SENATE
MEETING 282 HELD ON 13th DECEMBER 2017
UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Composition		Membership	Count	Meeting 11.10.17	Meeting 13.12.17	Meeting 07.03.18	Meeting 16.05.18	Meeting 11.07.18
(a) Ex-Officio Staff	President (Chair)	Professor Sir Paul Curran	1	Y	Y			
	Deputy President & Provost	Professor David Bolton	2	Y	Y			
	Vice-Presidents	Professor Richard Verrall (Deputy Chair)	3	Y	Y			
		Professor Andrew Jones	4	Y	Y			
		Professor Stanton Newman (p/t)	5	A	A			
	Director of Student & Academic Services	Ms Susannah Marsden	6	Y	Y			
	Chairs of the Standing Committees of Senate: BoS in Arts & Soc Sciences	Professor Chris Greer	7	Y	Y			
	BoS in Business Studies	Professor Marianne Lewis	8	Y	A			
	BoS in Eng & Math Sci & Inf	Professor Roger Crouch	9	Y	Y			
	BoS in Health Sciences	Professor Debra Salmon	10	A	Y			
	BoS in Law	Professor Carl Stychin	11	Y	Y			
	BoS in Learning Development	Professor Susannah Quinsee	12	Y	Y			
	Academic Governance Cttee	Professor Richard Verrall	13	Y	Y			
	Research Ethics Committee	Professor Ron Douglas	14	A	Y			
	Collaborative Provision Committee	Professor Laurence Solkin	15	A	A			
	Dean of City Graduate School	Professor Ken Grattan	16	Y	Y			
Non Ex-Officio Staff	Elected members of academic staff to equal the number of ex-officio staff posts and to include at least two from each of the Board of Studies areas. Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 18)	Professor Giulia Iori	1	Y	A			
	Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 18)	Professor Jean Chalaby	2	Y	Y			
	Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 19)	Professor Mireia Jofre-Bonet	3	Y	A			
	Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)	Dr Rachel Cohen (Senior Elected Senator)	4	Y	Y			
	Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)	Dr Xeni Dassiou	5	Y	A			
	Business (to Jul 18)	Professor Charles Baden-Fuller	6	Y	Y			
	Business (to Jul 19)	Professor Anthony Neuberger	7	Y	Y			
	Business (to Jul 20)	Dr Elena Novelli	8	Y	A			
	Health Sciences (to Jul 20)	Dr Dave Flinton	9	Y	Y			
	Health Sciences (to Jul 20)	Dr Chris Flood	10	Y	Y			
	Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 19)	Dr Arti Agrawal	11	Y	N/M			
	Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 19)	Dr Anton Cox	12	Y	Y			
	Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 18)	Professor Abdulnaser Sayma	13	Y	Y			
	Law (to Jul 18)	Professor Susan Blake	14	A	Y			
	Law (to Jul 18)	Mr Keith Simpson	15	Y	Y			
	Law (to Jul 18)	Mr Sarwan Singh	16	Y	Y			
(b)	One additional elected member from the Visiting Staff	Vacancy		NM	NM			
(c) Students	A maximum of five students nominated by the Trustee Board one of whom should be the President of the Students Union. At least one from each of the following categories – undergraduate, postgraduate and research.	Ms Olesea Matchovshi, President	1	Y	Y			
		Mr Malek Arab, VP Education	2	Y	Y			
		Mr Zulkaif Riaz, VP Activities & Development	3	Y	A			
		Ms Aurora Herrera, Research Rep	4	Y	Y			
		Mr Andrew Tripoli, PGT Rep	5	Y	NM			

Key: Y =In Attendance   A= Apologies   S=On Sabbatical leave   N/M=Not a Member   EA=Extended Absence   AD = Apol/Deputy Sent

In Attendance	Role
Ms Louise Doolan	Director of Library Services
Ms Alison Edridge	Assistant Director (Quality And Academic Development)
Dame Lynne Brindley	Lay Member of Council
Dr Alexander Rhys	Development Co-ordinator TEF/Quality, Student & Academic Services
Dr William Jordan	College Secretary
Ms Gemma Watt	Governance Administrator

MINUTES SECTION A – OPEN FOR PUBLICATION

Part One – Preliminary Items

1.   Apologies and Preliminary Discussions
The Chair noted apologies from Senators and welcomed to the meeting Dame Lynne Brindley, lay member of Council and Dr Alexander Rhys, Development Co-ordinator TEF/Quality, who was attending for Item 19, Office for Students Consultation.

