THE SENATE

**Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 26 January 2011
in the Hub Theatre**

Present:

1) Ex officio

Mr Martin Bean, Vice-Chancellor
Professor Alan Bassindale, Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor
(Research and Enterprise)
Professor Denise Kirkpatrick, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality)
Professor Alan Tait, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Qualifications)
Professor David Rowland, Faculty of Arts
Dr Sharon Ding, Dean, Faculty of Education and Language Studies
Mr Jeremy Roche, Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care
Dr Simon Bromley, Faculty of Social Sciences
Professor Phil Potts, Dean, Faculty of Science
Professor Anne De Roeck, Dean, Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology
Professor James Fleck, Dean, Open University Business School
Mr Will Swann, Director, Students
Professor Josie Taylor, Director of the Institute of Educational Technology
Mrs Nicky Whitsed, Director, Library Services
Ms Anne Howells, Director of Learning and Teaching Solutions

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

Professor Richard Allen	Dr Lynda Prescott
Professor Suman Gupta	Dr Bob Wilkinson
Dr Graham Harvey	

Faculty of Education and Language Studies

Dr Regine Hampel	Professor Karen Littleton
Ms Felicity Harper	Dr Peter Twining
Dr Steven Hutchinson	

Faculty of Health and Social Care

Mrs Sue Cole	Professor Jan Draper
Professor Monica Dowling	Dr Verina Waights

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr David Bowers	Professor Andy Lane
Dr Judy Ekins	Dr Nicholas Moss
Professor Joyce Fortune	Dr Shirley Northover
Mr Derek Goldrei	Dr Toby O'Neil
Professor Uwe Grimm	Dr Helen Yanacopulos

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Troy Cooper	Dr Raia Prokhovnik
Dr Helen Kaye	Professor Michael Saward
Dr Bob Kelly	Dr Jason Toynbee
Dr Hugh Mackay	

Faculty of Science

Dr John Baxter	Dr Robert Saunders
Dr Payam Rezaie	Dr Terry Whatson
Dr Nick Rogers	Professor Ian Wright
Dr David Rothery	

Open University Business School

Mrs Keren Bright	Mr Mike Phillips
Dr Jacky Holloway	Mr Alessandro Saroli
Ms Carmel McMahon	

Institute of Educational Technology

Dr Robin Goodfellow	Professor Eileen Scanlon
Professor Agnes Kukulska-Hulme	

Other Central Units

Dr Rebecca Ferguson

Regional/National Centres

Mrs Lynda Brady	Ms Barbara Stephens
Dr Liz Manning	

3) Associate Lecturers

Mr Paddy Alton	Mr John James
Dr Isobel Falconer	Dr Roma Oakes
Mr Bruce Heil	Dr Walter Pisarski

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association

Mrs Marianne Cantieri	Mr David Reed
Mrs Roz Evans	Mr Carey Shaw
Ms Laura Murphy	Mrs Sandra Summers

5) Academic-related Staff

Mrs Liz Armitage	Mr Tony O'Shea-Poon
Mrs Carole Baume	Ms Hilary Robertson
Ms Fiona Carey	Mr Ian Roddis
Mrs Lynda Juma	Ms Gill Smith
Mr Martin Kenward	Mr Michael Street
Mr Billy Khokhar	Ms Elaine Walker
Dr Christina Lloyd	

6) Co-opted members

Mr John D'Arcy   Dr Peter Scott
Mr Rob Humphreys   Dr Petrina Stevens
Dr James Miller

In attendance

Miss Victoria Lindsay (alternate), Open University Validation Services
Dr Sally Crompton, Head of Open Broadcasting Unit
Dr Malcolm Cross, Director of Research and Enterprise

Apologies:

Appointed

1) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts
Professor John Wolffe

Faculty of Education and Language Studies
Dr Jane Cullen
Mr Pete Smith

Faculty of Health and Social Care
Dr Sarah Earle

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology
Mr Anthony Meehan
Dr Sally Organ

Regional/National Centres
Mrs Celia Cohen

2) Academic-Related Staff
Mrs Bethan Norfor

1	MINUTES	S/10/4/M

1.1 Referring to minute 8.30, which reported the discussion about who managed associate lecturers (ALs) in the context of the Student Services Operating Model (SSOM), a member commented that the Director, Students, Mr Will Swann, had said that he would be happy to write into the SSOM report that staff tutors were responsible for the management of ALs across a whole variety of functions. However, this had not been recorded in the minutes. Mr Swann confirmed the view that staff tutors were and would remain responsible for the academic and quality management of the role of the associate lecturer.

1.2 The member also referred to minute 8.33 where it was recorded that the line management arrangements for staff tutors would be the same in the regions and in the nations. However, the report had indicated that whilst the status quo would remain in the nations, there would be changes in the regions. Mr Swann confirmed that in all regions and nations, staff tutors would have a single line manager who would be in the faculty. However, it had been recognised that there were particular features of the role of the staff tutor in the nations that would require different arrangements. The nation directors and the deans were working on the detail of these arrangements, but this would not extend to a change in the line management arrangements for those in nations rather than regions.

1.3 Subject to the clarification and amendment above, the Senate **approved** as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 13 October 2010.

2 MATTERS ARISING

Minute 8.36

A member commented that whilst the evaluation of the cluster trial referred to by the Director, Students, Mr Will Swann, was welcome, it was less far reaching than the other pilots. Some reassurance was necessary about the evaluation of the major changes that would be taking place next year. Mr Swann said that this was not a pilot, but a permanent change. In that context, the purpose of the evaluation would not be to understand whether the University should do something else, but how it could operate successfully within that framework. The University would be monitoring the impacts on the student experience, the staff experience and on the costs, and if those impacts fell short of expectations or requirements then the University would react and adjust accordingly.

3 REPORT FROM AND QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR

3.1 The Vice-Chancellor welcomed Professor Alan Bassindale back to the Senate. Professor Bassindale had retired from the University last year, but had now rejoined the University as Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) whilst recruitment was underway for the substantive post.

3.2 The Director, The OU in Ireland, Mr John D'Arcy, was also welcomed to his first meeting of the Senate since taking up his post in October 2010.

3.3 The Vice-Chancellor commented that 2012 promised to be both a momentous and challenging year in the history of The Open University (OU). There would be unparalleled change in higher education in England and there was also a great deal of uncertainty in Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland. The University would be facing different and diverging environments across the four nations over the coming years.

3.4 However, there was plenty of good news from all quarters of the University, which included the following examples:

The Systems Futures Project

3.5 Over the past year, there had been a common message across the University that new systems were needed to support the University's activities. The OU's Chief Information Officer, Mr David Matthewman, and his team now had the Systems Futures project well underway. The project would specify and deliver a world-class enterprise architecture that would help the University to understand its requirements for the future in order that its systems would provide the agility needed for the OU's business to respond to the opportunities, challenges and events over the next 5-10 years.

