

Senate

Wednesday 17 November 2021, 2.15pm

Location: 3 West North, 3.7 and remotely, via TEAMS

Present:

Professor Ian White, Chair

Dr Peter Allen

Professor Julie Barnett, Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)

Professor David Bird

Dr Rob Branston

Professor Nick Brook, Dean of Science

Dr Rita Chawla-Duggan

Professor James Davenport

Professor David Galbreath, Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences

Dr Sabina Gheduzzi

Dr Marion Harney

Dr Alan Hayes, Chair of Academic Assembly

Professor Momna Hejmadi, Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)

Professor Tim Ibell, Dean of Engineering and Design

Dr Nigel Johnston

Professor Robert Kelsh

Professor Jonathan Knight, Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor

Professor Davide Mattia, Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)

Professor Guy McCusker

Professor Marcelle McManus

Dr Dai Moon

Professor Bruce Rayton, Chair Programmes and Partnerships Approval Committee

Dr Paul Shepherd

Siddharth Singh, SU Postgraduate Officer

Professor Brian Squire

Professor Danae Stanton-Fraser

Dr John Troyer

Dr Steve Wharton

Professor Lorraine Whitmarsh

Annie Willingham

Professor Cassie Wilson, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience)

Jacob Withington

Dr Jun Zang

[Remote attendance](#)

Professor Andrea Abbas

Professor Steve Brammer, Dean of School of Management

Professor Matt Davidson

Professor Joe Devine, Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)

Kate Robinson, Librarian

[In attendance:](#)

Dr Christopher Bonfield, Director of the Centre for Learning and Teaching

Richard Brooks, Director of Human Resources (for item 15013)

Dr Emma Denham, Senior Lecturer, Biology and Biochemistry (for item 15052)

Professor Matthew Jones (for item 15048)

Dr Nicky Kemp, Director of Policy, Planning and Compliance (remote attendance for items 15049 and 15052)

Rachel Sheer, Director of Academic Registry

Charlie Slack, Head of Student Voice & Engagement, Students' Union

[Secretariat](#)

Emily Commander, Secretary

Jane Eyles, Member of Secretariat

Karen Gleave, Member of Secretariat (remote attendees)

Caroline Pringle, Member of Secretariat

[Apologies](#)

Dr Frances Laughton

Introductory items

15039 - Welcome and Quorum

The Chair welcomed members and attendees and made a formal note of attendance to ensure that quorum was maintained throughout the meeting.

15040 - Declarations of Interest

Members were asked to declare any potential conflicts of interest. In respect of item 15050, it was noted that Dr Steve Wharton had a role as Departmental Erasmus and Assistantships Director for POLIS.

15041 - Minutes of the Previous Meeting – S21/22 – 23 (updated version)

The minutes of the previous meeting of Senate held on 6 October 2021 were approved, with corrections to the names of two members (Dr Sabina Gheduzzi and Dr Jun Zang).

Action: Corrected minutes to be published on the website.

15042 - Actions and Matters Arising

1. Standing Orders (15004)

Standing Orders to be amended and uploaded to the website. [Complete](#).

2. NSS analysis (15011)

Paper on NSS to contain WP analysis. *See item 15047 below.* **Complete.**

3. Annual promotions round (15014)

Proposals on the single annual promotions round to be reviewed in light of comments made during discussion. *See item 15054 below.* **Complete.**

4. Senior academic appointments (15014)

Revised procedure to be approved by Council. *Approved at Council's meeting on 14 October (minute 7342) and [uploaded to the website](#).* **Complete.**

5. Regulation 16 (15015)

Regulation 16 to be updated and uploaded to the website. **Outstanding.**

6. Minor amendments to Regulations (15016)

Minor amendments to Regulations to be updated and uploaded to the website. **[Complete.](#)**

7. Prize criteria (15016)

Amended eligibility criteria for the Godfrey and Sue Hall Prize to be published. **[Complete.](#)**

8. Chancellor's Prize Committee (15016)

Updated Terms of Reference to be published on the website. **[Complete.](#)**

Part I: Items in this part of the agenda are for decision and/or discussion

15043 – Institutional updates – S21/22 – 24

The Vice-Chancellor noted that proposals were being brought to Senate at an earlier stage in their development, including through a number of informal channels, to allow members of Senate to have meaningful input and to engage with one another, and welcomed any feedback on this new approach.

He thanked colleagues for their hard work at the start of the academic year.