2.   Highlighted Items
No changes were requested to highlighted items.

3.   Minutes
The minutes of Meeting 281 held on 11thOctober 2017 were **approved**.

4.   Matters Arising
<u>Item 1, AOB, Research Fellows in the category of elected staff members of Senate</u>
Senate **noted** an update from the College Secretary regarding proposals for including Research Fellows in the category of staff members of Senate.

5.   Conflicts of Interest
None were noted.

6.   Terms of Reference and Governance Regulations
Senate **noted** the Terms of Reference and Governance Regulations.

7.   Items Specially Brought Forward by the Chair
7.1   Student Attendance and Engagement Policy
Senate **noted** Chair's Action taken to approve the Student Attendance and Engagement Policy to enable the implementation of the MAfS project. The proposed policy had been considered at the October meeting of Senate and BoS and Schools had been consulted on the Policy.

It was anticipated that the Policy would be effective for the 2018/19 academic year and a draft timetable and readiness assessment would be discussed at a future meeting of ExCo. Senate would receive a further update on the timetable and plans for implementation at the March meeting of Senate. **[Action]**

A Senate Regulation would be developed to support implementation of the Policy. There would be an opportunity to review the Policy again if issues arose that would impact on the successful implementation of the Policy.

<u>Decision</u>
Senate **confirmed approval** of the Policy.

7.2   Fitness to Study Policy
Senate **noted** Chair's Action taken with regard to the Fitness to Study Policy. Revised procedures had been approved to enable emergency action to be taken to suspend a student under the Disciplinary Regulation where there was an immediate safeguarding issue. Suspension decisions would require approval of the President and cases would then be channelled to the Fitness to Study process as appropriate. It was reported that a full review of the Fitness to Study Regulation was underway and would be scheduled for discussion at a future meeting of Senate. **[Action]**

7.3   Annual Assurance Statement to HEFCE
The Chair reported that Council had received the Assurance Report on Academic Quality and Standards at their November meeting and the annual assurance statement to HEFCE had been submitted.

8.   Senate Calendar
Senate **noted** the annual Senate calendar of business. The 'debate item' for the March meeting of Senate had not yet been confirmed and Senators were encouraged to contact the Governance Team with suggestions.

9.   Students' Union Standing Report
The Students' Union Standing Report was **noted** by Senate. The SU President reported the following issues:
- Work was underway to identify a new PG Taught Student Senator.
- The SU had recently amended their by-laws to allow for two postgraduate representatives on their Student Executive Committee.
- The Executive Team of the SU had been collaborating with staff in Student & Academic Services on SU priorities; free printing, lecture capture and welfare.
- The Autumn Leadership Elections had taken place and the SU now had a full Executive Committee.
- The SU had reached their KPI for the number of academic societies.
- A Wellbeing and Insight Coordinator had been appointed and would commence work in January 2018.
- The NSS had recently introduced the following question (Q26); *'The students' union (association or guild) effectively represents students' academic interests.'* It was reported that 56.1% of respondents agreed with the statement, putting the SU 92nd out of 146.
- There had been an increase in the number of programme reps recruited and an increase in programme rep attendance at both Student-Staff Liaison Committees and Student Experience Committees.

