of learning opportunities and student support provided by the institution meet the University's standards.

7.   To maintain and monitor the University's procedures for the validation and review of programmes, with reference to the current guidance from the QAA.

8.   To maintain and monitor the procedures for the external examination of validated awards.

9.   To keep under review the handbook for the University's accredited institutions and validated awards, having regard to the relationships between such awards, their comparability with the University's taught awards and the relevant national qualifications frameworks.

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

Advising other governance bodies or management

11.   To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the approval of institutions, their re-accreditation and the terms of their accredited status and to make recommendations to the CAVC on their approval.

12.   To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the termination of the approval of an institution, ensuring that commitments to continuing students are protected to the completion of their studies, and to make recommendations to CAVC on the termination of the accreditation.

Making governance arrangements e.g. appointing to other committees

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

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

14.   To formally approve the appointment of external examiners at associated and accredited institutions.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

15.   To delegate to the Director of OUVS the responsibility for resolving complaints and appeals, where an accredited institution's own procedures have been exhausted, on matters relating to programmes of study, awards, and validation and review processes, in accordance with procedures approved by the Senate.

Membership

1.   A Chair appointed by the Curriculum, Awards and Validation Committee.

2.   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards).

3.   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality) or nominee.

4.   The Director, Open University Validation Services.

5.   The Director, Open University Worldwide.

6.   The Head of Quality

7.   Two members having experience in appropriate branches of industry or commerce or in appropriate professions, including members with experience in the field of occupational standards.

8.   Three members from accredited institutions of the Open University.

9. ~~Five~~ One representative~~s~~ of each of the central academic units of the University, normally at associate dean level.

10. At least one regional/national director.

11. Three members from other higher education establishments having suitable experience, for example of ensuring standards and quality assurance through peer validation.

12. One representative appointed by the Curriculum Partnerships Committee who is a member of that Committee.

13. Such other members as may be appointed by the Curriculum~~, Awards~~ and Validation Committee up to a maximum of three.

14. Such others as the Committee may co-opt up to a maximum of three, to include members with expertise in HE issues including foundation degrees.

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

Secretary

Mode of Operation

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

2. The Chair of the Committee shall have executive authority to act on its behalf in consultation with its Secretary.