He updated Senate on developments since paper S21/22 – 24 had been circulated, namely:

- Congratulations to Dr Chris Brace, who had won a prize for global leadership in automotive engineering.
- The University was supporting a Masters student on a Chevening Scholarship: in a project being led by Professor Devine, the University had offered a top-up to the scholarship and rent, and was offering some support with utilities.
- iCAST was due to be launched later that week in Swindon, with congratulations to Professor Matt Davidson and Professor Marcelle McManus.
- Work was underway to develop a coherent programme of engagement with the Royal United Hospitals and other healthcare providers in the region, with potential benefits for research and education.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that, at a recent meeting of University Executive Board (UEB), there had been discussion of low take-up rates for mandatory cyber-security training, which presented real financial risks and risks to the security of personal data. He reminded members

of Senate of the need to be vigilant and asked them to encourage their colleagues to complete the training if they had not already done so. Members of Senate underscored the importance of work on cyber-security.

The University had received formal notification of the University and Colleague Union (UCU)'s intention to strike for three days in December. The University respected the decision taken by those going on strike and said that the University would do its best to support both students and staff through this period. He expressed hope for a positive resolution, notwithstanding the very serious issues at stake.

Senate discussed the update on the online MSc in Artificial Intelligence (paragraphs 18 – 22). The following points were made:

- There was a feeling that the problems in relation to the online MSc course were more widespread within the department and had been an issue for longer than 18 months. The Vice-Chancellor acknowledged the need for any solution to be set within the wider departmental, Faculty and University context.
- There was concern expressed by some Senators about the very high workload levels reported by the department and the institutional response to this, which had been to adjust the workload model. The Dean of the Faculty of Science noted that there had been ongoing discussions between the Faculty and the department about staffing levels. The number of students recruited to the course had been much higher than the target, which had been a contributory factor. The department was working to ensure new staffing covered the gaps in the programme.
- The department had itself grown, so that it was no longer a small department in the context of UK computer science departments. Adjustments to delivery models would be required to take account of this.
- Concern was expressed over course completion rates, but Professor Davenport explained that, while several students were taking gaps between modules, as the course delivery model allowed, the true dropout rate was just under 7%, which he considered to be better than reasonable for a part-time online MSc.
- This was the first course put on by the University with a commercial partner and there were lessons to be learnt for future collaborations, particularly in relation to future caps on intake numbers.
- The department was looking into support for students in producing their dissertations.
- It was hoped that the Education Board may, in part, be able to prevent such problems arising in future.

The following issues were raised in the general discussed which then ensued:

- The accuracy of the University's COVID statistics was queried on the basis of anecdotal evidence that numbers may be higher than reported. It was noted that the statistics only tracked the number of confirmed cases on campus, which may explain any perceived discrepancy, as many staff confirmed cases were at home. Although student numbers did look low, the percentage of Bath students who had been doubly vaccinated was very high. The Vice-Chancellor offered assurance that the numbers were tracked on a daily basis.
- Although the REF Review Group would report to the Vice-Chancellor, Senate would be consulted on all recommendations on an open and ongoing basis.

The institutional update was noted.

Action: Chief Operating Officer to respond to the query about COVID statistics.

15044 – Admissions– S21/22 – 25 (A and B)

Dr Bruce Rayton presented paper S21/22 – 25 on admissions. The conclusion of the 2021/22 undergraduate admissions cycle had been strong given the challenging context. Results were not evenly distributed across courses but it was positive that the University had not experienced the uncontrolled growth seen at other institutions.

The coming year would be challenging, particularly because of the likely A-level grade distribution. The offer-making strategy would be conservative, allowing the University to retain sufficient flexibility at the end of the cycle to prevent uncontrolled growth once more. No steps would be taken to compromise the achievement of the University's Widening Participation (WP) milestone targets, which had been achieved this year for the first time. The University had begun to make some offers and aimed to produce exactly the number of appropriately-qualified undergraduate students set in the targets.

The following points were made in the discussion:

- It was suggested that a lower number of international students, and a reduction in the associated in-country presence, may help the University to meet its carbon targets. However, the issue of how many students the University had, and where they came from, mattered to the University at the highest level, and sometimes there were trade-offs to be made.
- It would be important to ensure that the higher number of students from a WP background had appropriate support for the duration of their studies at the University and this would need to be monitored.