Part Two – Debate Item

10.   Peer Supported Review of Education
Senate **received** a presentation from the Chair of the BoS in LEaD on peer supported review of education. Peer review had been designed to be a supportive process, which encouraged dialogue and critical reflection. It was an important part of CPD and could expose staff to new ideas and the sharing of good practice. The Chair of the BoS in LEaD explained that it would be helpful to receive feedback from Senators on engaging staff with peer review, the monitoring of peer review and whether an institutionally driven themed approach to implementation would be helpful. In discussion the following points were made:
- Implementation of the policy, with the exception of Health Sciences, had been patchy in the first year of implementation.
- In Health Sciences the Associate Dean Education was responsible for monitoring peer review. It was also regularly discussed by the Executive Team and the Dean collaborated with HR as required.
- Implementation in other Boards of Studies area did not appear to have such clear leadership. The SASS Board of Studies was considering standardisation of approaches within the School following an audit which had shown a diversity of approaches.
- It might be helpful to consider whether the Learning and Teaching Committee could 'own' the Policy as this would give staff a forum for discussing related issues.
- Introducing themed approaches to Peer Reviews could risk losing its current focus on the individual and on development. However, within the themed

approach, the categories could also be broad and varied and could help individuals be reflective on specific areas.

- Monitoring whether peer review had taken place was sensible, but more monitoring than at present may be met with resistance. It was important for staff development to be the main focus of peer review.
- It would be important to develop a school specific communication to staff setting out the benefits and positive impact of peer review.
- Encouraging Schools to share the good practice coming out of peer reviews would be a helpful way of motivating staff to engage with peer review.

Part Three – Items for Approval

11. PSRB Policy

Senate **received** the PSRB Policy and Register template which had been refreshed to strengthen Senate oversight of PSRB activity. The revisions had been designed to enable enhanced reporting for the HEFCE Annual Provider Review and to respond to the updated Unistats requirements and recent internal audit recommendations. The updates to the reporting template captured conditions and recommendations from PSRB review activity, as well as good practice for dissemination.

Decision
Senate **approved** the Policy

12. Governance of Senate Sub-Committees

Senate **received** a report outlining proposals for the establishment of the Educational Quality Committee as a formal subcommittee of Senate. Senate had received initial proposals in July 2017, but the Terms of Reference and Membership had since been updated following feedback from Senate, Education and Student Committee and AGC. AGC discussed the proposals at their October meeting and agreed to recommend to Senate the establishment of the Educational Quality Committee.

The DP&P explained that the Education and Students Committee was currently advisory to the DP&P on quality matters and this was unusual in the sector. The proposed changes had been informed by the external report, *City, University of London Evaluation of Student Experience,* and the recommendation to establish a committee to provide oversight of formal quality matters would help Senate to provide direct assurance to Council.

In addition, it was reported that the learning and teaching aspects of the Education and Student Committee had also been revisited and terms for this Committee were currently being strengthened. This Committee would continue to report to ExCo.

In discussion the following points were made:
- When drafting the Senate Regulation for the Educational Quality Committee it would be helpful to revisit and strengthen the wording of objective one, in the proposed terms of reference.
- The development of proposals of learning and teaching issues by the DP&P and by the Executive required further development.

Decision
Senate **approved** the establishment of the Educational Quality Committee as a Sub-Committee of Senate.

13. Nominations for Chair's of Assessment Boards 2017/18

Senate **received** a report providing nominations for Chair's of Assessment Boards for 2017/18. It was noted that where there were inaccuracies in academic titles and departments these would be rectified and the revised paper would appear on the website. In addition, it was noted that the number of assessment boards was still very

high and this was a quality and standards issue. Schools were encouraged to reduce the numbers in future years.

Decision
Senate **approved** the nominations for Chair's of Assessment Boards.

14. **Nomination for the Chair of Senate Research Ethics Committee (SREC)**
Senate **received** the nomination of Professor Peter Ayton for the position of Chair of SREC, which had been recommended to Senate by AGC. AGC had considered and approved the process for selection, which had been more formal than in the past. Further process improvements would be introduced when the post next becomes vacant.

Decision
Senate **approved** the nomination of Professor Peter Ayton as Chair of SREC.

