

SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2015

- Present: Prof J Vinney (**Chair**)
Mr C Allen; Ms M Barron; Mr G Beards; Dr C Bond; Dr C Chapleo; Prof J Fletcher; Ms J Forster; Dr R Gunstone; Mr A James; Ms J Mack; Prof I MacRury; Ms E Mayo-Ward (SUBU); Prof S McDougall; Dr S Minocha; Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty; Ms J Quest; Ms C Schendel-Wilson (SUBU); Dr H Thiel; Prof G Thomas; Prof T Zhang
- In attendance: Ms M Frampton (Policy & Committees Officer); Mr I Marsland (Observer); Mr G Rayment (Corporate Governance & Committee Manager);
Mr R Rogers (Agenda Item 6.1 & 6.2); Ms D Wakely (Agenda Item 6.3)
- Apologies received: Mr J Andrews; Mr P Briant (SUBU); Mr S Jukes; Prof A Mullineux; Prof S Page; Prof E Rosser; Ms A Stevens; Prof K Wilkes

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and apologies were noted as above.

The Chair also welcomed Mr Ian Marsland as an observer.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON 29 OCTOBER 2014

The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

2.1 Matters Arising

Item 4.1.12 – HE Sector Update – AV Equipment in Lecture Theatres

A response was provided through the February Electronic Senate meeting. No further action was required by Senate.

3. REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SENATE MEETING OF 4 FEBRUARY TO 11 FEBRUARY 2015

The report of the Electronic Senate meeting of 4 to 11 February 2015 was noted.

The question raised by Dr Gunstone regarding an access control system for the Faculty of Science and Technology's laboratories was not an issue within Senate's Terms of Reference, therefore the Deputy Vice-Chancellor had agreed to raise the matter directly with the Faculty's Management Team.

4. VICE CHANCELLOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 BU 2018 and HE Sector Update

Since the last meeting of Senate a number of exciting events had taken place which included the announcement of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) results. The Deputy Prime Minister, Nick Clegg, had visited Bournemouth University in January 2015 to officially launch the £12.6m expansion of the Government's Growth Deal for Dorset. Part of the funding would be used to create a joint business incubation centre for Bournemouth University and the Arts University Bournemouth.

A lot of discussion had taken place within the Labour Party with regards to the reduction of tuition fees from £9,000 to £6,000 and this was expected to be part of the Labour Party's manifesto for the General Election in May 2015. The proposals would cost £10 billion over the next parliament, and would be funded from tax revenues. The Board of Universities UK (UUK) had written an open letter to The Times expressing their concern over the policy, which highlighted fears that the funding gap may not be met by government.

Bournemouth University had recently received the annual grant letter from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) which confirmed the funding allocations to the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) for the 2015/16 financial year. The letter confirmed that the total funding available to universities was expected to increase from £11.1 billion to £12.1 billion in 2015/16. It was important to remember that there would be a Comprehensive Spending Review after the General Election when it was expected that cuts would be made to the BIS budget from 2016/17.

The cost of REF had been in the media recently and it was believed that the total cost of the 2014 REF had been £1.2 billion.

The A-Level Content Advisory Board (Alcab), which was set up to advise on the content of A-Level syllabuses, would no longer receive further funding.

There had been 592,290 university applications by the main admissions deadline in January 2015 which was an increase of 2% on last year. Bournemouth University's position has remained strong with application numbers similar to previous years.

There was still concern regarding the future of quality assessment in Higher Education and speculation continued regarding the role of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The initial consultation would remain open until 27 February 2015.

The Dowling Review was ongoing and was exploring how government could support effective collaboration between businesses and University researchers. Senators were requested to submit any comments to Colette Cherry.

Ms Schendel-Wilson advised that the SUBU Democracy Team had been working with Bournemouth Council to encourage students to participate in the forthcoming General Election as historically it had been difficult for those students living in Halls of Residence to register to vote.

4.1.1 Research Excellence Framework 2014

Prof Fletcher presented the results of the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) which had been excellent, and was a consequence of Bournemouth University having staff and students who had helped to make a significant difference. The 2014 REF had looked at the impact of the research undertaken in addition to the papers which were submitted. All of the University's submissions were excellent submissions and it was highlighted that BU had succeeded in every aspect.

Prof Fletcher explained the REF scorecard to Senators and advised that scores of 2* and above related to institutions with international recognised research. A score of 4* was for world leading research. For the sector, the average REF submission based on staff FTE fell by 2.5 FTE (0.7%), however the University's submission had increased by 50.6 FTE (45.5%), which now placed the University in an excellent position and was now within the Top 20 institutions with the largest FTE increases and the second highest proportion of 4* research.