3.6 Stage 2 of the Systems Futures programme was now looking at the OU's core activities in curriculum, teaching and student administration, as well as understanding the needs of the University's research and business development units. The systems supporting some of the administrative teams, such as Human Resources, would also be reviewed.

3.7 Mr Matthewman's team would now be arranging a series of workshops and other sessions to run in February - March 2011 to ensure that the University had the right breadth of thinking and that staff were connected across the University. This was a considerable undertaking as the University was determined to map the processes and systems across the University, rather than just in isolated pieces, in order to provide a more flexible and agile way of doing business in the future.

Grants, Awards and Honours

3.8 Professor Paul Garthwaite in the Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology (MCT) had helped to secure a grant of 3.4 million Euros from the European Union (EU) for a multi-centre, three-year project on global climate change. The OU was leading the project, and the principal investigators were Professor Garthwaite and Dr Neil Edwards of Earth Sciences.

3.9 The Science Faculty had been awarded £250,000 from the Wolfson Foundation to produce short modules for the 'Reach and Teach' community initiative.

3.10 Multimedia resources from *U116 Environment: journeys through a changing world* had been recognised by the prestigious Europe-wide MEDEA competition against stiff opposition. These resources focussed on sustainable water use in the Nile basin, with a particular focus on Ethiopia. Pam Furniss, Senior Lecturer in Environmental Systems in MCT had been the author of the activities in collaboration with the Learning and Teaching Solutions (LTS) U116 team.

3.11 The Professor of Transport Strategy, Stephen Potter, was involved with the Milton Keynes Electric Vehicle project (ELVIS) that had successfully bid for a grant under the *Plugged in Places* programme to develop public electric car charging infrastructure in Milton Keynes. This would help to make Milton Keynes a more carbon-friendly environment, reduce pollution and lower travel costs.

3.12 Professor Susheila Nasta, Chair in Modern Literature, Faculty of Arts, had been awarded an Member of the British Empire (MBE) in the New Year's Honours List for her services to black and Asian Literature. Professor Nasta was founder and editor of Wasafiri, Britain's premier magazine for international contemporary writing. Established in 1984, and published quarterly, Wasafiri had established a distinctive reputation for promoting work by new and established voices across the globe.

3.13 Amy Sackville, associate lecturer for A215 *Creative Writing*, had won the John Llewellyn Rhys prize for her first novel *The Still Point*. Amy had been identified by The Telegraph as one of the top new novelists for 2010, and had been long listed for the Orange Prize for Fiction.

3.14   MCT, together with the Faculty of Science, was part of a £1 million consortium, funded by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council, to develop web based training in the theoretical components of Systems Biology for bioscience researchers. The OU's contribution in the area of basic maths for systems biology would focus on the development of OU Applied Maths materials into e-learning formats. The OU team was headed by Dr David Crowe, Maths and Statistics Department, and also comprised Dr David Morse (Computing) and Dr Rob Saunders (Biology). The consortium was being led by University College London (UCL) and the OU, and included a contribution from Birkbeck College and the University of Edinburgh. It was excellent to see more collaboration not only across disciplines within the OU, but also between higher education institutions (HEIs). This would be the way of the future across all four nations of the UK, and those HEIs who were able to collaborate would be the ones to survive.

3.15   The Vice-Chancellor congratulated all those involved in these achievements, as well as the many who had not been mentioned at this meeting.

Degree ceremonies

3.16   The Vice-Chancellor encouraged all members of the Senate to attend at least one of the forthcoming degree ceremonies. There was no better way of grounding oneself in what the OU was about than to participate in the success of its students. The ceremonies were enhanced by having the academic community of the OU present, and the individuals within that community would take away much more from being there than anything that they had invested by way of time and energy in attending. The main way in which the University would evaluate the changes that it would have to make would be in the quality of the student experience. Talking to them about all aspects of the student journey was the best way of informing the University's decision making.

The UK Political Landscape and Funding Environment

3.17   The Vice-Chancellor remarked that it would be difficult not to be aware of the ongoing debates in the UK concerning the balance of private and public contributions to higher education (HE) provision, and the drive to reduce levels of public expenditure. The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, would speak to paper S/11/1/7: The UK Political Landscape and Funding Environment, later in the meeting, focussing on the current state of play with funding and the external environment across the four nations of the UK; the anticipated impact on The Open University; and the key principles and tests that the University should adopt and seek public support for as part of the OU's engagement with the ongoing reviews.

3.18   The University was responding to and engaging with these changes. Although the funding for 2012-14 would not be known for some time, the University was actively planning for all likely scenarios. It was clear that Government had cut 6% from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) budget for 2011/12 and it was expected that HEFCE would pass this on by cutting the teaching grant. In addition, a cut of 4% had been announced for Wales and around 10% for general teaching grants in Scotland. Until the exact size of any cuts was known, the University would hold to the existing targets in the unit plans that had been agreed last year and to the targets that related to the work of the focus areas. However, the University was anticipating and planning for further reductions that may become necessary as the size of cuts became clearer. The publication of the White Paper, which would set out how the Government planned to bring the outcomes of the Browne Review and the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) into force in England, was expected sometime in March 2011.

3.19   Over the past few months, through engagement with Government, the OU had not only influenced but also helped shape policy by:

a)   securing cross-party support for the principle of parity between full-time and part-time higher education;

b)   having the Minister confirm, on the record, that the tariff point system is "unworkable";

c)   gaining a line in the Department of Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) letter to HEFCE, that read "for 2011/12 the top policy priorities for targeted funding should be supporting widening participation and fair access";

d)   and persuading the Government to reduce the intensity level at which part-time students receive support to 25% or 30 credits, which would help a further 19,000 of OU students participate in the Student Loan Programme.

3.20   However, there were a significant number of open issues, that would be addressed in the White Paper and beyond, on which the University would continue to press the Government, including:

a)   the terms by which loans and student scholarships were to be made available to part-time students in England;

b)   the importance of retaining HEFCE funds for widening participation, improving retention and supporting students with disabilities;

c)   the transitional arrangements in moving to the new funding model; and

d)   the needs of specific groups of students such as those with an Equivalent or Lower Qualification (ELQ), those OU students studying at a full-time rate, and offender learners

with the aim to secure the very best possible financial and educational settlement for the OU and for its enduring mission.

3.21   To ensure that the University responded quickly and appropriately to all these changes, three work streams had been set up to assess and react to the challenges of the new environment:

a)   Markets, students and pricing, would focus on developing a clearer sense of the target student markets within the UK, the products and services that the OU needed to offer to those students, and the appropriate price levels to charge. This work stream would be led by the University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn;

b)   Cost reduction and efficiency, would identify options for tactical cost reduction, as well as recommending areas for protection and investment. This work stream would be led by the Finance Director, Mr Miles Hedges; and

c)   New income streams, that would develop and implement a UK Business-to-Business and Business-to-Government strategy and an International strategy in order to grow existing and new sources of sustainable net revenue. The Business Development Director, Ms Anthoula Madden, would lead this work stream.

