

# Senate

26 February 2020, 14:15 to 16:30  
OVC Board Room, Poole House

## Attendees

### Attendees

John Vinney, Y T McIntyre-Bhatty, Jim Andrews, Einar Thorsen, Stephen Tee, Lois Farquharson (Academic Staff Member), Jacky Mack, Julie Northam, Ade Balogun, Lenrick Greaves, Samantha Leahy-Harland, Jane Murphy, Sam Porter, Esteves Luciana, Shanti Shanker, Dermot McCarthy, Karl Rawstrone, Helen Best, Laura Roper, Dinusha Mendis

Absent: Keith Phalp, Mandi Barron, Michael Silk, Tim Lloyd, Catherine Angell, Carol Clark, Kerstin Stutterheim, Katherine Appleton, Tim Rees

## Meeting minutes

### 1. APOLOGIES

Chair

Members were welcomed to the meeting and apologies were noted as above. The Chair welcomed two new members: Professor Einar Thorsen (Executive Dean, FMC) and Helen Best (elected Professional and Support Staff representative).

The Chair gave thanks to Professor Stutterheim, who was leaving BU and would be standing down from Senate as a result. An election was due to take place to appoint a new Academic Staff representative from the Faculty of Media and Communication (FMC). It was noted that Professor Sutterheim's departure would also leave a vacancy for a Senate representative to sit on the Academic Standards and Education Committee (ASEC), which would be determined post-election.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Chair

There were no declarations of interest.

### 3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF 30 OCTOBER 2019

15 Minutes

#### 3.1. Accuracy/approval of previous minutes

Chair

**Approved:** The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

##### 3.1.1. Matters Arising

Chair

- Academic Standards and Education Committee Terms of Reference

The ASEC Terms of Reference had been presented at the last meeting of Senate on 30 October 2019. At the meeting, it was noted that ASEC had approved a change to its membership, increasing the number of student representatives from three to four. However, the change had not been reflected in the version of the Terms of Reference presented to Senate.

**Noted:** The correct version of the Terms of Reference, with the amended number of student representatives, was re-presented and **noted** by Senators.

As reported at the previous meeting on 30 October 2019, Professor Tee provided an update on the proposed collaboration with East Dorset Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. A meeting had been held between representatives of the Trust and BU to discuss the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), which would enable the creation of a new University Trust. It was confirmed that a paper outlining the content of the MoU and ambitions for the partnership more generally would be shared at a future meeting of Senate.

##### 3.1.2. Report of Electronic Senate meeting of 29 January to 7 February 2020

Chair

**Noted:** The report of the Electronic Senate meeting of 29 January to 7 February 2020 was noted.

## 4. VICE-CHANCELLOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

15 Minutes

### 4.1. HE Sector and BU2025 Update

Chair

#### HE Sector

There had been further ministerial changes following the UK general election in December 2019. Specifically, Michelle Donelan had replaced Chris Skidmore as Minister for Universities, reporting to Gavin Williamson in the Department for Education.

For the first time since 2010, the new Minister for Universities did not have dual reporting lines, reporting for Science and Innovation into the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). Instead, Amanda Solloway had been appointed as Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at BEIS. It was noted that neither Michelle Donelan nor Amanda Solloway had yet said much about their plans. However, it was considered that the split between the roles could be an indicator of increased focus on business and industry as leaders in science and innovation, with universities acting as partners.

It was expected that the government would be providing responses to both the independent review of the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF) and the Augar review into post-18 education later in the year.

#### BU2025

Now in its second year of delivery, the Chair provided an update on the Strategic Plan, BU2025. The first 18 months of the plan had focused primarily on shifting culture and embedding high performance across the University. The Chair cited examples of good innovation across Faculties, including the development of new provision, which was attracting new applicants. There had been positive signs in terms of research, with the proportion of successful research bids increasing. It was considered that these were good indicators of increased engagement and positive changes to behaviour.

---

## 5. FOR DISCUSSION

60 Minutes

## 5.1. Update on the strategic investment areas

Professor McIntyre-Bhatty opened the discussion by providing an update on the Strategic Investment Areas (SIA) as articulated within BU2025.

An innovative and experimental approach had been taken to develop the SIAs, beginning with the formation of initial Steering Groups who were tasked with confirming and embedding the scope of each SIA. Engagement with External Advisory Bodies (EABs) was highlighted as being fundamental in ensuring the scope of each SIA was relevant to external audiences and aligned with future policy and funding priorities.

Since the launch of BU2025, there had been three funding calls for staff to put forward expressions of interest for strategic investment. It was reported that 82% of the expressions of interest received had been from the Faculty of Science and Technology (FST). In order to continue growing the SIAs, it was considered important to ensure the scope of each SIA was inclusive for all staff to enable broader engagement across the University.

