

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

SENATE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 14 June 2017

- Present: Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), Dr D Britnell, Professor A Clarke, Professor A Cooley, Ms S Crookes, Professor C Davis, Professor A Dowd, Professor C Ennew (Provost), Professor M Freely, Professor S Gilson, Professor R Goodwin, Professor L Gracia, Professor L Green, Mr R Green, Professor F Griffiths, Dr G Hartshorne, Professor C Hughes, Mrs K Hughes, Professor S Jacka, Professor S Kumar, Professor D Leadley, Professor G Lindsay, Professor A Lockett, Professor J Millar, Professor M Nudds, Mr L Pilot, Professor A Reeve, Professor L Roberts, Professor P Roberts, Professor K Seers, Dr N Shiers, Professor J Smith, Professor J Solomos, Professor C Sparrow, Professor H Spencer-Oatey Professor S Swain, Dr T van Rens, Dr N Whybrow, Ms H Worsdale
- Apologies: Professor M Balasubramanian, Professor D Branch, Dr R Freeman, Professor S Hand, Professor J Palmowski, Professor M Nudds, Professor M Shipman, Professor J Solomos, Professor P Thomas, Professor L Young
- In attendance: Academic Registrar, Administrative Officer (Academic Registrar's Office), Deputy Academic Registrar, Group Finance Director, Registrar, Secretary to Council, Ms A Chambers (for item 6 only)

83/16-17 Institutional Teaching and Learning Review 2017

CONSIDERED:

- (a) An evaluation report arising from the conduct of ITLR 2017, summarising key outcomes and making recommendations with respect to the conduct of future exercises, together with an oral report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), (S.53/16-17).
- (b) A brief summary of work in train to develop an action plan consequent upon the ITLR, and an oral report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) (S.54/16-17).

REPORTED (by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, (Education)):

- (c) That the ITLR exercise had been successfully conducted and consideration of departmental review reports and Faculty Engagement reports overseen by the ITLR Steering Group;
- (d) That members of the Senate would have seen that there were now over 1,000 lines of recommendations which had been logged from review reports and that these were currently being organised into over-arching themes with priorities, attribution and timescales attached.
- (e) That much work towards the recommendations identified through the ITLR process was already underway, for example: a Review of Assessment had recently been commissioned by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee; the roles of Academic Directors for Postgraduate Study and Employability and Skills were currently out to advertisement and bids arising had been considered by both ARC and APSG during the 5YP round.

- (f) That key themes had emerged as set out in the summary to the evaluation paper (S.53/16-17).
- (g) That a number of key recommendations had been made in relation to the shape, scope and conduct of future ITLR exercises which the Senate was invited to consider and that lessons learned from the 2017 exercise included earlier planning and appointment of the core team from the summer term prior to ITLR being held; the on-going availability of a small amount of resource dedicated to monitoring and oversight between exercises; a modest extension to the time span allowed for ITLR, comprising 2 weeks for academic departments plus a further week for a wider range of professional service departments and the continued development of the online resources and evidence-base.
- (h) In response to a query from Professor L Green, that January continued to be the recommended month in which to hold ITLR since the Autumn Term was very busy and PGT Boards of Examiners in November had been particularly problematic when the ITLR had first been held in 2011;

By Professor L Roberts:

- (i) That in view of a number of departmental reports having identified a failure by departments to address recommendations made in 2011, she favoured investment in on-going resource to ensure appropriate progress could be made in the interim period;

By Professor P Roberts:

- (j) That insufficient time within the ITLR had been dedicated to consideration of postgraduate matters and that consideration might be given to separating out this element of review to ensure appropriate scrutiny;

By the Registrar:

- (k) In response to a comment from Professor A Reeve, that the direction of resource to key areas of recommendation would now be expected, notably in mental health provision, that £1.9M of APSG funding had already been allocated to meeting needs identified through the ITLR 2017;

By Professor S Jacka:

- (l) That the exercise had been more systematic and thorough than in 2011 and that more attention had been paid to getting strong student representation from academic departments;