3.22 The outcomes of all three major work streams would be reported to the meeting of the Council in July 2011. These would then feed into the OU Futures refresh process in the final calendar quarter of the calendar year.

3.23 The University was planning for the known-knowns, the known-unknowns, and the unknown-unknowns in a methodical way, involving stakeholders within and outside the University, to ensure that when decisions were made they resulted in the best possible outcome for the OU.

3.24 A member commented that, by any measure, the plans as currently being outlined by the Government would be more expensive than those currently in place, and enquired whether there was any indication as to how the Government would reshape the proposals to make them more affordable. The Vice-Chancellor responded that it was a complicated situation and might explain the delay in the publication of the White Paper. The Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI) and other think tank reports suggested that it was arguable, on a cash basis, that the plans would not save public money in the short to mid term. This was not the goal of the Treasury, which wanted to ensure that overall levels of external borrowing were reduced and the UK balance sheet cleaned up. Discussions were taking place between the Treasury, BIS and the Student Loans Company to clarify the situation. The Browne Review had recommended a systems approach, in which all the pieces were connected. If one started to play with certain pieces of the model, then one started to get into difficulties were the original objective of cutting overall public investment in higher education might not be realised.

4 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE (SPRC)   S/11/1/1

The Senate **noted** the unconfirmed minutes and the unconfirmed confidential and restricted minutes from the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee (SPRC) held on 27 October 2010.

5 LEARNING, TEACHING AND STUDENT SUPPORT COMMITTEE (LTSSC)   S/11/1/2

5.1 Referring to paragraph 6 of the report, a member enquired as to the pedagogical outcome of the measure of richness of online provision, and whether the measure led to better teaching or better results. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality), Professor Denise Kirkpatrick, observed that it was unfortunate that the brief report did not reflect the detail of the presentation to LTSSC, which indicated that the measure did indeed relate to the pedagogic value. Further information was available in the paper on the eLearning Data Project, which could be found at : http://intranet.open.ac.uk/strategy-unit/committees/ltssc/papers.shtml

5.2 The Senate **noted** the report from the meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Student Support Committee (LTSSC) held on 8 November 2010.

6 CURRICULUM AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE (CVC)   S/11/1/3

The Senate **noted** the report from the meeting of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC) held on 16 November 2010 and the subsequent Chair's action taken on behalf of the committee.

7   RESEARCH COMMITTEE   **S/11/1/4**

The Senate **noted** the report from the meeting of the Research Committee held on
1 December 2010.

8   QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE (QAEC)   S/11/1/5

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

9   SENATE MEMBERSHIP PANEL   **S/11/1/6**

The Senate:

a)   **approved** the following appointments to the Disciplinary Tribunal and Grievance
        Committee Panels (DTGCP) until 31 August 2014:

        i)   Professor Nicholas Braithwaite   Engineering Physics   Science
        ii)   Mr Anthony Meehan   Computing   MCT

b)   **noted** the matters for report from the meeting of the Senate Membership Panel
        (SMP) held on 29 November 2010.

10   THE UK POLITICAL LANDSCAPE AND FUNDING ENVIRONMENT   S/11/1/7

10.1   The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, presented the report, on which the Vice-
        Chancellor had already commented in his introductory remarks. The 2003 White Paper on
        the Future of Higher Education in England had made little reference to part-time education,
        which at that time was not recognised in any of the four UK nations. Wales had led the way
        in improving arrangements for part-time students and placing them on a more equal footing.
        Now, in response to pressure from the Vice-Chancellor and the Nation Directors, the
        fundamental importance of part-time was recognised in every part of the UK, although not
        necessarily translated into effective policy. Fortunately for the University, the Browne
        Review and the Government's response to it had recognised the fundamental importance
        of part-time education. It was the University's job to steer the best path through the
        changing environment for the OU and its students. There was much to do to influence the
        public policy agenda over the next few months and years. The University would have to be
        agile in developing propositions that were attractive to governments, that were consistent
        across the UK, but which recognised the increasingly diverse funding environment in the
        four nations. It would also have to be adept in developing programmes and models of
        student support that worked across the whole of the UK.

10.2   A member congratulated the Vice-Chancellor, the senior team and all who had been
        involved with the negotiations on the political front for their outstanding work. The
        outcomes had not been a given, but the OU had risen to the challenge and now had more
        confidence in its position than many other HEIs.

10.3   Referring to the Vice-Chancellor's earlier remarks about the University's response to the
        changes in the external environment, a member proposed a fourth work stream on public
        political action. The Government's aims were to reduce participation in higher education
        and to privatise what remained. Given the magnitude of the Browne Review and the
        Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR), the University's work in influencing the
        Government had been very effective, but it was now necessary to go further and to

challenge the Government's goals. The student street protests had achieved some major concessions. The OU should also challenge vigorously, because it was in danger of losing half of its funding. This threatened the core principles openness, widening participation and life-long learning. The University should go public, use its expertise and spend its resources to join with other HEIs to challenge the coalition's ideology and to demonstrate that the Government's HE policy would be a socio-economic disaster. Mr Woodburn responded that the OU was ambitious and influential, but it was doubtful that the University would be able to reverse the entire Government policy in England. The University's campaign was focussed on getting the best outcome for part-time HE from the emerging fees and funding regime. This stance had been very successful: if the University had taken a different stance and part-time education had been forgotten, the OU would be in much more difficult situation. A member agreed that moving away from the influencing strategy that had been so successful for the University would be counterproductive.

10.4   The Vice-Chancellor assured the Senate that the University had been battling on many fronts. The OU was publicly fighting for widening participation (WP). The Vice-Chancellor had been outspoken in a televised forum with David Willets, the Minister of State for Universities and Science, and John Denham, Shadow Education Minister, and with the media. The Four-in-Ten website was now shifting its focus from part-time inclusion to widening participation. It was important to hold the Government accountable to do something about widening participation. The appointment of Simon Hughes, Deputy Leader of the Liberal Democrats, to his role regarding social mobility had happened because of the number of people who were holding ministers true to their word. The University was regularly pointing out the errors in their communications and impact statements, and had lined up the publicly facing resources to fight the OU's corner. It was better to be invited to the table and to have the ear of those who were able to make a difference, than to adopt different measures that would preclude the OU from the debate. The University had an external relations strategy group, which met regularly, and the Vice-Chancellor's diary included meetings with stakeholders across all parties and divides, and with various channels for the OU's voice.

10.5   With reference to previous comments on the HE sector being divided, a member enquired about the extent to which the OU was involved in lobbying with other HEIs on the broader front, as any division might be to the advantage of the Government. The Vice-Chancellor commented that the OU had worked with Birbeck College throughout the process in respect of part-time provision. The OU was a member of the University Alliance and had been actively engaged with the development of its policy stance where possible. The OU was involved with Universities UK (UUK) who had been supportive of the OU and had called upon the University to contribute to its key forums. In the other nations, the OU was actively participating in collaborative programmes. During its lobbying, the University had indicated to policy makers that, apart from Birbeck College and the OU, part-time provision in the rest of the sector had been in decline. The OU would continue to collaborate with other HEIs because of the fundamental belief in its mission to drive access to high quality education. The OU was a big part of that provision, but the whole HE sector needed to be able to deliver in the UK and around the world.