The process for approving concepts for strategic investment consisted of six stages, from submission of an expression of interest to approval of a full business case. In terms of progress, it was reported that only one full business case had been approved since the first funding call; the creation of an Institute for the Modelling of Socio-Environmental Transformations, with two further business cases in the latter stages of development. It was noted that each of the three business cases resided within the SIA of Sustainability, Low Carbon Technology and Materials Science, with direct links to the Animation, Simulation and Visualisation SIA.

The time taken for approval was considered to be longer than first expected, despite a stream of concepts being generated through an innovation funnel. Nevertheless, it was noted that clear progress was being made within each SIA, albeit at different paces. It was advised that progress would be kept under review.

Professor Tee provided an update on the SIA of Medical Science:

- A number of new initiatives and activities had emerged within Medical Science, with these primarily funded through external grants rather than by internal investment.
- The University's educational portfolio had expanded to include Medical and Biomedical Science, Physician Associate Studies and Public Health, with new educational programmes in the field of Medical Imaging being developed.
- The University was in pre-contract negotiations to establish a Digital Healthcare Catalyst, which would see the development of a Digital Health Institute. The Institute would enable the University to work in collaboration with a broader range of industry stakeholders.
- The development of a clinical trials unit was noted as a future development. The unit would extend the University's capacity to conduct randomised controlled clinical trials, thus expanding the potential for larger research grants.
- In terms of external engagement, the University had signed a partnership with the Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group. In addition to furthering collaboration in education, research and professional practice, the partnership would enable the University to conduct population-based studies.
- The development of a Medical School remained a significant aspiration. The University was awaiting the government's announcement on the development of future Medical Schools, with coastal and rural areas earmarked as potential priorities. In the meantime, the Faculty would continue developing medicine related programmes.

It was advised that a degree of interpretation was required to determine whether a subject aligned within the scope of an SIA, which could be one of the reasons why only a small proportion of expressions of interest had been received from outside FST. It was proposed that the scopes for each SIA were circulated with colleagues to investigate whether the pitch of each scope could be more inclusive.

Professor Porter proposed that the SIAs would benefit from greater input from social sciences. It was suggested that a variety of mechanisms could be used to enable discussions across the University to identify potential opportunities for synergy. Ms Northam reported that work was in progress to explore how social sciences and humanities could be further integrated and made more visible within the scope of each SIA.

## 5.2. Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) and KE Concordat

Ms Northam provided an update on the Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) and Knowledge Exchange (KE) Concordat.

It was explained that the KEF had been developed in order to provide more information about university achievements in serving the economy and society for the public, businesses and communities, after being announced as part of the government's Industrial Strategy in 2017. There were indications that the framework might eventually be used to support the allocation of funding.

The first iteration of the KEF was due to take place in the current academic year, with the expectation that institutions submitted three written narratives by 15 May 2020 and metrics based data, which would largely be calculated from the existing Higher Education Business & Community Interaction (HE-BCI) return.

The KEF would capture activity in seven different perspectives, all of which would be measured through the narrative submissions and metric based data. It was reported that the final narrative templates would be published by the end of February 2020.

As outlined in the paper, it was proposed that the University's KEF 2020 submission was led by the Research Development and Support (RDS) team, with input from the Head of External Engagement and Chair of the University's Higher Education Innovation Funding (HEIF) Panel. The final narratives would be reviewed by the University Leadership Team (ULT) and Senate prior to submission to Research England.

To help BU prepare for the KEF and develop its KE activities further, it was reported that a KE Working Group had been established. Chaired by the Head of External Engagement, the Group would be responsible for reviewing the University's strengths and weaknesses in terms of KE and making recommendations for improvements.

In comparison to the KEF, much less was known about the KE Concordat. The Concordat proposed eight guiding principles of themes to help institutions make informed decisions in developing their own strategies around KE. A timeline for the development of the KE Concordat was published by Research England in February 2020. It was expected that an updated version of the KE Concordat would be published in spring 2020, followed in the summer by guidance and action plan templates. Institutions were expected to carry out a gap analysis in relation to the eight guiding principles during the autumn, before producing an action plan in early 2021. As with the KEF, it was proposed that the University's response was led by RDS, with input from the Head of External Engagement, Chair of the HEIF Panel, and KE Working Group.

Ms Northam confirmed that further information would be provided to Senate as required.

**Endorsed:** Senate endorsed the proposed plans for coordinating the University's response to the KEF and KE Concordat.

---

## 6. FOR APPROVAL

30 Minutes

### 6.1. University Research and Professional Practice Committee Terms of Reference

J Northam

**Deferred:** The approval of amendments to the University Research and Professional Practice Committee Terms of Reference was deferred to the next electronic Senate meeting.