15. **Sabbatical Leave Policy for Academic Staff**
Senate **received** a report outlining revisions to the Sabbatical Leave Policy for Academic Staff. The Policy had been updated in light of recommendations outlined in the Internal Audit Report on Sabbaticals and previous discussions at AGC. The report had been discussed and endorsed by AGC at their October meeting.

Decision
Senate **approved** the Sabbatical Leave Policy for Academic Staff.

Part Four – Major Items for discussion (Research)

16.1 **Annual Research Quality Monitoring (ARQM) Exercise 2017**
Senate **considered** the ARQM report. Discussion of this report had been deferred by Senate until the ARQM gender analysis report had been completed. The headline news was that the proportion of total academic staff FTE with a Grade Point Average equal to or greater than 3 had increased from 42% to 48% by the end of 2026. In discussion the following points were raised:
- Although the ARQM had been devised as method of monitoring and reporting to Council on research quality in years when a REF was not conducted, it was important to note that there would be a a need to develop set of tactics for City's submission to the next REF. Today the ARQM is used for many purposes and is one of City's four academic KPIs.
- It would be helpful for Senate to schedule a review of the ARQM process to minimise duplications and overlaps with data collected in response to the changing nature of REF requirements. The College Secretary would check what arrangements had been suggested for this in the review of the ARQM process carried out by the previous VP(R&E). Senate would receive an update at its March meeting. **[Action]**

16.2 **ARQM Gender Analysis Report**
Senate **considered** a report on the gender analysis of ARQM 2017 results, including assessment of research outputs and the Grade Point Average. It was reported that this was the first year the data were being presented to Senate in this form and that the analysis would be repeated for each subsequent ARQM exercise. The VP(R&E) thanked Dr Claudia Kalay, Head of Research Support, for her considerable work on the paper. In discussion the following points were raised.
- When considering the data there would be a range of implications for Schools, but the paper was designed to provide analysis rather than a set of recommendations.
- The SES would discuss some of the figures included in the report further with the VP(R&E) and the Head of Research Support outside of the meeting. Senate would receive an update in due course. **[Action]**

- Colleagues in SASS had analysed the gender of sub-panels and found that women were underrepresented in SASS. Senate agreed that it would be helpful to receive a report on the composition of all the sub-panels at a future meeting of Senate. **[Action]**

17.   **Draft Research & Enterprise Strategy Action Plan**

Senate **discussed** the draft Research & Enterprise Strategy Action Plan, which had been updated in light of comments from colleagues across City. The VP(R&E) explained that comments on the action plan would feed in to the final version of the plan which would be considered by Senate in March. In discussion the following points were raised:

- The action plan should be read in conjunction with School Plans which showed that there was considerable variation between Schools in relation to resourcing the Action Plan. The costings and resource requirements would be considered further during the resource planning process. It would nonetheless be helpful for the plan to set out clearly where actions would be City wide, and where they were School-specific.
- Each School had an academic staff plan, as noted on page 3 of the Action Plan, to identify recruitment needs and increase the proportion of staff producing 3*/4* research outputs.
- Identifying academic staff on Education and Research role profiles who did not undertake research did not imply an exit policy for such staff. Rather, as noted in relation to action 4 on page 6 (academic performance management) training and support to produce research would be offered to such staff, or a transfer to an Education role profile. City would continue to engage with the Trade Unions on staffing matters that arose from this or other elements of the Action Plan.
- A greater sense of the top priorities would be helpful in the final draft of the Plan.
- Other areas that could helpfully be treated at greater length included: a discussion of how the ARQM interacted with REF preparations; City's work to join Doctoral Training Partnerships such as the AHRC; and a greater focus on the importance of research students to City.
- School approaches to PhD students would be a priority in the current planning round and Senate could expect to hear from the VP (R&E) in early 2018 the outcomes from his review into support for PhD students. **[Action]**
- Senators were invited to email the VP(R&E) with further comments relating to the Action Plan.