10.6   A member said that whilst the lobbying to date had created some concessions for the OU, the next steps, in terms of getting more funding from the Government for Widening participation, would be more difficult. The Pro-Chancellor, Lord Haskins, had said at the Council meeting in November 2010 that all stakeholders, including students, must be prepared to get behind the OU. This would require not only lobbying, but a campaign that all stakeholders could get involved in to defend the mission of the University. The Vice-Chancellor responded that the intention behind the construction of the Four-in-Ten website was to provide a galvanising point for all stakeholders to spin up a campaign. The underlying architecture allowed individuals to send letters to their Members of Parliament (MPs). To ensure that the £372m for WP and the £150m for the National Scholarship Programme were applied fairly might require the OU to lobby even harder. The underlying

apparatus to allow this to happen was now in place, so that if and when it became necessary to call the University's stakeholders to action, it would be done in a meaningful way.

10.7 The President, OUSA, Mrs Roz Evans, acknowledged that it was a time of uncertainty, but said that a statement to the students, to say that although the OU did not have all the answers it was working in their interests, would be very well received. There were many myths currently circulating, including that the OU would close. Information should be put out to students as soon as it was available to avoid losing them. Students were ready to campaign for the OU, but some reassurance and encouragement would be welcome. The Director, Students said that a statement had been issued to front line staff for students who contacted the University, which they were in growing numbers. There was very little that the University could say at present and it was not helpful to speculate. The strategy for communicating with students was being led by Communications, because it was important that what was said to students was consistent with what was said to other stakeholder groups. As soon as there was something definitive and helpful to be said to students, the University would do so.

10.8 Another member agreed that it was necessary to concentrate on the financial imperatives. However, whilst the OU had achieved parity with regard to the funding of part-time students, it would also mean that the University would be compared more directly with other HEIs in relation to measures such as contact hours, teaching patterns and employment outcomes (para 20). The OU would be fighting on different territory and would have to learn how to position and present itself not just to politicians and the rest of the education community, but more generally to the public at large. Mr Woodburn responded that this was one of many ways in which evolving policy could be seriously damaging to the OU. If the University did not act, information and arrangements would be developed which were entirely based on full-time face-to-face institutions and that would not work for the OU. This was already apparent in the HE league tables which did not fit the OU model. The University could not afford this in the new regime where the OU was seen as an integral part of the HE system. The OU was very alert to the need to influence civil servants and the funding councils that such information should recognise the particular nature of the OU.

10.9 The Director, the OU in Scotland, Mr James Miller observed that, whilst the University should be seeking the best for part-time students, the diversity in policy across the four nations might mean that this would be different in each nation. Whatever the University chose to do both now and in the future would have to take account of these major differences. With reference to paragraph 29 (d), the Scottish Government had not been generous in allocating the University an additional £0.4 million under the Widening Access Retention Premium (WARP). This funding was for a particular project.

10.10 The Director, the OU in Wales, Mr Rob Humphreys, remarked that the fact that the paper dealt with the four nations in a thorough way demonstrated the progress that the OU had made in this area over the past few years. The governments in Wales and Scotland had explicitly rejected a market approach for HE and still viewed it as a public good. As a consequence, these governments might see the role of the OU in their respective sectors in very different ways. The University should be mindful that the role that it came to play in England did not skew and inhibit its ability to play a different role in the other nations. The more the University started to look and feel like an orthodox university in England, the less distinctive it would be. With reference to the four tests set out in paragraph 58, an explicit reference to the University's sense of itself as an academic community and a distinct institution was missing, as well as a sense that HE itself was a force for public good and played a major role in contributing to society, economy and developing a critical culture. Amidst the turmoil and change it was important to remember the OU's contribution to social justice, as well as considering the bottom line, and this should be at the forefront of the University's thinking when considering OU Futures. Mr Woodburn said that it would be difficult for the University to get a sense of itself and its mission that worked across the four

nations, but that it was important to achieve that outcome. England might become a more market orientated environment with private as well as public sector providers than would be the case in the other nations, but the OU did not need to change its mission to meet the different funding regimes. Indeed, the OU had a special role that was probably even more important in a market environment, than in a public sector funded environment. In the University's lobbying, key points, sense of mission and internal responses to the changing environment, it was important to find a way that worked across the four nations.

10.11 A member suggested that there was a need for a fifth test that considered whether the new funding system would sustain and promote the OU's mission, particularly in relation to Widening participation. Mr Woodburn said that whole point of lobbying was to get the best deal possible to support the mission of The Open University. The four tests proposed in the paper were about the funding system as a whole, rather the University, and tactically this seemed to be the best way to approach it. Previous exercises which had focussed on the OU had demonstrated that this did not play as well with ministers and policy makers as propositions for the sector. Whilst it was appropriate to use the proposed fifth test internally, externally it was better to focus on the issues affecting the sector.

10.12 A student member said that members of the OU Students Association (OUSA) had also proposed a fifth test, which was whether the system sustained life-long learning. Mr Woodburn suggested that this might fit with the previous proposal regarding the mission of the OU. The President, OUSA, Mrs Roz Evans, remarked that of the four tests, the students had thought that the fourth, regarding quality, was probably the most important and should therefore appear first.

10.13 Another member suggested that an additional test might be whether the system sustained and promoted collaboration and cooperation between universities, particularly across the nations, or whether it would drive more competition between HEIs. Mr Woodburn said that he would not want to speculate on whether the Government wanted collaboration or competition. The OU was in a privileged position given its role and national reach to operate as a collaborative organisation, and it would continue to look for opportunities to collaborate with other institutions.

10.14 A member observed that the Government had forgotten about the huge role that life-long learning had to play for those who already held qualifications, and who provided a significant amount of business for the OU. In negotiations regarding the future of the ELQ policy, the University could be more forceful about the value of life long learning to the community. It was important to record the added value of the OU to people's lives, not just in terms of salary and status, but their contribution to society through life long learning. Mr Woodburn agreed that this was hugely important to the University, although it was not all about ELQ. Intellectually, the University had won the argument and ministers and opposition leaders from all the parties had recognised that the ELQ policy was a mistake that would need to be rectified in due course. Unfortunately, the argument had still to be won with MPs in general. Despite the University's success in influencing, backbenchers still thought of HE as primarily for 18-21 year olds and did not consider ELQ an issue. However, the OU would be continuing the argument for the restoration of equality of support for ELQs and for the recognition of life long learning as increasingly essential for the survival of the UK economy.