In 2008 the University was ranked 99 out of 158 institutions, however, in 2014 the University had increased its position to 69 out of 154 institutions. The Grade Point Average increased from 2.18 in 2008 to 2.74 in 2014, which had in turn increased the University's ranking from 92 in 2008 to 87 in 2014. The staff FTE submitted had increased from 111.2 in 2008 to 161.8 in 2014, which therefore had increased the University's ranking from 90 to 79. The University was now 5th for world-leading research environment, 12th for world-leading impact and 25th for world-leading research outputs.

One third of the University's research had world class impact which was very impressive for an institution which was new to research. The University was now ranked 12th out of 69 post-1992 institutions based on world-leading 4* research impact scores. It was now important for the University to develop its external communications regarding the REF results. Further work would continue to look at the roles of Institutes, Centres and Clusters in continuing to enhance future REF results.

A University REF Committee had been established which would report to the University Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee (URKEC). The REF Committee would develop strategies for existing and new REF Units of Assessment (UoA). An Output Working Group would also be established shortly to develop output strategies including Open Access (OA) and to examine the REF papers submitted by the University. An Impact Working Group would also be introduced to develop impact strategies and monitor metrics. 'International' would be the key term moving forward and would be important for a 4* institution.

UET had considered the Research Assessment Exercises (RAE) and REF FTEs which would be submitted for the 2020 REF and further information would be disseminated via Deans.

Moving forward, the University would need culture change to establish a more collegiate team environment and broaden the international aspect.

The Themes were due to be reviewed in June 2015 and cross-faculty working would be encouraged with some focus groups being introduced to engage with the local community. The structure and framework had recently been agreed and further information would emerge through the delivery planning process, which would then continue as an annual process.

5. DEBATE

5.1 Shaping our Journey towards a Global BU

Dr Minocha presented an overview of the development of the University's Global Engagement Plan (GEP) to date. The Plan would drive the University in the right direction in order to achieve its global ambitions as defined in BU 2018.

The emergent GEP had been informed by a range of engagement with staff across the University over the last few months. Targeted discussions had taken place and these discussions had helped to inform the development of the key anchors of the GEP and to create a Global BU which was supported by activity across the core academic and service areas of global engagement. It was anticipated that the GEP would be finalised by the end of the 2014/15 academic year.

External Context

It was proposed to promote BU Fusion globally, however Global HE is a crowded marketplace and the majority of HEIs were seeking international growth. It was therefore important that the University was able to be innovative and distinguish itself from the rest of the sector and find its own position and space in order to raise its profile internationally.

Internal Context

The starting point for the internal context was Fusion, and the journey to make Global Fusion happen had now commenced in line with the following vision statements in BU2018 creating a world class learning community; develop strategic international partnerships; build strong professional and academic networks worldwide; create an increasingly internationally diverse staff and student body and also ensuring the University's graduates were culturally aware and internationally mobile.

When Fusion is promoted globally, it would have its own educational character and a Global BU personality would be identifiable. Discussion took place regarding the challenges in the partnerships, recruitment and mobility agendas.

International student support was a very important element in the University's global strategy and further work still needed to be carried out, whilst recognising the special or additional support which was necessary for international students. The University would provide an excellent diverse and multi-cultural experience for students and staff.

The importance of integrating home and international students was highlighted and the University needed to ensure that all students received the best possible experience whilst at the University, for example, to ensure that students fully understood academic policies and regulations.

Dr Gunstone advised that some UK universities were starting to set up satellite campuses and it was questioned whether this was something the University would wish to look into for the future. It was believed there could be some issues with regards to the validation of courses. However it was acknowledged that these satellite campuses appeared to be successful and could be beneficial to the University, although some felt this was a high risk model.

Further thought would be given as to how the University captured 'international' information and the richness that already existed.

In order for the University to begin to make the shift towards internationalisation, it was suggested that the University should reinvigorate language programmes again, which may encourage students to study abroad.

BU 2018 measures of success would include: the University becoming a Top 50 institution in the UK; 16% of the non-UK student population being on campus; 20% of undergraduates undertaking an international activity as part of their programme and attendance at one international conference per academic FTE. Senators agreed that the promotion of the University to international students as a very 'English' experience should be capitalised upon. It was noted that accommodation for international students had historically been a barrier, however solutions to this issue were being identified through the Estates Development Framework.

The numbers of incoming students from the USA were low, which was possibly due to the low number of partnerships with American universities at present. Further work would therefore continue to increase the number of American partnerships.