By the Students' Union Education Officer:

- (m) That it would have been useful for more preparation time to have been available to student panel members, and the contribution to a student's HEAR could have been publicised earlier;

By Professor D Leadley:

- (n) That greater use might have been made of external panel members, some of whom sought more informal discussion with students within the process;

By Ms S Crookes:

- (o) That the participation in ITLR 2017 by professional service departments had been particularly appreciated and that this should continue in future exercises;

By Ms K Hughes:

- (p) That professional service departments had missed an opportunity following the ITLR to come together collectively to review the report and outcomes for all service areas and that an adjusted schedule be adopted in 2022 to include the equivalent of a Faculty Engagement exercise for professional service departments;

By Professor L Roberts:

- (q) That it be noted that by holding the exercise at the same point in the year on each occasion, that some student groups would necessarily be missed, for example, final year MBChB students in January;

By Professor M Freely:

- (r) That her department was firmly committed to delivering the recommendations set for it, but that some guidance would be appropriated on the scheduling and delivery of the c. 3 years of work arising;

RESOLVED:

- (s) That the approach recommended by the ITLR Steering Group to future reviews of teaching and learning be approved.
- (t) That the recommendations made by the ITLR Steering Group relating to the scope, timing and operation of future reviews be approved.
- (u) That the report be recommended to the Council.

84/16-17 Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meetings of the Senate held on 15 March 2017 be approved.

85/16-17 Matters Arising on the Minutes

- (a) Progress of Senate Recommendations: Revisions to University Ordinances

REPORTED:

That the Council, at its meeting on 17 May 2017 noted the report from the meeting of the Senate on 15 March 2017 and considered and approved the recommendation of the Senate for the first time to rename the Centre for Professional Education, the Centre for Teacher Education, including the necessary changes to Ordinance 7 on the Constitution of the Boards of the Faculties (minute 73/16-17 refers).

(b) Progress of Senate Recommendations: Revisions to University Regulations

REPORTED:

That the Council, at its meeting on 17 May 2017 noted the report from the meeting of the Senate on 15 March 2017 and confirmed the recommendations of the Senate to revised Regulation 8.3 Regulations for the Degree of BSc (and for the Degree of BA Awarded on the Recommendation of the Board of the Faculty of Science) and for Undergraduate Masters Degrees in Science except for the Degree of BSc in Engineering and the Degree of BSc, Master of Engineering, (BSc, MEng) and BEng, Master of Engineering (BEng, MEng), to reflect changes to the Degrees of BEng and MEng in Computer Systems Engineering (minute 78/16-17 refers).

86/16-17 Chair's Business: QS Rankings

REPORTED:

That the QS World University Rankings 2018 have named the University of Warwick as one of the world's top 100 universities and one of the UK's top 10 universities; ranked at number 10 in the UK, the new QS World Rankings place Warwick as 57th in the in the world's top 100 universities.

87/16-17 Chair's Business: LEO data

REPORTED:

That LEO data, which mapped graduate earnings against course and institution of study had been published which showed that after a period of 5 years following graduation, Warwick graduates ranked 5th in terms of total earnings.

88/16-17 Chair's Business: Electoral outcome

REPORTED:

- (a) That, following the election, Higher Education remained a component of the Department for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy and Jo Johnson had retained his role as Minister of State for HE and Science;
- (b) That TEF outcomes, expected to be available to institutions on 12th June had not been published owing to the outcome of the recent election but were expected to be published shortly.

89/16-17 Chair's Business: Athena Swan Charter

REPORTED:

That the University had retained its silver status in the Athena Swan Charter in national results announced by the Equality Challenge Unit and would re-submit in another 12 months in the expectation that additional progress would have been made during this time.

90/16-17 Registrar's Business: Workplace Well-being Charter Mark

REPORTED:

That in May the University was awarded the Workplace Wellbeing Charter Mark, following assessment by Coventry City Council.