10.15 Referring to paragraph 4 and the earlier comments on the value of HE to society, a member observed that funding for Humanities and Social Sciences was likely to be withdrawn. It was not clear how this might play out in the OU, but there was speculation elsewhere that the study of the arts would become the prerogative of the rich. Society was not just an economy and the individuals who made up that society were not just economic units and consumers. The arguments presented in the Browne Review and the CSR had treated education as a commodity, but a healthy society needed HE for other reasons. Humanities and Social Sciences developed multi-purpose critical thinking skills, the ability to scrutinise

language, and the capacity to review ideologies objectively. Consequently, whenever the OU could wield influence, it should support the breadth of the curriculum. Mr Woodburn acknowledged that one of the unintended, or possibly intended, consequences of the changes might be to damage the contribution of HE to the culture in society. However, many students taking Science degrees went into jobs that were no better paid than those secured by Humanities and Social Sciences students. The funding system might intend to equalise the contribution that students had to make, whether they undertook a Science or a Humanities degree. The cost of Science degrees was higher, so this would be subsidized to an extent, but the contribution that students have to pay through fees would be the same. That may be what was intended. This arrangement might also provide special opportunities for the OU, as one of the few affordable routes to undertake a Humanities or Social Sciences degree. The Vice-Chancellor said because the debate to date had been so focussed on fees, many other critical conversations had not yet taken place, such as the way in which education provided quality to society and enriched people's lives. When the White Paper was published, the OU would argue in the round, because it was dangerous to consider HE as simply an instrument of economic development.

10.16 A member enquired about the situation for the many students who did not live in the UK, or who started their studies within the UK and then went abroad. Mr Woodburn responded that a consideration of overseas students had not been part of the work of this paper, but would be included in the International Strategy being prepared by the Business Development Director, Anthoula Madden. This would go to the Council in July and would form part of the discussion at the prior Senate meeting.

10.17 The member also asked whether those students already earning over £21,000 would have to pay their fees upfront or whether they would be able to get a loan that could be paid back later. This could have a big impact on the student body. Mr Woodburn said that the OU had argued for parity of treatment for full-time and part-time students, so the expectation was that students would be eligible for loans, whatever they earned. This had been included in the Browne Review and the Government's response. This concession could be lost in the small print, so it was important to be vigilant. The Vice-Chancellor added that there was still some dialogue about when and how the repayment would be made by students earning over £21,000, for example whether it should be immediate or after a student had completed their studies. The University's stance was that it should not be paid back until after a student's studies had been completed, just as for full-time students, and the OU was seeking ways to influence this debate.

10.18 A student member enquired where post-graduate funding fitted within the new regime. Mr Woodburn responded that in England such funding would not be affected by the dramatic changes. It would be necessary to see what emerged in the other nations. Funding would stay much as it was at present in England, except that the small amount of money that the University got per student from HEFCE was likely to disappear. With respect to the work on the UK marketplace, the University was including post-graduates as well as under-graduates and the OU would need to develop offers in terms of curriculum and support arrangements and pricing that met post graduate needs across the four nations of the UK

10.19 A member expressed concern for the current students who had been patient in understanding that the OU did not have all the answers as to what would be happening to them in the future. It was important to lobby hard with regard to funding and transitional arrangements for these students, as they had already demonstrated their commitment in coming into OU study. Some were about to start their first course, whilst only knowing the funding situation for this year and the beginning of next year. Unlike in other HEIs, there was no absolute answer as to how long it would take these students to complete their studies and it was important to reassure them that the OU would endeavour to protect them from the new funding regime. Mr Woodburn assured the Senate that the transition arrangements for current students were a key issue. For HEFCE and civil servants, because the paradigm was 18 – 21 year olds, all the thinking on transition was for the full-

time sector. Transition arrangements were essential for part-time students and this was another point on which the OU was lobbying, primarily with civil servants.

10.20 A member said that in the light of the changing educational landscape there was an opportunity for the OU to review fundamentally the University's offering, not just in terms of educational products, but also with regard to how students might access them in an affordable way. There was an opportunity to extend the University's existing student loan scheme, to review its operation and perhaps consider entering into partnership with an appropriate body to take advantage of recent suggestions that major organisations might consider funding students through their studies, and to make this a focus for philanthropic fundraising. By taking the initiative, the University would not be so dependant on the political whims and uncertainties of political discourse, whatever the governments did across the four nations. Mr Woodburn said that the University believed that it could raise philanthropic funding for loans and was fundamentally reviewing the way its current loan system worked. There had been interest from other universities, who thought that their students might want to take advantage of a similar loan system and thereby avoid the Government loan system.

10.21 Referring to the comments on life-long learning, a student member asked whether age would be a factor in the availability of loans, as mature students and pensioners were unlikely to be able to pay them back. Mr Woodburn said that the OU was alert to this issue, but that currently there were no indications as to whether the Government would set an age limit and, if it did, whether it would be legal. The University would seek to influence Government policy as best it could, as there were both societal and economic arguments in favour of support for older students. In response to a further query about whether the University would be considering ways in which older students could take parts of degrees or at least continue working with the University, Mr Woodburn said that the OU would consider all ages when reviewing what it should offer to potential students.

10.22 Another member observed that the OU should be campaigning not only for Widening participation, but also 'maintaining wide participation' in relation to age groups. Access to loans was not necessarily the answer, as retired people wishing to continue with life long learning would not want to pay significantly increased fees for a course, even if they were able to borrow money that they might never repay. The University should be considering whether there was anything that could be done, either externally or internally, to alleviate the impact of the increased fees.

10.23 Referring to paragraphs 49 – 56, a student member observed that the OU might have a very different student profile in the future. This would not only have an impact on fees, but also on student support. Currently, there were many students who had long experience of studying with the OU and who consequently needed less support. An increase in new, less experienced students would have a financial cost. Mr Woodburn said that it was quite possible that the profile of the student body would shift and that the way in which the University supported those students would also have to change, but this would have to be done in a cost-effective way. The work by the external consultants, Monitor, on the UK Market Strategy was intended to explore such issues. Mr Swann agreed that, as more was understood about the OU's future students, much could change in terms of student support requirements. However, it was important to preserve the value of younger and older students learning together, in an environment where the barriers of age were irrelevant. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Qualifications), Professor Alan Tait, added that conclusions regarding the OU's future market and any likely changes to the student cohort, would also have an impact on the shape and size of the curriculum. The Curriculum Strategy that was presented to the Senate in 2010 would be revisited in the autumn and the outcomes brought back to the Senate in January 2012.