Dr Bruce Rayton reported that postgraduate admissions had also been strong in the context of a challenging year. The number of overseas postgraduates had risen, with a small decrease in home students, representing an overall return to pre-pandemic volumes. As a market, India was growing in significance but China had shrunk, partly because of the pandemic but also because of deeper structural issues. One of the attractions of India as a market was its link to the post-graduation opportunities available in the UK. This could have implications for the design of future courses.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Dr Rayton and the updates on the outcomes of the 2021/22 admissions cycle for undergraduates and postgraduates were noted.

15045 – Curriculum Transformation– S21/22 – 26A - C

Professor Joe Devine, Joint Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) presented an update on the Curriculum Transformation Programme (S21/22 – 26A). The project now had a defined end date of September 2024, which is when the courses would be launched. From this flowed a project definition – the redesign of the curriculum offer – and everything else became business as usual. The project would report to UEB for operational, strategic and resourcing requests, and to the Education Quality and Standards Committee for course approvals. The Academic Standards Working Group would work on the adaptation of standards for a 2023/24 launch.

He noted that, by the end of the month, all undergraduate programmes should have been approved by the School and Faculty quality committees, with more flexibility for postgraduate programmes. The Faculty of Engineering and Design would launch its programme in 2022/23.

There would be a wider paper on the implications for workload, which would follow.

The following points were raised in the discussion which ensued:

- It would be helpful to have a sufficient degree of granularity to assess the success of Curriculum Transformation even at unit level. This was feasible but would take time. The Curriculum Transformation Sub-Group was considering how best to prompt these questions in a light-touch way.
- One of the drivers for Curriculum Transformation had been a desire to reduce assessment: going forwards, careful consideration would be needed of the right balance between pursuing the right strategic path and keeping students happy.
- It was hoped that vanguard courses would allow student feedback to be taken into account.

The Director of Academic Registry introduced paper S21/22 – 26B. The following points were raised in the discussion:

- The passmark was being translated from 40% to 50%. As a result the proposed lower boundary definable range was being translated from 35% to 45%. In other institutions the lower boundary definable range was 40% where the passmark was 50%. This was intended to reflect an articulation of the same standard, including the condonement range: it had been felt that a range of 49-49% was too broad for a marginal fail.
- Some thought would need to be given to academic staff development in relation to the change in passmark, which may require changes to the way exams were conceived and designed. Increased capacity within Academic Registry should help with this process.

Senate:

- Noted workstream progress and plans made, and consultation undertaken, since the last report.
- Noted the proposed approach for outside-meeting decision-making (paragraph 8).
- Approved the development and roll-out for adapted postgraduate taught (PGT) regulations and the implementation of the 50% FHEQ level 7 passmark for PGT courses (Appendix 1).
- Approved the specific proposals for the 50% passmark module result mark scheme (Appendix 2, paragraph 3).

Professor Momna Hejmadi, Joint Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) presented paper S21/22 – 26C on course variants. The University was using the opportunity presented by Curriculum Transformation to simplify the conventions of presenting variants of courses to students, based on marked research and with the support of the admissions and marketing teams.

In response to a question, it was noted that current undergraduate programmes with no variants would continue with their current names, unless otherwise specified in the appendices to the paper.

Senate:

- Approved the adoption of standard conventions for variants of undergraduate courses (as separate from degree titles) as outlined in Appendix 1.
- Approved changes to relevant undergraduate course titles and available course variants in keeping with these conventions, as detailed in Appendix 2, with effect for new students joining in 2023/24.

15046 – Education: Governance – S21/22 – 27

Professor Momna Hejmadi, Joint Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) introduced a paper on Education Governance, an issue which had been mentioned at the Senate meeting of 6 October. The proposal to create an Education Board was being made largely in response to changes to the Resilient Curriculum Project Team (RCPT), which had been established in response to COVID but would now be stood down. The intention was to establish a longer-term, strategic policy and planning body building on the lessons learned from RCPT and on consultation, including with members of Senate, who had provided valuable insight.

She noted that the changes would require consequential amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Education, Quality and Standards Committee, which would assume a largely monitoring and assurance role. A paper on this would come to Senate in February.

Senate considered whether the word “operational” should be used in relation to the role of the Education Board with a view to underlining the strategic role of Senate on all academic matters, as laid out in Statute 19.1. It was noted that part of the purpose of the Education Board would be to ensure that strategic and operational decisions were taken together: this would be empowering to Senate in providing it with more information. The Board would advise the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), who would bring proposals to Senate, but Senate would retain the strategic decision-making authority.

As a result of this discussion, Senate agreed to delegate to the Vice-Chancellor responsibility for amending the introductory paragraph of the Terms of Reference to include a reference to Senate’s role as set out in Statute 19.1

Proposals for the establishment of an Education Board and associated education governance changes were approved, with one amendment to the Terms of Reference.