91/16-17 Registrar's Business: Health & Safety Audit of the School of Life Sciences and Warwick Medical School

REPORTED:

That a Health & Safety Audit of the School of Life Sciences and the Warwick Medical School had recently been conducted following an institutional focus on work in this area and the departments concerned had performed extremely well.

92/16-17 Registrar's Business: Staffing changes

REPORTED:

- (a) That Dr Mike Glover, Academic Registrar, had been appointed Director of Planning & Council Secretariat at the University of Oxford with effect from 1 September; that Mike be congratulated on his appointment and the thanks of the Senate be extended to him for his contribution during his 15 years' service to the University;
- (b) That Simon Gilling, Director of Legal Services had recently taken early retirement;
- (c) That Mary McGrath, Director of Development, would retire in December.

93/16-17 *California

RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on developments in California.

REPORTED:

- (a) That the Council sub-group on California had been exploring the challenges of delivering teaching in the California Graduate School for 2019, noting particularly that the impact of the high financial bond required and the up-front costs, including those of refurbishing the building acquired for the purpose would be to exert very considerable pressure upon the project funders;
- (b) That in the light of recent Council discussions, a visit had been undertaken the previous week in order to determine next steps and that these would be to move ahead to a proof of concept, under which:
 - (i) the land would be sold to release funding at greatest value rather than as soon as possible;
 - (ii) that a clear fundraising strategy would be developed, noting that a fundraiser had already been hired and an initial gift of £100k had been received but that this individual would need 'products' to use;
 - (iii) that research activities would deliver as intended; and

- (iv) that the necessary legislative changes would be secured; it being noted that other organisations had been permitted to run 10 programmes plus doctoral study and that Warwick was currently being restricted to 2 programmes, with the same attendant financial risks and that a case that the University should not be subject to these constraints was being made with the support of the current Mayor of Sacramento, a former leader of the California Senate;
- (c) That the Board of Trustees would be established once teaching programmes were advertised;
- (d) That a further report would be provided to the Senate in July following report to the Council sub-group;

By Professor A Clarke:

- (e) That whilst financial difficulties might increase uncertainty, the co-operation between the University and UDF teams was strong and colleagues had a very positive experience of engagement; the opportunity in California remained one well worth pursuing;

By Professor G Lindsay:

- (f) That discussions relating to research were progressing well and collaborations from CEDAR had the potential to develop relationships with world class research institutes in California;

By the Vice-Chancellor:

- (g) That the work of the Dean in California would continue and that resource for colleagues' visits continued to be provided by UDF, not the University;

By the Provost:

- (h) That successful international campuses had typically enjoyed flexibility at the outset to offer more programmes and that working at scale would be critical.

94/16-17 The Assembly

RECEIVED:

Minutes of the meeting of the Assembly held on 12 May 2017, including the motion considered (S.57 /16-17).

REPORTED (by the Secretary to Council):

That a meeting of the Assembly had been called for 12th May; that the Minutes from the meeting had been approved by the Steering Committee; that a request had been made that the meeting should be attended by academic colleagues only owing to the topic for discussion, but that no efforts had been made to curtail attendance by staff category and that the motion discussed was passed with a significant majority.

CONSIDERED:

- (a) A report from the Assembly Working Group commissioned to address feedback from the 2016 Pulse staff survey and to consider matters relating to the membership of the Assembly, together with an oral report from Professor Saul Jacka, on behalf of the Working Group (S.58/16-17).

REPORTED (by Professor S Jacka):

- (i) That consideration had been given by the Working Group to the purpose of the Assembly, which was essentially as a means for the corporate body of the University to speak back to University management and to that extent Group members had felt strong that it was worth retaining;
- (ii) That the consensus of discussions over membership was that it ought to be open to all staff on grades 1-9;
- (iii) That the Group had noticed with concern that in terms of the representation of the assembly on the Senate, the constitution was out of synch with existing practice and that this ought to be remedied as swiftly as possible through the Review of Governing Instruments;

By Dr T van Rens:

- (iv) That the assembly should itself consider through which subset of its membership various potential topics of debate should be progressed depending on which categories of staff might be impacted;

By Professor P Roberts:

- (v) That it was a moot point whether the membership of the Assembly constituted those staff in attendance at a meeting, or all those eligible to attend, whose views might be sought through an electronic ballot on the topic concerned.