10.24 A member observed that the pace of change, the external pressures and the University's strategic response, and the way in which the University management proposed to approach

the change process around realigning the business were all addressed at this meeting, and that the University was profoundly engaged with these matters. However, there was a gap with respect to the academic debate, which should review what the University was doing and check its direction. The need for such a check was illustrated by the current paper, which set out the complexities of what the University had to deal with. The academic debate should centre on how the idea of 'student first' would be embodied by the University in the new world with a potentially new student population. Students came to the University primarily to gain qualifications and the design of their study journey was a profoundly academic exercise. Areas of the University were engaged in academic debate about, for example, the need for a qualifications framework, for an agreement on how the OU articulated rules of assessment around qualifications as opposed to modules, and for a way of addressing the issues of study intensity and its relation to student aspirations and what the OU could deliver in a very competitive environment. However, there was some concern about how this might be communicated. The danger was that the University would lose itself in the process, when there was more involved. The issues raised in paragraphs 49 – 56 required a significant amount of co-ordination of the different academic communities. It would be appropriate for the Senate to expect reports on this work, which surfaced the different strands from an academic perspective and to hold academic communities to account for the joint proposition to students coming to the OU.

10.25   Professor Tait, responded that the work by Monitor was a necessary next step for reshaping the structure of the curriculum, as it would help the University to better understand the business sectors that it might serve in the future. The impact that the analysis had on what and how the University taught would be discussed with the Deans and the broad academic community from the autumn onwards, and the outcomes presented to the Senate in January 2012. Mr Woodburn, added that Monitor's work would help the University to understand what those communities valued and what the OU might offer them. Once the final report was received from Monitor at the end of May, the OU would have to make some choices. In order that it could respond rapidly, the consultants would have deep engagement with the rest of the University, especially the academic community and those responsible for student support as these were the areas most likely to be impacted. The timing of propositions to the Senate required further consideration, as it might be better for a paper to be presented to the June meeting, rather than leaving it until the autumn.

10.26   The Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), Professor Alan Bassindale, said that in a time of such profound change academics should come to the fore and think deeply about the University's purpose and how and why it operated as it did. The University's formal and informal structures should be used to encourage debate about the nature of academia and how and why the University taught. The University should engage with this debate through the research agenda, as it was a legitimate subject for research in the OU, as well as through the scholarship agenda. The University should be re-imagined in a more systematic way than it had ever done previously.

10.27   Referring to paragraphs 53 and 54, a member asked how quality and equality of access were mapped together in terms of the OU's offer and how this would impact on market considerations. Various models of course delivery had been introduced to the OU, ranging from OU Light, or wrap round courses, to OU Classic. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality), Professor Denise Kirkpatrick, responded that this aligned with earlier comments in respect of reshaping the curriculum. The issue would not just be about what was taught, but how it was taught. The most fundamental re-conceptualisation of the University's production and presentation since the OU began would be required if quality was to be maintained in a way that was efficient, that maintained the extent of the University's wide participation, that addressed the needs of a more diverse cohort and that took into account different approaches to the OU's offer even within the four nations. This was a significant area for academic engagement and debate, and all types of scholarship.

10.28 A member said that there was currently a great appetite amongst academics to engage with these issues and to make progress. Whilst this should be done in a consistent way, the University should capitalize on this opportunity. Academics knew that the situation was challenging, but also recognised that there were great opportunities for the University, and wished to support the OU in supporting its students. It was important to move quickly.

11 STRATEGY REFRESH: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO OU FUTURES   S/11/1/8

11.1 A member commented that it was useful to have an update on the strategy refresh process, but the process (paras 6 to 9) did not indicate whether or not the strategy would come back to the Senate for discussion. The Senate's role in the wider academic debate and the way in which this contributed to the refresh of *OU Futures* should be clarified.

11.2 The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the major work on *OU Futures* had been brought before the Senate for comment. This paper had appeared in Section D of the Senate agenda, because the updates had been light touch at this point in the strategy's three year journey. The flow of such business would always be through the Senate, to SPRC, the joint committee of the Senate and the Council where it would be discussed in more detail, and then to the Council for approval.

11.3 The member asked for further information on the new Focus Area 12: People and Culture. The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, replied that this had previously been a strand across all Focus Areas, but it had now been identified as a specific Focus Area in its own right. The intention of the work stream was to improve the skills and capability of staff and to help them be true to the values of the OU. The skills required of staff would have to change significantly in the changing environment facing the University. The Senior Team was identifying the core capabilities needed going forward and the key skills and capabilities gaps and initiating programmes to put these skills and capabilities in place.

11.4 The Senate **noted** the update on the Strategy Refresh process.

12 RESTRUCTURING OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE   S/11/1/9

The Senate **approved** the following recommendations:

a) that the Faculty of Science be restructured into three departments and nine disciplines as outlined in the paper;

b) that the Faculty's three Research and Scholarship Centres be reconfigured as described in the paper.

13 NAME CHANGE FOR THE OPEN UNIVERSITY BUSINESS SCHOOL (OUBS)   S/11/1/10

13.1 A member asked whether the accrediting bodies had been consulted on the change, as experience indicated that such bodies would query the autonomy of the business school in such an arrangement. The Dean of OUBS, Professor James Fleck, responded that the name had been changed in response to the competition facing the constituent parts of OUBS, ie the Business School itself and the Centre for Law. The Centre for Law accommodated approximately one third of students in the UK and raised one quarter of the revenue of the Business School. The need for a clearer external position had led to the change of name from the Centre for Law to The Open University Law School. To avoid a clash of nomenclature, it was logical to rename the umbrella that included the outward facing Business School and Law School, the Faculty of Business and Law. It was not, therefore, a substantive change to the name of the Business School, which as a unit

remained absolutely consistent. The change should also avoid the need for lengthy explanations to accrediting bodies that the law programmes were not part of the Business School.

13.2   The Senate **approved** the name change from The Open University Business School (OUBS), to The Faculty of Business and Law.

14   COMMITTEE MATTERS   S/11/1/11

The Senate **approved** the following recommendations:

a)   the re-structuring of the programme committees in the Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology (MCT), with effect from 1 February 2011;

b)   the constitutional changes arising from the annual effectiveness reviews and subsequent changes for the following committees:

      i)   Chair and Readership Committee (Appendix 1)

      ii)   Human Participants and Materials Ethics Committee (Appendix 2);

      iii)   Qualifications Committee (Appendix 3);

      iv)   Validation Committee (Appendix 4);

The revised constitutions are attached as appendices to these minutes.

15   EMERITUS PROFESSORS   S/11/1/12

The Senate:

a) **approved** the recommendations from the Chair and Readership Subcommittee that the title Emeritus Professor was awarded to Professor Jane Aldgate;

b) **noted** that Chair's Action had been taken in respect of the award of the title of Emeritus Professor to Professor Robert Spicer, Faculty of Science.

16   AACSB ACCREDITATION REPORT – ACTION PLAN   S/11/1/13

The Senate **noted** the reaccreditation of The Open University by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), and the three suggestions made by the Peer Review Team.