18.   **Conflict of Interest Policy**

Senate **noted** the Conflict of Interest Policy which was required for City's compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity. The policy reflected consideration of a draft plan by Schools and the Executive Team. In discussion the following points were raised:

- In relation to paragraph 6.2 it was not clear whether this related to past or present conflicts of interest.
- It was not clear that the example of an insignificant conflict of interest was in fact an example of an insignificant conflict of interest. The example should therefore be revisited before dissemination.
- Consideration should be given to how the Policy would be effectively communicated across City.
- It was likely that the Policy would be revisited in future to address broader issues pertaining to conflicts of interest, for example to include a discussion of issues relating to the authorship of a joint paper.
- When expanding on the Policy it might be useful to consider whether there should be a designated section or possibly a separate Policy that related specifically to students.

19. **Office for Students (OfS) Consultation**
    Senate **received** a report outlining the key issues contained in the OfS consultation paper. The paper had been circulated widely across City and comments received from colleagues would be used to feed in to City's formal response to the consultation. In discussion the following points were raised:
    - The OfS would be the first Regulator for English Higher Education from Easter 2018, when HEFCE would cease to exist.
    - The Regulator would clearly be independent of the sector, but it would be important to the sector and the public for the Regulator also to be independent of government.
    - In relation to the consultation question relating to GPA, there was some support for exploring alternative degree classification approaches, but it was noted that it would be important to consider the implications for teaching and the risks of moving away from the status quo. It was also noted that the UUK response was that the sector was not supportive of other classification approaches.
    - With regard to student contracts it was suggested that the introduction of such contracts might negatively change the nature of the relationship with the students and the student experience might become more transactional. The Student Charter and current terms and conditions provided sufficient safeguards for students: students who are unhappy with their course and their grading can contact their programme reps with their concerns.
    - In relation to value for money, the Student Senators reported that the focus on this could result in some groups of students feeling as though they were subsidising other students; and that this would be an unwelcome outcome.
    - With regard to reducing barriers for entry to new providers it was noted that rather than 'reducing' barriers the proposals were likely to be 'changing' barriers. Granting Degree Awarding Powers would require a high level of checks and it was not yet clear what these checks would be. Without appropriate checks there was a reputational risk to the sector.
    - In relation to student transfers it was noted that this could be disruptive for students and it would be important to consider the driver for this proposal.
    - With regard to the potential impact of the proposals on equality it would be important to consider whether mature students would be disadvantaged by the proposals and to consider the impact that plans for student transfers might have on international students.
    - A draft response to the consultation would be considered by ExCo on 18th December. Senators were encouraged to send any further comments to Dr Alex Rhys prior to this meeting. The Chair thanked Dr Rhys for his helpful summary of the consultation document.

20. **Vision and Strategy Educational KPI Meetings – Overview Report**
    Senate **noted** the Educational KPI Meetings report which provided a commentary on the meetings held with all undergraduate programme teams in relation to programme performance against the three institutional KPIs (satisfaction, progression and employability).

    The DP&P reported that he had recently met all undergraduate programme teams to discuss their initiatives and action plans that would support the educational KPIs. The paper provided a summary of good practice as well as support requirements that had been identified. A full set of notes from the meetings would be made available to Senators in due course. **[Action]**

21. Progression, Attainment, Satisfaction and Employability Monitoring Report

Senate **received** a student monitoring report which provided data on student progression, attainment, satisfaction and employability, broken down by student characteristics. Data for the last three academic years had been provided, with the exception of student satisfaction which were provided for 2017 only.

The report had been produced in response to a previous request from Senators and therefore this was the first time the data had been captured and presented in this way. Future work would include analysing prior attainment and reflecting on how the data could inform action planning. It was intended that for future years Senate would receive the student data, as well as a reflective report on actions previously identified and recommendations for the coming year.