RESOLVED:

- (vi) That the report of the Assembly Working Group be noted;
- (vii) That the membership of the Assembly be extended to all staff employed on level 1-9 terms and conditions from the date of their employment;

RECOMMENDED (to the Council):

- (viii) That that the Assembly be retained as a statutory body;
- (ix) That the current provisions of statute 20 (5) that require the Vice-Chancellor to summon an extraordinary meeting of the Assembly on the requisition in writing of no fewer than twenty-five members of the Assembly stating the purpose for which the meeting is to be called, be retained in Statute;
- (x) That the Assembly considers the report on Assembly Processes, as set out in Appendix C;
- (xi) That the Statutes are amended to reflect the current constitution of the Senate regarding the representatives of the Assembly.

- (b) A paper authored by Dr T van Rens and Professor J Millar, representatives of the Assembly on the Senate, S.70/16-17, (circulated 48 hours prior to the meeting) urging the adoption of a resolution recommending that additional effort be made to address the concerns raised in relation to the revision of Statute 24 by the University and to gain the support of the Assembly for its reform.

REPORTED (by Dr T van Rens):

- (i) That consultation within the institution concerning the documents relating to Statute 24 had already led to significant revisions and improvement, but that eight academic departments had expressed concerns about the draft and that the UCU also had concerns.
- (ii) That there were a number of difficulties with the current drafts: problems with the notion of equitable treatment of staff; problems at a procedural level in terms of removing content from Statute and putting it into policy which would make it much easier to change the substance and problems with content, notably in relation to the significant augmentation in the role and responsibility of Heads of Departments;
- (iii) That in a number of areas, the current draft was unclear in terms of definitions, for example in relation to gross misconduct, which included the provision “refusal to obey reasonable instruction”; “knowingly failing to follow procedure” and “conduct which could damage the reputation of the University.”
- (iv) That other problems related to the removal of the right to legal representation.

By Professor J Millar:

- (v) That in addition to the difficulties already outlined, the proposed changes failed to recognise the core principles of research, notably that staff should have freedom to pursue novel interests and that freedom to fail was also necessary if not to undermine the research environment;
- (vi) That owing to the innate transferability of skills developed by professional services staff, the changes to Statute 24 would necessarily have a lesser impact upon these staff;
- (vii) That whilst making the process for making academic redundant would make the institution more responsive to government directives, there was an inherent danger for the institution in undermining job security in terms of the development of an institutional reputation which discouraged colleagues from joining the University;

RESOLVED:

That it be noted that there was support for additional effort to be dedicated to work in this area and that the foregoing contributions be highlighted in discussions arising from consideration of the latest revised draft of Statute 24 considered under 94/16-17 (b) below.

CONSIDERED:

- (a) A report from the Secretary to Council proposing changes to the University's Charter and Statutes (S.56/16-17).

REPORTED (by the Secretary to Council):

- (i) That over a period of years, efforts had been made to de-regulate the University's governing instruments and that any such changes needed to be submitted to the Privy Council which produced guidance as to those matters it expected to see retained in this format and those not;
- (ii) That existing governing instruments were dated, inconsistent and in some areas, both the Senate and the Council were now operating outside Statute;
- (iii) That a Working Group had been established to oversee the drafting of proposed revisions in which representatives of the Senate had been involved and that these had been overseen by colleagues at Shakespeare Martineau;
- (iv) That the strategy followed had been one of moving much of the detail currently contained within Statute to Ordinance; to achieve greater clarity on instances of delegated authority either to committees or to individuals;
- (v) That changes were highlighted in track changes for ease of identification and, if approved, would be considered by the Council in July;

RESOLVED:

That the principles adopted in re-drafting the revised Charter and Statutes be noted;

RECOMMENDED (to the Council):

That the revised Charter and Statutes be approved as set out in paper S.56/16-17.