Action: Terms of Reference to be updated and published on the website. Education Board members to be appointed and Education Board to begin meeting.

Action: Resilient Curriculum Project Team (RCPT) to be dissolved.

Action: EQSC sub-groups to be stood down.

Action: Amendments to the Terms of Reference for EQSC to be brought to the February meeting of Senate.

15047 – Student survey results– S21/22 – 28 (A to C)

Professor Momna Hejmadi, Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) introduced the results of the National Student Survey (NSS), Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), Professional Doctorate Experience Survey (PDES) and Postgraduate Taught Education Survey (PTES). The NSS was a regulatory survey, but the others were all optional. The University had action plans in relation to each of them.

In response to a question she noted that discussions with Advance HE were underway on the timing of the PTES, which was misaligned with the academic year for postgraduate taught students.

The Vice-Chancellor congratulated everyone involved on positive results.

Senate noted the outcomes of the NSS, PRES, PDES and PTES.

15048 – Degree outcomes– S21/22 – 29

Professor Matthew Jones presented paper S21/22 – 29 on degree outcomes. Degree outcomes for 2020/21 were broadly in line with the 2019/20 results, with a notable increase in First Class degrees common across the sector. Trends in under-represented groups had improved over the previous four-five years, but there were persistent gaps between students with and without disability, for minority ethnic groups and for students with bursaries: these gaps increased for First Class degrees.

The Degree Outcomes Group would be analysing reports on this data at a departmental level to understand the reasons behind it and would report back to Senate in 2022. Targeted support was needed for academics and departments to tackle the reasons behind the gaps in attainment.

The following points were made in the discussion:

- Concern was expressed about the increase of scaling and the possibility that this was linked to a failure to adapt to the open book format. There was also some anecdotal evidence for a rise in malpractice and care would be needed to ensure this did not have an adverse impact on those students who played by the rules. It was noted that many departments had moved to shorter, fixed-term exam windows to address this point but scaling could be looked at.
- There would be a full review of exams at the end of the year and the outcomes would be incorporated into planning for the following academic year.
- It was noted that it would be helpful to benchmark individual subjects against national data to give a more nuanced picture in the future.
- It was noted that contextualising degree outcome data with entry tariffs might be useful.
- It was noted that the Students' Union would be working with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) on attainment gaps as part of the work on the SU Top Ten.

Senate noted Ppper S21/22 – 29 on undergraduate degree outcomes for the 2020/21 academic year.

Action: Degree Outcomes Group to investigate possibility of benchmarking individual subjects against national data and contextualising degree outcomes with entry tariffs, with this information included in the report to Senate in 2022/23.

15049 – Academic KPIs– S21/22 – 30

Professor Momna Hejmadi, Joint Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), Professor Davide Mattia, Joint Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) and the Director of Policy, Planning & Compliance introduced a paper on academic KPIs. The following points were made in the discussion:

- It was noted that, in future years, it would be helpful to order the benchmarking data by ranking.
- The Director of Policy, Planning & Compliance agreed to come back to Senate with an explanation of why there were no targets for the KPIs on female professors and staff wellbeing.
- In future years, consideration would be given to the equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) and sustainability impact of the KPIs.
- A number of additional KPIs were suggested, particularly in relation to postgraduate students, student wellbeing and national teaching fellows. It was noted that the University used a much wider range of performance metrics, but that these indicators were the ones that had been selected as being the most important. Further consideration of the list of KPIs could be given at Education Board.

Senate noted the report on performance against academic KPIs.

Action: Paper S21/22 – 31 to be recirculated with benchmarking data arranged in rank order.

Action: Director of Policy, Planning & Compliance to provide an explanation of why no targets had been set for the number of female professors or on staff wellbeing.

Action: EDI and sustainability impact to be given more thorough consideration in future reports.

Action: Education Board to review the academic KPIs.

15050 – Renewal of student exchanges– S21/22 – 31

The Director of Academic Registry introduced paper S21/22 – 31 on the renewal of student exchanges. It was proposed to streamline unnecessary bureaucracy through risk-based quality assurance processes. This would facilitate the renewal of 94 exchange agreements due for renewal in 2022/23.

Senate approved, with immediate effect, the proposed approach to the renewal of exchanges to allow routine renewals, which pose no risk, to be approved by Heads of Departments, or the Associate Dean (Learning & Teaching) in the School of Management, as appropriate.