17   ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW – THE SENATE SUBSTRUCTURE   S/11/1/14

17.1   With reference to paragraph 7, a member raised the issue of the effectiveness of the Senate's engagement in the academic debate. The world in which this annual effectiveness review (AER) had been conducted was very different to that of the future, where governance decisions would have to be made in a very short timescale. The governance structure could support academic debate, but it could also inhibit it, particularly when meetings were out of step with the discussions that needed to take place in other OU communities. For example, the meeting cycle of the Senate substructure was due to commence soon after this meeting of the Senate, whereas faculty meetings took place much closer to the next Senate meeting. This meant that faculties were often commenting

on papers that were already well advanced in the governance cycle and had very limited opportunity to affect the final papers. The timing of the scholarship paper was such that faculties had discussed it after it had been approved by the Senate. This was not the most effective way of encouraging discussion inside the faculties. Paper S/11/1/17: Future Items of Business listed the postgraduate review for discussion at the April meeting of the Senate. It would be helpful for the faculties to have the opportunity to comment on this item before it came to the Senate.

17.2   The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, clarified that paragraph 7 referred to a very limited review of academic governance following the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) Institutional Audit and was not intended to be a statement about the OU's overall academic governance structure. A substantial academic governance review had been scheduled to take place during 2011, but had been delayed due to the pace and pressure of external events. It might be necessary to radically change the academic governance structure in the light of the changing external environment, but this was not currently being considered. Notwithstanding this, the current cycle of meetings both of the Council and the Senate was not ideal and should be reviewed in advance of any wider review. However, it was difficult to change the cycle without notice, so further consideration would have to be given as to how quickly such changes, if considered desirable, could be introduced.

17.3   A member commented, as she had in previous years, that the AERs did not assess effectiveness, but conformance to particular requirements. Effectiveness was a much bigger issue. Mr Woodburn said that any suggestions as to how to improve this would be welcome. The annual effectiveness reviews were intended to be light touch, but the five-yearly review would endeavour to look at effectiveness more deeply.

17.4   The Senate **noted** the Annual Effectiveness Review (AER) of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee (ASPC), the Honorary Degrees Committee and the committee of the Faculty of Science for the period September 2009 until July 2010.

18   THE COUNCIL   **S/11/1/15**

The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Council held on 23 November 2010.

19   APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE)   **S/11/1/16**

The Senate **noted** the appointment of Professor Alan Bassindale to the post of Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) from 17 January 2011.

20   FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS   **S/11/1/17**

20.1   A member asked when the postgraduate review would be available for discussion. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Qualifications), Professor Alan Tait, responded that the latest draft had been sent out that morning to all Deans. A review of how the University engaged with its taught master's programme was on the agenda for the April meeting. Comments were invited between this meeting and the March meeting of the Curriculum and Validation Committee.

20.2   The Senate **noted** the list of potential items for discussion at the meeting of the Senate in January 2011.

21 FAREWELL AND THANKS

The Chair reported that the Dean of Science, Professor Phil Potts, was attending his final meeting of the Senate as he would be retiring at the end of March. On behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor thanked Professor Potts for his contribution to The Open University and wished him well in his retirement.

22 DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS

Meetings would be held on the following dates:

Wednesday 6 April 2011
Wednesday 8 June 2011
Wednesday 19 October 2011

Julie Tayler
Assistant Secretary
Central Secretariat
j.d.tayler@open.ac.uk
January 2011

Attachments:
Appendix 1   Chair and Readership Committee constitution
Appendix 2   Human Participants and Material Ethics Committee constitution
Appendix 3   Qualifications Committee constitution
Appendix 4   Validation Committee constitution

CHAIR AND READERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE

DRAFT CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 23.01.200826.01.2011

Purpose

The Chair and Readership Subcommittee (CRSC) is responsible through the Academic Staff Promotions Committee (ASPC) to the Senate for the strategy, policy, procedures and standards relating to the promotion of academic and research staff to Chair and Readership.

It has delegated powers on behalf of the ASPC by the Senate to approve individual promotion of staff to chairs and readerships, and to consider and recommend to the Senate nominations for the award of the title Emeritus Professor.

Terms of Reference

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

1.   To advise the ASPC on criteria and policies for the consideration of submissions for promotions to chair and readership for recommendation to the Senate.

2.   To advise the ASPC on guidelines on the interpretation of the criteria and operation of policies in respect of promotions to Chair and Readership.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

3.   To monitor and review the implementation of policy on all matters within the Subcommittee's remit.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

4.   To assure quality and standards of the promotion process, and to recommend to the Senate through the ASPC criteria and procedures for promotion to Chair and Readership.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

5.   To consider as may be required from time to time, in respect of academic and research staff, promotion to Chair and Readership and to approve such promotions on behalf of the Senate. Promotions will be reported to the ASPC.

6.   To consider as may be required from time to time, nominations of persons recommended for the title Emeritus Professor, and to recommend such nominations to the Senate for approval.

Membership

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

2   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Qualifications), *ex officio*

2̶3.   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), ~~Deputy Chair,~~ *ex officio*.

3.   Professorial or equivalent members of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee.

Secretary

Mode of Operation

Promotion to Chair or Readership

1.   The Subcommittee will normally meet three times a year and will be contacted as necessary between meetings to expedite outstanding business.

2.   The following code of conduct will operate for the protection of members and candidates:

Where a member of the Subcommittee has a professional or personal relationship with an individual which could involve a potential personal interest, or potential conflict of interest and which may affect their ability to make an unbiased judgement of the case, the member must not take part in the discussion of the case or answer questions. The member should inform the Committee Secretariat in confidence that they will not take part in the discussion of the case or answer questions or vote when a decision is taken on the case. There is no need to declare the nature of the relationship unless the individual wishes to seek guidance from the Committee Secretariat on whether to refrain from participating in the discussion of an individual case.

Where a member of the Subcommittee is in the same department/centre/discipline as an individual whose case is being considered, this would not automatically constitute a conflict of interest. Members of the Subcommittee are required to exercise their own judgement and consider carefully their own position. They should withdraw from the consideration of the case if they feel a conflict of interest might exist and their judgement or the perception of their judgement could be compromised.

3.   The Subcommittee will decide in respect of all submissions received from heads of units or individuals for promotion to Chair or Readership whether to proceed to the investigation of the *prima facie* case for promotion. If the *prima facie* case is investigated the Subcommittee will ensure full information is received, and the Vice-Chancellor will normally determine the initial approaches for opinions to be made. The Subcommittee will also ensure feedback is sent to heads of units, or individuals in the case of personal submissions, at each stage.

4.   When the *prima facie* case for promotion to a Chair or Readership is investigated, the Subcommittee will consider the evidence obtained and normally decide whether or not to confer the title of Chair or Reader on behalf of the Senate, and to report such decisions to the ASPC.

5.   In exceptional circumstances, following investigation of the *prima facie* case for promotion of an individual to a Chair or Readership, the Subcommittee can refer the decision on promotion to a Chair or Readership Promotion Panel. (See Chair and Readership Promotion Panel).

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

7.   The Subcommittee shall review each year according to agreed University criteria how effectively, efficiently and economically it is working in respect or participation, the conduct of business and production of high quality decisions, the schedule of the review shall allow for implementation of improvements from the beginning of the next committee year.

8.   The Subcommittee 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.

Award of the title Emeritus Professor.