- (b) A report from the Provost including a revised draft of Statute 24, together with an oral report (S.67/16-17).

REPORTED (by the Chair):

- (i) That the motivation for reforming Statute 24 was not to make it easier to dismiss colleagues, but to provide a way of dealing more pragmatically with extreme situations; and that there was an understanding that the Statute was representative of academic freedom.

REPORTED (by the Provost):

- (ii) That there had been extensive 'without prejudice' consultation with trades unions, that Statute 24 had been revised in the light of feedback, and that currently the remaining trades union that wished to engage in further debate about Statute 24 was the UCU;

- (iii) That the proposed changes were summarised in the paper, and included a commitment in Statute for an academic member of staff to request a review to determine if their Academic Freedom had been infringed at the commencement of a formal disciplinary/grievance/redundancy/sickness absence procedure; Council approval for redundancy proposals which involve the cessation of areas of academic activity; and the option for redundancy consultation meetings to be chaired by a senior member of staff from outside the relevant department;
- (iv) That the sections of Statute 24 and associated policies highlighted in yellow indicated the changes that had been made since the meeting of the Senate on 15 March 2017, and those sections highlighted in green indicated changes subsequent to 9 May 2017;
- (v) That the sub-group of the Council tasked with considering the proposed changes to Statute 24 had agreed that the feedback received from University staff had highlighted the issue of academic freedom;
- (vi) That a sub-group of the Council had agreed an extension to the timescale for the review based on feedback from the consultation process and from the Senate;
- (vii) In response to a query from Dr T van Rens regarding the benefit of extracting procedure from Ordinance into policy, that if there hadn't been a change in meaning, there was a desire to have a common and consistent process available in one place, which enabled differential treatment of staff where appropriate;
- (viii) An observation by Mrs P Glover, that Ordinances were formally held in the Office of the Secretary to Council to preserve the desirable separation;
- (ix) An observation by Dr M Glover that the Council had an overview of staff policies, and that it may be unwise to circumnavigate Senate and to expect this level of scrutiny from the Council;
- (x) In response to a query from Professor M Freely regarding who would be responsible for determining challenges to academic freedom on a case-by-case basis given that there was still no adequate definition of academic freedom, that it would be helpful to develop guidelines in this respect;

By the Provost:

- (xi) That whilst guidelines could be developed, they could not possibly cover all eventualities, however work on the underlying principles would be helpful and this might assist future panels;
- (xii) An observation from Professor J Millar that the University should not take any action that would alter the perception that academic freedom was upheld at the University;
- (xiii) An observation from Dr N Shiers that much content had moved from Statute to Ordinance where it would be afforded lesser protections and that he felt that the core principles ought to be retained in Statute;

- (xiv) A proposal from Professor S Jacka that a suitable way forward might be to establish a working group of the Senate, and that this might include members of the Senate and lay members of the Council so as to draw them into discussions as to what constituted academic freedom that was intended to be protected;
- (xv) An observation from Professor C Sparrow that the proposed working group should include some Heads of Department to ensure that what emerged was a pragmatic procedure in which Heads of Departments could have operational confidence;
- (xvi) In response to a query from Ms H Worsdale, that the recommendations of a working group would need to be received prior to seeking the approval of the Privy Council.
- (xvii) An observation from Dr M Glover, that he had noticed some issues with the drafting of the Statute, such as the inclusion of titles of some specific roles, which he would feed directly into the working group.
- (xviii) An observation from Mr R Green that it would be important to make any appropriate distinctions between process and protections applying to academic staff and those applying to other categories of staff;
- (xix) In response to a query from Dr T Rens, that interface with the Governing Instruments Group, led by Ms Viki Cooke from the Council, would enable the group to establish a clear mandate and means to address concerns raised by the proposed reforms;
- (xx) A registration of concern from Ms H Worsdale over the way the topic of Statute 24 had been introduced by the Chair, and that it should be possible both to be appropriately supportive of academic staff and to combat sexual violence;
- (xxi) Observations from Ms H Worsdale regarding the impact of an erosion of academic freedom on students' learning environment and the need to protect the ability of students to study the widest possible range of topics without restriction; noting also that the impact of protections afforded staff through Statute should also be considered in relation to future University leadership at a time when current values might be placed under even greater pressure;