15051 – Academic integrity– S21/22 – 32

Dr Christopher Bonfield introduced paper S21/22 – 32 on academic integrity. The proposal the the University become a signatory to the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)'s Academic Integrity Charter had come from proposal from the Students' Union. The Charter had been developed nationally by the QAA National Academic Integrity Group. By signing up to it, the University would not lose control over its ability to determine policies and penalties but would be linked to a wider community of resources and support.

The appendix mapped areas covered by the Charter on which the University had already taken action. There was more work to be done and elements of this would be brought to Senate in due course.

The following points were made in the discussion:

- The University was working with StuDocU to get all University of Bath listed content taken down. It was impossible to give any guarantees as this was a third-party company. Updates would be forthcoming.
- It was noted that some other universities used watermarking of all official paperwork, which also carried official warnings about non-authorised publication.

Senate approved the signature by the University of Bath of the QAA Academic Integrity Charter.

Action: Bath to sign up to the QAA Academic Integrity Charter.

Action: PVC(E) to provide an update to Senate on the illegal publication of University Bath content on various student websites.

15052 – Student case monitoring – S21/22 –33 (A – F)

Dr Emma Denham, Postgraduate Independent Adviser (PIA), presented her independent report (S21/22 – 33E) to Senate. The report identified two main issues – supervision and the difficulty of dealing with processes and procedures across the University. She had been meeting with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) to make progress on these.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) introduced paper S21/22 – 33F, which was the institution’s initial response to the report of the PIA. The recommendations made had been helpful and formed basis of initial response in relation to safeguarding, training, processes, and bullying and harassment.

She reported on progress made since her initial response was written. A task and finish group was looking at how to respond to students when they came forward with a complaint on a dignity and respect issue, with the acknowledgement that the University’s response to these issues had frequently made difficult situations worse. The recommendations from this group would be brought to UEB and Senate. The University was serious about tackling these issues but the improvement would not be immediate and would need to be tracked over a period of years.

There were no questions on papers S21/22 – 33A (fitness to practice) and 33B (fitness to study).

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) introduced paper S21/22 – 33C on student disciplinarys. The University now had well-established internal disciplinary processes and procedures. A review was underway into the effectiveness of these processes and procedures in response to an internal audit which had taken place. Increased investment in this area had enabled the formation of a new Student Policy and Safeguarding Unit. The disciplinary team had seen an increased caseload in 2020/21 linked to the pandemic – volume was expected to fall back to pre-pandemic levels in the current academic year.

The Director of Policy, Planning & Compliance introduced paper S21/22 – 33D on complaints. The student complaints procedure had been overhauled for the 2019/20 year, which meant that this was the second year of data produced on a comparable basis. The number of complaints had increased, possibly as a result of proactive signposting from the Universities Minister. Benchmarking information on complaints made to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) demonstrated that the Office for Students (OfS) was unlikely to have cause for concern in relation to the University’s handling of complaints. In response to this, it was

noted that the complaints process was onerous for both students and the University, and a lack of complaints to the OIA was not necessarily an indication of a strong performance within the sector.

Senate noted the reports on student case monitoring.

15053 – Academic year dates – S21/22 – 34

The Director of Academic Registry introduced paper S21/22 – 34 on academic year dates. In response to a question, she noted that Senate would need to review the use of the January revision period on an annual basis.

Senate approved the academic year dates for 2023/24 and amendments to assessment period dates in 2021/22.

Action: academic year dates for 2023/24 and updated assessment dates for 2021/22 to be published.

15054 – Academic promotion– S21/22 – 35

The Secretary to Senate reminded members of Senate that the proposal to move to a single annual promotions round presented a potential conflict of interest for members of the academic staff eligible for promotion, who may be affected by the outcome of the proposal. She noted that they would be given an opportunity to recuse themselves from the decision.

The Director of Human Resources introduced paper S21/22 – 35, which comprised a recommendation from the Academic Staff Committee to amend the Career Progression Document to move to a single annual academic promotions round.

The proposal had previously been discussed at Senate on 6 October 2021, when two main themes had emerged, in relation to issues of EDI and out-of-cycle promotions. The proposal before Senate was substantially the same but with more information provided on these issues.