The next steps for the GEP would include further discussion and debate, internally and externally, to develop the detail for the Plan. A lot of staff and student engagement would take place over the next six months to assist with the production of the GEP. A Global Engagement team would be established to lead the journey over the coming months and virtual Global BUzz workshops would take place shortly where staff and students could become involved and help shape the detail of the GEP.

Moving forward, work would continue towards designing a comprehensive, cohesive and confident strategy and an underpinning resource map to aid the journey to a Global BU.

An update of the Global Engagement Plan (GEP) journey would be presented to Senate at the June meeting.

Senate **noted** the presentation and the report provided, and it was agreed that progress would be reported to Senate at the next meeting.

6. OTHER REPORTS

6.1 Annual Review of Assessment Regulations and 6L – *Implementation of the Regulations*

Following the review by the Quality Assurance Standing Group (QASG) and consideration by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) meeting in February 2014, Senate was asked to consider and approve the proposed changes to the Standard Assessment Regulations. Upon approval by Senate the changes would be introduced for the 2015/16 academic year for all continuation students and new entrants.

Section 2.1.1 – Compensation, Regulation 6A Section 7.1

The compensation regulation currently allows compensation for up to 40 credits as long as the student achieves a mark of 40% (or 50% for postgraduate provision) in other units for the level. To ensure consistency across all Boards, ASC supported QASG's proposal to clarify the regulation that where a Pass/Fail element has been failed, it should also be taken into account when units are considered for compensation even though a Fail does not alter the numerical mark profile for the unit.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation that Section 7 'Compensation' of 6A – *Standard Assessment Regulations* (all awards) be amended to make explicit that failed Pass/Fail elements must be considered in the same way as units with failed numerical elements when compensation decisions are made.

Section 2.1.2 – Submission of coursework, Regulation 6A Sections 9.1 – 9.2

From the 2013-14 academic year, Assessment Boards have had the discretion to accept a late piece of work as a resubmission piece of work if it falls within three weeks of the deadline and would have achieved a pass mark had it been submitted on time. If accepted by the Board, the capped mark is currently carried forward to the next Board as the reassessment mark. The mark is then ratified and the credits awarded to the student. As most students submit their late work within 72 hours of the deadline, in this situation ASC agreed that the work would be marked and capped at the pass mark (no Board discretion) and would form part of the reassessment allowance.

Dr Bond commented that Section 9 of 6A - *Standard Assessment Regulations* (all awards) should clarify that the late submission of work would be counted towards the reassessment allowance.

It was agreed that Section 9 would be clarified further and the updated paper would be circulated electronically and approval would be made via Chair's Action.

ACTION: Section 9 would be clarified further and the updated papers would be circulated electronically and approval to be made via Chair's Action.

ACTION BY: Mr R Rogers

Section 2.1.3 – Classification, Regulation 6A Sections 11.1 – 11.2

ASC approved a number of changes relating to Board reporting in July 2013 in order to prepare for the implementation of the new Student Record System and to bridge the gap in the classification weightings to accurately reflect achievement.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation that Section 11, 'Classification' of 6A – *Standard Assessment Regulations* (all awards) be amended to incorporate the proposed new classification bands.

Section 2.1.4 – Provision for failed candidates, Regulation 6A Section 12

The 2013-14 regulations introduced an equal reassessment limit alongside the new capping rule to ensure parity of assessment outcomes for all students. ASC endorsed the proposal to exceptionally allow Board discretion to determine a lower limit where students exceed the level entitlement for reassessment if it is not deemed to be in the student's academic interest to be reassessed in a large number of credits at one time. A detailed rationale for the decision should be recorded in the Board minutes and the student counselled accordingly.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation that Section 12, 'Provision for Failed Candidates' of 6A – *Standard Assessment Regulations* (all awards) be amended to allow Boards to exceptionally determine a lower reassessment limit for students who exceed the level entitlement for reassessment if this is perceived to be in their academic interest.

It was noted that all changes to student-facing documents within the University's *Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures (ARPP)* were notified to students at the start of each academic year and links to the updated documents were also included in emails to students, and on the Student Portal.

6.2 ***Integrated Masters Assessment Regulations and 2A – Awards of Bournemouth University: Policy incorporating changes and new titles relating to Integrated Masters Awards***

BU currently has a Master of Engineering (with Honours) (MEng (Hons)) Integrated Masters award and previously a Master of Chiropractic (MChiro) award which was delivered at the Anglo-European College of Chiropractic (AECC) and is currently in the process of being re-approved. In addition to these two awards, three new Integrated Masters award titles had been approved by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for development during 2014-15 as follows: Master of Nutrition (MNutr); Master of Literature (MLit) and Master of Design with Honours (MDes (Hons)). A further Master of Management with Honours (MMan (Hons)) and Master of Business with Honours (MBus (Hons)) were currently under development within the Faculty of Management.