RESOLVED:

- (xxii) That a Working Group of the Senate and the Council be established, including the following members of the Senate; Professor S Jacka, Professor D Branch, Professor M Freely, Professor A Clarke, Dr T van Rens and Ms P Glover;
- (xxiii) That the Terms of Reference of the Working Group would include consideration as to how to address the concerns raised about the proposed reform of Statute 24, and to report back to the Senate with guidance in areas where there was a lack of definition and with a workable procedure for Heads of Departments to enact.

96/16-17 *Report from the Steering Committee

CONSIDERED:

*Report from the Steering Committee, (S.59/16-17 {restricted}), and its resolutions under the following headings, with an emphasis on the current institutional activity around health and safety:

- (a) *Proposed Collaboration with New Model in Teaching Engineering (NMiTE)
- (b) *Draft Institutional Response to the HEFCE's Consultation on the Second Research Excellence Framework (REF)
- (c) *Health and Safety Update
- (d) *Car Parking Proposals
- (e) *Admissions and Recruitment Spring Update
- (f) Institutional Teaching and Learning Review (ITLR)
- (g) *University's Access Agreement 2018/19
- (h) *Report from the Fees Working Group (FWG)
- (i) *QS Rankings by Subject
- (j) *Prevent Update
- (k) *Report from Budget Steering Group on Q2 2016/17 Financial Performance and the Financial Plan 2017 Initial Considerations
- (l) *Report from the Administrative and Professional Services Group (APSG)
- (m) *Report from the Capital, Space and Amenities Group (CSAG)
- (n) *Report from the Academic Resourcing Committee (ARC)
- (o) *Draft Response to General Medical Council Consultation (GMC) on a proposed Medical Licensing Assessment (MLA)
- (p) *Draft Response to the Government's Industrial Strategy
- (q) *Draft Response to DLHE Consultation
- (r) Replacement of the Senior Officials' Robes
- (s) *Draft University Records Management Policy
- (t) *Draft Response to the Department of Health consultation on expansion of undergraduate medical education
- (u) *Warwick Medical School Collaboration with the University of Chester
- (v) *Social Inclusion Strategy
- (w) *Annual Chaplaincy Report
- (x) *Equality and Diversity Report
- (y) Minutes of the Meeting of Assembly Held on 12th May
- (z) *HEFCE Annual Provider Review Preliminary Assessment

RESOLVED:

That the report from the Steering Committee be approved as set out in S.59/16-17.

97/16-17 Report from the Academic Quality and Standards Committee

CONSIDERED:

A report from the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (S.60/16-17) {Part 1} and its resolutions, recorded under the following items:

- (a) Draft Guidance on Dealing with Cheating in Assessed Work

RESOLVED

That the Draft Guidance on Dealing with Cheating in Assessed Work as set out in Appendix A of paper QAWG.13/16-17, reporting the recommendations from the Plagiarism Working Group, be approved, subject to the minor amendments noted.

- (b) Draft Proof-Reading Policy

- (i) In response to a query from Professor D Leadley regarding whether an extra tick box was required for PhD theses, that proof reading was an accepted part of the supervisory process, and the Policy referred only to third party proof reading.
- (ii) In response to a query from Professor M Freely about the proactive role that Royal Literary Fund Fellows took in the reading of assessed work, that this seemed to be counter to the Proof-Reading Policy and should be discussed outside the meeting.
- (iii) An observation from Professor A Cooley that it should still be possible for students with a diagnosed learning difficulty to have their work proof-read, but a disability would need to be declared and a diagnosis provided by Disability Support Services.