The following points were made during the discussion:

- There was a view that the current system already worked very well and did not require any change. Some members of Senate felt that the benefits of the proposal were unclear but that the risks were significant.
- It was queried whether there would be sufficient time between the launch of the promotions round and the deadline for people to make their applications. The Director of HR said that the deadline could be adjusted in view of the late launch date.
- Some members of Senate felt that moving to an annual promotions round would decrease academic staff opportunities for promotion. The chair of the Academic Staff Committee noted that they only had a single opportunity for promotion each year under the current system: the proposal reduced chances but not opportunities for promotion.
- It was noted that promotion was against a standard and that there was no element of competition.
- It was confirmed that there was no suggestion that fewer candidates would be promoted under the proposal, which simply affected the timing of submission of applications.

- One of the rationales for the proposal was that it would enable the University to put in place measures to support EDI work, such as workshops to drive up the number of applicants from diverse backgrounds and support them through the process. These had proved successful within the Faculty of Science and had significantly longer lead times. Mentoring was another scheme that had positive impact on EDI and which had a long lead-time. However, some members of Senate felt that the proposal would have negative implications for EDI.
- The advantages for the Academic Staff Committee in streamlining the process were noted. The Chair of the Committee observed that having a single promotion round would support consistency in decision-making.
- It was noted that having a single annual promotions round was common within the sector and would feel unremarkable after one or two years had elapsed.
- It was noted that the aspects of the underpinning processes supported by the Library would be easier to deliver across two promotion rounds each year.
- There was a concern that the proposal would affect morale at a very challenging time, which could have an impact on academic staff retention. There was, however, no evidence from other universities of a single promotions round having a negative impact on retention.
- Some members of Senate noted that they had been surprised to see the proposal come back to Senate after an interval of only a month.
- It was noted that it took about a year to prepare a good quality application for promotion, on which basis a single annual round made practical sense.

Question put: that Senate approves the movement to a single annual academic promotions round, effective from the start of the 2022/23 academic year, and the revision of the Career Progression Framework to reflect the move to a single annual round subject to appropriate consultation with UCU”.

A motion was moved “that the matter do lie upon the Table”. The motion was seconded.

The Question was put immediately (Standing Order 11(vii)a).

On a point of Order, the Secretary to Senate provided an explanation of the procedure being used.

Senate voted on the Question “that the matter do lie upon the Table”.

In favour: 14

Against: 15

Abstentions: 4

Question accordingly negatived.

Senate accordingly proceeded to vote on the main question: “that Senate approves the movement to a single annual academic promotions round, effective from the start of the 2022/23 academic year, and the revision of the Career Progression Framework to reflect the move to a single annual round subject to appropriate consultation with UCU”.

Members of Senate were offered the opportunity to recuse themselves from the vote. None did so.

In favour: 15

Against: 16

Abstentions: 3

Question accordingly negatived.

15055 – New course approvals – S21/22 – 36A and B

Senate approved a new online MSC Engineering Business Management course for 2022/23 entry, on the recommendation of the Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee.

Senate noted that it would be asked to approve a further new course by circulation before its February meeting.

Action: decision on new course to be taken by correspondence on the recommendation of CPAC.

Part 2: Items in this part of the agenda are for noting without discussion

15056 – Committees– S21/22 – 37

Senate approved amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Board of Studies (Doctoral).

Action: Terms of Reference to be updated and published on the website.

Part 3: Items in this part of the agenda are for noting without discussion

15057 – Senate Vacation Powers and Urgent Business Procedure – S21/22 – 38

Senate noted an item agreed under the Senate Vacation Powers and Urgent Business Procedure (SUB21/22 – 07).

15058 – Minutes of Boards of Studies – S21/22 – 39 (A- C)

Senate received minutes of the following Boards of Studies:

- A. Faculty of Science meeting of 28 September 2021
- B. School of Management meeting of 13 October 2021
- C. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences meeting of 13 October 2021

15059 – Senate committee and Joint Council/Senate committee minutes – S21/22 – 40 (A – E)

Senate received minutes of the following meetings of Senate committees and Joint Council/Senate committees:

- A. Academic Programmes Committee meeting of 20 October 2021
- B. Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee meeting of 5 October 2021
- C. Courses and Partnerships Approvals Committee meeting of 26 October 2021
- D. Education, Quality and Standards Committee meeting of 1 November 2021
- E. Council Senate Students' Union meeting of 2 November 2021

15060 – Calendar of Meetings for 2021/22 – S21/22 – 41

Senate noted the programme of meetings of Senate for 2021/22 and noted the draft business for the meeting on 2 February 2022. The meetings would be as follows:

- Wednesday 2 February 2022 at 2.15pm
- Wednesday 6 April 2022 at 2.15pm
- Wednesday 8 June 2022 at 2.15pm

15061 – Any Other Business

No other business was raised.