Following discussion by QASG and ASC giving in-principle approval, the recommendations are made to Senate for approval of the draft Integrated Masters Assessment Regulations.

Section 2.1 – Period of Registration (Section 5 of the Regulations)

Following discussion by ASC, the Committee recommended a period of 7 years rather than 10 years should be set for the maximum period of registration for part time Integrated Masters awards as there was not an expectation that this provision would be delivered in a part time mode, but exceptionally, due to circumstances, a student may be required to move from full-time to a part-time route.

Approved: Senate approved the Period of Registration be set at 7 years for part-time Integrated Masters awards.

Section 2.2 – Progression (Section 8 of the Regulations)

Where students progress from one award to a higher award, e.g. a student on a Foundation degree progresses to a Level H/6 programme, a progression hurdle may be stipulated to ensure the student is both able to study at the higher level and is not being set up for potential failure. QASG recommended that a progression hurdle should be placed between Levels H/6 and M/7 with an aggregate pass mark of 50%. ASC agreed with this recommendation.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation to introduce a progression hurdle between Levels H/6 and M/7 with an aggregate pass mark of 50%.

Section 2.3 – Classification – Aggregate Weightings (Section 11 of the Regulations)

At present the classification of the MEng (Hons) award is based on 15% Level I/5 units, 35% Level H/6 units and 50% Level M/7 units. Where MEng (Hons) students enter directly to Level H/6 (part time students), classification is based only on the Level H/6 and Level M/7 units with an equal weighting of 50% and 50%. Sector research varied greatly when determining classification weighting of the Integrated Masters award, however sector research tended to favour the approach used within BU's current MEng (Hons) regulations.

QASG recommended that a standard classification based on 15% Level I/5, 35% Level H/6 and 50% Level M/7 units (as per the MEng (Hons) award) was appropriate. ASC agreed with this recommendation.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation that a standard classification be set based on 15% Level I/5 units, 35% Level H/6 units and 50% Level M/7 units.

The second part of this recommendation is whether students should be allowed to enter onto an Integrated Masters award beyond Level H/6. Currently, Recognition of Prior Learning would allow a student to enter at level H/6 with only 40 credits remaining at that particular level. It was perceived that this did not align with the nature of the Integrated Masters award and could potentially impact upon postgraduate provision.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation that students should not enter an Integrated Masters award after the commencement of Level H/6 (unless Professional requirements specifically permit this).

Students who enter at the commencement of Level H/6 would be required to have alternative aggregate weightings as opposed to students entering at Level C/4 or Level I/5. QASG suggested a ratio of 40% Level H/6 and 60% Level M/7 to allow students the opportunity to embed into their studies, which was endorsed by ASC.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation for a standard classification based on 40% Level H/6 units and 60% Level M/7 units for students entering at Level H/6.

Section 2.4 – Classification – Aggregate Mark (Section 11 of the Regulations)

The current MEng (Hons) award is classified as per the UG classification. The sector research greatly supports this approach providing Level H/6 is included in the weighting of the award, even where award titles do and do not include (with Honours). Following discussion by QASG, it was recommended that the aggregate mark classification should be based on the UG classification. This recommendation was approved by ASC.

It was noted that the changes to the *Standard Assessment Regulations* for 2015/16 including changes to the classification bands (as approved by Senate) would be incorporated into the Integrated Masters Regulations.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation that the University adopts the UG classification as the standard approach to classify Integrated Masters awards.

Section 2.5 – Classification – Board Discretion for the award of Bachelors degree (Section 11 of the Regulations)

Students who have performed at a higher classification than their aggregate mark in at least two thirds of their final Level credits will be awarded the higher classification if the aggregate mark is no more than 3% below the classification boundary. Where the aggregate mark falls more than 0.5% below the classification boundary but remains within 1.0% of it, the Assessment Board may use its discretion and award the student the higher classification as long as this is justified by the student's overall performance. This will apply as standard to the Integrated Masters Award.

Following discussion by QASG, it was noted that the intermediate Bachelors award was ordinarily a final award in its own right and recommended that the profile regulation and the 1% Board discretion should apply to this intermediate award. ASC agreed with this recommendation.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation that the Profile Regulation and the 1% Board discretion should be applied to the Intermediate Bachelors degree award.

Section 3.1 – 2A – Awards of the University: Policy

With the ongoing development of Integrated Masters awards across BU, one generic statement for all Integrated Masters awards has been proposed using a definition from the *Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)* October 2014.