1.   The Subcommittee normally meets three times a year and will be contacted as necessary between meetings to expedite business.

2.   The ASPC's code of conduct (as set out in paragraph 2 overleaf) will operate for the protection of members and candidates in the consideration of cases for the award of the title of Emeritus Professor.

3.   The Subcommittee will consider submissions from heads of units and individuals in accordance with the Subcommittee's procedures. The Subcommittee will ensure feedback is provided on progress with a submission.

4.   When the Subcommittee approves a submission for the award of the title of Emeritus Professor, a recommendation will be made to the next meeting of the Senate for approval. A report will also be made to the ASPC.

5.   Individuals will be entitled to use the title of Emeritus Professor immediately on approval by the Senate.

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

HUMAN ~~PARTICIPANTS AND MATERIALS~~RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

~~DRAFT~~ CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~11.06.2009~~26.01.2011

Purpose

On behalf of the Research Committee to advise on ethics considerations relating to all Open University research involving investigations on human participants or materials, other than research that is deemed to be 'no risk', and to grant or withhold approval for such research proposals.

Terms of Reference

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

1. To provide guidance to researchers on the need for ethical scrutiny through the publication of internal guidelines, advice on external ethical documentation and dissemination of information on best practice.

2. To develop a code of practice on investigations involving humans and human materials.
Monitoring and reviewing actions and institutional performance

3. To keep under review its terms of reference to take into account the developing needs of the research community, and national and international research ethics review standards and legislation.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

4. To ensure institutional compliance with national guidelines and legislative requirements and to provide guidance to University officers on matters of compliance.

Advising other governance bodies or management

5. To make recommendations to the Research Committee on human participants and materials ethical issues.

6. To advise all levels of the University on ethical considerations relating to any research which involves investigations on humans.

7. To clarify the role and relationship of the Human Participants and Materials Ethics Committee to other committees/panels in the University.

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

8. To operate in a manner that is consistent with relevant national and legislative guidelines concerning the scrutiny and confidentiality of individuals and projects without adversely affecting institutional commitment to transparency and openness.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

9. To grant or withhold approval of proposals for research involving human participants or materials. [Note that if approval of a proposal is withheld the applicant may lodge an appeal, in the first instance with the HPMEC and then if the appeal is not settled to the applicant's satisfaction, to the Research Committee.]

Membership

1. Five external members appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), to include:

   a) a medical practitioner

   b) a researcher from a research institution other than The Open University

   c) a lay person

   d) a representative from a corporate body

   e) a person with specific ethics expertise

2. The Chair of the Research Committee, *ex officio*, or nominee

3. Two members nominated by the Research Committee

4. Up to eight members co-opted by the Committee so as to cover any aspect, professional, scientific or ethical, of a research proposal which lies beyond the expertise of existing members.

Note 1: The Chair and Deputy Chair shall be appointed by the Research Committee

Note 2: At least one member of the Committee shall have expertise in psychological research

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet as and when required and shall report to the Research Committee at least annually.

2. The Committee may deal with straightforward applications by correspondence

3. The Committee shall seek the advice of specialist referees so as to cover any aspect, professional, scientific, or ethical, of a research proposal which lies beyond the expertise of existing members

QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

DRAFT CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~13.10.2010~~26.01.2011

Purpose

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

Terms of Reference

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

1. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the introduction of individual taught qualifications, and their regulations, taking into account the QAA requirements relating to programme specifications, learning outcomes and subject benchmarking, the balance of such awards between Open University originated credit and credit originated outside the University, and taking into account of the University's validated programmes and qualifications; where appropriate, to refer proposals for classification schemes to the Assessment Policy Committee.

2. Following scrutiny, to approve new qualifications and their associated regulations where the proposals are standard.

3. To approve proposals for the withdrawal of individual taught qualifications, and amended regulations, ensuring that students are given reasonable notice of any changes.

4. To approve amendments to existing qualifications and their regulations.

5. To approve the award of general and specific credit, specific credit transfer schemes and, in consultation as appropriate with the Curriculum Partnerships Committee, collaborative credit agreements with other institutions, for the University's taught qualifications, which do not require regulatory changes.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

6. To monitor the demand for the University's taught qualifications and to receive an annual report on the number of qualifications made of each type.

7. To monitor the process for the annual review of qualifications.

8. To have oversight (on behalf of the Senate) of the award of credit to applicants and students towards the University's taught qualifications based on study undertaken outside the University in accordance with established regulations.

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

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

10. To monitor the University's procedures for the approval and review of its qualifications, ensuing that they are in accordance with the current guidance from the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA).

11. To keep under review the credit structures and requirements for the University's taught qualifications, having regard to the relationships between such qualifications, their comparability with the University's validated qualifications and the relevant national qualifications frameworks.

12. To make recommendations to the Curriculum and Validation Committee for new or revised general regulations, including credit transfer regulations, for the University's taught qualifications.

Advising other governance bodies or management

13. To make recommendations to the CVC on the approval of proposals for the introduction of individual taught qualifications, and their regulations, particularly where such qualifications involve a partnership dimension, where any aspect of the qualification is being funded from strategic/central funds; where the qualification is the first example of a new type of qualification; where the qualification has a non-standard element; or where the qualification is in a subject or sub-subject that is new to the University.

14. To identify and consider credit accumulation and transfer issues particularly those involving the status and recognition of the University's modules and qualifications arising from discussions with other institutions and from national and international developments, to co-ordinate the University's response to consultative documents and reports on such issues, and where appropriate to propose the introduction of new types of qualification or changes to existing curriculum policy to the CVC.

Membership

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

2. One associate dean or equivalent with a relevant portfolio from each central academic unit (or the dean/director's nominee if no suitable portfolio exists).

3. The Director, OU Validation Services, or nominee.

4. The Director, Centre for Inclusion and Curriculum (CIC) or nominee, *ex officio*.

5. The Head of Assessment, Credit and Qualifications 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 Executive.

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

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

13.   The Head of the Learner Advisory Service or nominee

Secretary

Mode of Operation

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

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

3.   The Committee shall delegate to the Credit Rating Panel the authority to approve and review awards of general and specific credit.

VALIDATION COMMITTEE

DRAFT CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~13.10.2010~~26.01.2011

Purpose

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

Terms of Reference

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

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

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

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

3. To monitor the appointment of external examiners at each meeting and to monitor the number of associated and partner institutions, the number of re-approvals, the number of validated awards and applications for re-validation, and student numbers on the University's validated awards and to receive an annual report on these items.

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

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

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

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

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

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

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

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

Advising other governance bodies or management

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

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

Making governance arrangements e.g. appointing to other committees

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

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 partner institutions.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

15. To delegate to the Director of OUVS the responsibility for resolving complaints and appeals, where a partner 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 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 partner institutions of the Open University.

9. One representative 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 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 7 to 11 to be appointed by the Chair of the Curriculum and Validation Committee on the advice of officers.

Secretary

Mode of Operation

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

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