RESOLVED:

That the Draft Proof-Reading Policy be approved as set out in paper BGS.5/16-17{revised 2}.

- 98/16-17 Joint Report from the Boards of the Faculties of Arts, Medicine, Science and Social Sciences

RESOLVED:

That the joint report from the Boards of the Faculties of Arts, Medicine, Sciences and Social Sciences be approved as set out in paper S.61/16-17.

- 99/16-17 Report from the Equality & Diversity Committee

RESOLVED:

That the report from the Equality & Diversity Committee be approved as set out in paper S.62/16-17 {restricted}.

- 100/16-17 Report from the Health & Safety Executive Committee

RESOLVED:

That the report from the Health & Safety Executive Committee be approved as set out in paper S.63/16-17 {restricted}.

101/16-17 Report from the Academic Staff Committee

CONSIDERED:

A report from the Academic Staff Committee, (S.64/16-17) {restricted}.

RESOLVED:

That the membership of the Academic Staff Committee and the Probation Review Group for 2017-18 be approved as set out in paper S.64/16-17 {restricted}.

102/16-17 Awards and Distinctions

RECEIVED:

A paper setting out Awards and Distinctions conferred upon members of the University since the last meeting of the Senate held on 15 March 2017, (S.65/16-17).

RESOLVED:

That particular congratulations be extended to Professor Graham Cormode of the Department of Computer Science, who had been jointly awarded the 2017 Adams Prize, considered to be a premier UK Mathematics Prize.

103/16-17 Academic Quality and Standards Committee

CONSIDERED:

A report from the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (S.60/16-17 {Part 2}).

RESOLVED:

- (a) That that the proposals for the approval and oversight of outcomes for students on the International Foundation Programme be approved as set out in AQSC.22/16-17.
- (b) That the revised version of the updated Good Practice Guide on Providing Information to students, be approved as set out in AQSC.23/16-17 (revised).
- (c) That the proposed amendments to the Good Practice Guide on Monitoring Student Attendance and Progress, be approved as set out in paper AQSC.24/16-17.

104/16-17 Vice-Chancellor's Action

RECEIVED:

Actions undertaken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate since its last meeting, (S.66/16-17).

105/16-17 Revisions to Ordinance

CONSIDERED:

- (a) Proposed amendments to Ordinance 13, for the second time (S.68/16-17) to remove the Master of Clinical Sciences (MClinSci) from the Ordinance on Degrees and Diplomas.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed amendments to Ordinance 13, on Degrees and Diplomas, be approved as set out in paper S.68/16-17.

- (b) Proposed amendments to Ordinance 7, on the Constitution of the Boards of the Faculties, for the second time (S.45/16-17) to reflect the change in name of the Centre for Professional Education to the Centre for Teacher Education.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed amendments to Ordinance 7, on the Constitution of the Boards of the Faculties, be approved as set out in paper S.45/16-17.

106/16-17 Student and alumni deaths

REPORTED:

That the University had been informed of the deaths of the following alumni and students since the last meeting of the Senate held on 15 March 2017:

Staff:

Professor Mark Rodger, Professor in Molecular Simulation in the
Department of Chemistry, 1999 – present

Alumni:

Mr David Griffiths, BSc Chemistry, 1966 – 1969
Mr Alan Perks, BEd Learning Difficulties, 1979 – 1980
Mr Richard Purday, BA History, 1979 – 1983
Miss Alexandra Sigala, MSc Economics and International Finance, 2007 - 2008
Mr Gregory Wells, MA History of Medicine, 2008 – 2010

107/16-17 Date of the next meeting

REPORTED:

That the next meeting of the Senate would be held at 2.00pm on Wednesday 5 July 2017 commencing in the Helen Martin Studio, Warwick Arts Centre, for the first item of business, the University's Financial Plan. Members of the Senate would be joined by current and incoming Heads of Academic Departments for this item of business. Upon conclusion of this item of business, members of the Senate would continue the meeting in the Council Chamber, Senate House.

* Denotes a restricted paper, confidential to members and attendees of the Senate.