Approved: Senate approved the recommendation of the amended wording in *2A – Awards of the University: Policy* for inclusion within the *Academic Regulations Policies and Procedures*.

Senate considered the addition of the following new Integrated Masters award titles within *2A – Awards of the University: Policy*.

Master of Nutrition (MNutr)
Master of Literature (MLit)
Master of Design (with Honours) (MDes (Hons))

It was noted that within the Faculty of Management, a Master of Management (with Honours) (MMan (Hons)) and a Master of Business (with Honours) (MBus (Hons)) was currently being developed and should be added to *ARPP 2A* for Senate approval (subject to pending subsequent ASC approval for the proposal).

The discussion on Integrated Masters questioned why some awards included (with Honours) in the title and others did not, as those awards that excluded (with Honours) in the title could affect the marketing of the programme. Senate supported consistent Integrated Masters awards titles and it was agreed that the various teams working on the development of the Integrated Masters awards would consider including (with Honours) in the award title

Approved: It was agreed that Senate would approve the updated titles in-principle and would be ratified following discussion within teams. Final approval would be made via Chair's Action.

ACTION:	Following the decision to make the titles of all Integrated Masters Awards consistent, further discussion would take place with Faculty teams to address the issue.
----------------	---

ACTION BY:	Mr R Rogers
-------------------	-------------

Section 7.5.1.3 - 2A – Awards of the University: Policy

For clarity, Section 7.5.1.3 (*Masters Degrees MA, MSc, MBA*) had been updated to remove the requirement that students entering the Master of Business Administration (MBA) must have appropriate professional experience.

Approved: Senate approved the amendment to Section 7.5.1.3 which had been updated to remove the requirement that students entering the Master of Business Administration (MBA) must have appropriate professional experience.

6.3 Review of Governance Documents

Ms Wakely directed Senators to the paper titled 'Analysis of differences between the current and proposed Instrument and Articles of Government'. There had been very minor changes to the Instrument around terminology, for example the term 'teachers' had been amended to read 'academics'.

Within the Articles section of the paper, it was proposed to change the responsibilities of Senate (section 4.3(a)) which was previously named Academic Board. Senate's responsibilities would be amended from 'the research, scholarship, teaching and courses' to 'research, education and professional practice' which was a more accurate reflection of the current BU terminology.

Noted: Senate noted the change in terminology from 'teachers' to 'academics' and 'Academic Board' to 'Senate', and also noted the amendment to 'research, education and professional practice' which was a more accurate reflection of the current BU terminology.

Section 5 of the paper proposed setting out Senate membership and procedures. This section would be removed entirely as it would increase the flexibility of keeping Senate procedures up to date and would therefore be set out in the Board Scheme of Delegation for Board approval.

Noted: Senate noted the removal of Section 5 in order to increase the flexibility of keeping Senate procedures current and up to date.

Section 10.2 of the paper referred to Academic Freedom. The term 'rules' was replaced with 'policies and procedures' to reflect current practice. It was proposed to strengthen this section to include the Senate and the Vice-Chancellor as well as the Board. This revised drafting would ensure that all those approving Policies and Procedures would be reminded of the need to consider academic freedom.

Noted: Senate noted the changes of terminology to 'policies and procedures' and inclusion of 'Senate and the Vice-Chancellor'.

Senators were requested to advise Ms Wakely of any further comments by email. Comments received from Senators would be included in the papers presented to the University Board in May 2015.

7. ROUTINE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Minutes of Standing Committees:

7.1 Education and Student Experience Committee (unconfirmed), 2 February 2015

The minutes were noted.

Academic Boards:

7.2 Faculty of Health and Social Care (unconfirmed), 5 February 2015

The minutes were noted.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Dr Gunstone advised that the pay progression form which had been introduced by Human Resources required a significant amount of time and effort on the part of academic staff. Dr Bond agreed with Dr Gunstone and advised that the form had created an unmanageable workload. It was agreed this issue would be flagged to Mr Andrews and Prof Fletcher for further consideration.

ACTION:	Mr Andrews and Prof Fletcher would be advised of the difficulties encountered by academic staff in completing the pay progression form.
----------------	---

ACTION BY:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
-------------------	------------------------

Dr Gunstone advised that there was a significant lack of space within the Faculty of Science & Technology and one member of staff did not have an office and alternative working space was very difficult to locate. It was agreed this issue would be flagged to Mr Andrews.

ACTION:	Mr Andrews to consider space issues in the Faculty of Science and Technology.
----------------	---

ACTION BY:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
-------------------	------------------------

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

Electronic Senate – 9.00am, Wednesday 13 May 2015

Live meeting – 2.15pm, Wednesday 3 June 2015