## 6.2. Approval of Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures relating to Admissions, Academic Appeals and Complaints

The Head of Academic Quality introduced the proposal by explaining that ARPP owners were able to make 'major' and 'minor' changes to their policy and procedure documents each year in line with the Scheme of Delegation and ARPP 1C. There was a degree of interpretation in determining whether a change constituted as 'minor' or 'major', with the latter requiring formal committee approval consistent with the Scheme of Delegation. A series of changes had been made to the ARPPs relating to admissions over time to make them clearer and more appropriate for staff and students. In reviewing these changes, it was identified that some were latterly considered as 'major' and therefore required retrospective approval through ASEC and Senate to ensure appropriate committee oversight. These were presented in a series of appendices, with details of the changes made between versions clearly outlined.

A review of the ARPPs also revealed that the original approval of the policy documents relating to academic appeals and complaints could not be traced through the available records of Senate and its sub-committees, with records available to 2006/07. Whilst the changes were not classed as 'major', it was suggested that a re-approval point was needed to ensure an appropriate record of committee oversight.

In response to a query, it was confirmed that ASEC had considered the proposal prior to the meeting and recommended approval to Senate.

In addition to the summary document, it was suggested that the appendices could have included comparisons between the different versions of the ARPPs to help better understand the changes year on year. It was confirmed that 'track change' versions of the documents were available if required.

The Chair queried what actions would be put in place to ensure that timely committee approval was in place for future updates to ARPPs. It was confirmed that the underlying processes supporting the annual republication cycle were being reviewed and improved to ensure that retrospective committee approval of policy changes would not be required. The Chair requested that confirmation be provided at the next meeting of the improvements implemented in advance of the next ARPP republication cycle.

### Action

**Approved:** Senate approved the Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures (ARPPs) relating to Admissions, Academic Appeals and Complaints

## 6.3. Policy updates to 7C – Partner Review: Policy and Procedure

A Child

The proposed revisions to ARPP 7C – *Partner Review: Policy and Procedure* aimed to deliver a more flexible format for reviewing partner provision based on the perceived level of risk to academic standards. In line with the approach introduced by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for its Quality and Standards Review, the decision about whether to hold a Partner Review event would be informed by an initial evaluation of a partner's ability to fulfil the requirements detailed in the Partnership Agreement with BU. In the event of a review, ASEC would be responsible for determining the format of the review and the key themes to be explored as part of the review event.

Noting discussions at ASEC, Professor McIntyre-Bhatty clarified that an academic member of ASEC would serve as Chair of a review panel, with the Chair selection to be determined by the perceived level of risk. In addition, it was confirmed that a Partner Review event would be held as standard where the recommendation from the initial evaluation was to close a partnership.

The Head of Academic Quality confirmed that the new approach to partner review would be adopted for the upcoming reviews, having been successful piloted at Bournemouth and Poole College.

**Approved:** Senate approved the proposed changes to 7C – Partner Review: Policy and Procedure.

## 7. REPORTING COMMITTEES

15 Minutes

### 7.1. Faculty Academic Board Minutes:

Executive Deans

7.1.1. FHSS FAB minutes of 11 February 2020 (unconfirmed)

**Noted:** The Committee noted the FHSS FAB minutes of 11 February 2020.

7.1.2. FM FAB minutes of 22 January 2020 (unconfirmed)

Noting recent staff changes, Dr Farquharson highlighted that the minutes demonstrated good progression within the Faculty in terms of the forthcoming transition to a Business School.

**Noted:** The Committee noted the FM FAB minutes of 22 January 2020.

7.1.3. FMC FAB minutes of 5 February 2020 (unconfirmed)

**Noted:** The Committee noted the FMC FAB minutes of 5 February 2020.

7.1.4. FST FAB minutes of 6 February 2020 (unconfirmed)

**Noted:** The Committee noted the FST FAB minutes of 6 February 2020.

**7.2. Academic Standards and Education Committee minutes of 29 January 2020 (unconfirmed)**

**Noted:** The Committee noted the Academic Standards and Education Committee minutes of 29 January 2020.

**Prof T McIntyre-  
Bhatty**

**7.3. University Research and Professional Practice Committee minutes of 23 January 2020**

**Noted:** The Committee noted the University Research and Professional Practice Committee minutes of 23 January 2020.

**Prof T McIntyre-  
Bhatty**

---

## **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No other matters were raised.

---

## **9. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

**Electronic Senate**

- 9.00 am on 13 May 2020

**Senate** - 2.15 pm on 10 June 2020