22.1 Guidance on Research Students Who Teach Policy

Senate **considered** guidance notes which would accompany the Research Students who Teach policy. The guidance had been revised in response to actions agreed at the October meeting of Senate, as well as subsequent correspondence with the Senior Elected Senator regarding the definitions of teaching activity outlined in the guidance. In discussion the following points were made:

- The definitions of tutoring and one-to-one support overlapped and consideration should be given to removing tutoring from the guidance to provide more clarity.
- In the second paragraph on 'calculation of teaching activity hours', the sentence referring to 'feedback and assessment activity which solely takes place within scheduled sessions' should be removed. **[Action]**
- Schools were responsible for informing LEaD of any students due to teach. LEaD could then allocate students to the appropriate training programme.
- Consideration should be given to notifying Schools when students had completed the training.
- Senate would consider the policy, guidance notes, and summary report again in the Summer, when further data, including actual hours taught, were available **[Action]**

<u>**Decision**</u>

Senate **approved** the guidance, subject to points raised in discussion, noting that there would be an opportunity to further reflect on implementation of the policy once complete data relating to hours taught becomes available.

22.2 Research Students Who Teach – Analysis of Data

Senate **considered** the Research Students Who Teach Data Report. The paper summarised the number of research students engaged in teaching support roles in Academic Year 2017/18, and of those students, how many had received training. It was reported that there were several cases where policy had not been upheld, and these instances were being followed up with Schools individually.

Once Schools had provided further data on the actual numbers of students who had taught during the academic year Senate would have a fuller picture of how the policy was being implemented. In discussion the following points were raised:

- There were 36 students teaching in the Autumn Term (out of a total number teaching of 142) who had not undertaken training. 10 of these students had a start date for the training and 26 did not have a start date (18 in Cass, 8 in other Schools). The Assistant Registrar (Research Degrees) was liaising with Schools with regards to application/enrolment for the 26 students without a start date.
- It was therefore essential for Schools to contact LEaD, both now and in the future, with details of all students due to teach so that they could be allocated training. LEaD could hold places on training courses without names if necessary.

- There was no capacity issue in LEaD for training. All research students who teach should commence a training module before they taught.
- In instances where students had missed the opportunity to enrol on a training programme it might be useful to consider providing a teaching workshop. However, no accreditation would be associated with such workshops.
- The Dean of the Graduate School would work with colleagues in LEaD and Schools to further discuss engaging students on training programmes prior to teaching. **[Action]**

23.1 Taught Postgraduate Survey 2017 Report.

Senate **noted** the outcomes of the PTES 2017 survey. Following a period of improvement City's performance had been lower than that of other selected London institutions and on average was 3% worse in each section of the survey. This was disappointing. It was suggested by the Student Senators that the postgraduate community might feel overlooked following a strong focus on undergraduate programmes. The SU were currently working with programme reps to understand the issues affecting the postgraduate student community.

It was reported that programme plans for the postgraduate taught student experience would be considered at the next Education and Student Committee. Summary reports would also be considered by ExCo in due course.

23.2 Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) 2017 – Action Plan and Analysis

Senate **noted** the summary report of PRES results. The paper included an action plan which summarised the provisional institutional action plan for PRES 2017 which had been discussed by the City Graduate School Committee. It was reported that following Senate the paper would be sent to Boards of Studies for further consideration and comment. In discussion the following points were raised:
- The response rate of 41.3% was a significant improvement on the 2015 figure of 25.8%. However, City was below the sector average of 46%.
- It would be important to further consider the results for question 18 (overall satisfaction) which indicated that satisfaction decreased as students progressed.
- It would be helpful to have a breakdown of question 17 (teaching) responses by School to inform future discussion at the Graduate School Committee.
- City had underperformed in the areas of Research Culture and support for teaching.
- There were contractual issues relating to research students who teach that were yet to be resolved and this was affecting the mood in the postgraduate research student community.

24. Assessment Feedback Turnaround Times Spring 2016/17

Senate **considered** the report on the turnaround times for feedback given on assessment. The average compliance rate for all Schools was 93% in the spring term of the academic year 2016/17. Explanations were provided for 72% of late returns. There had been some improvement in turnaround times but it was still not at the required 100% and action at School level was required. Scores in Cass for undergraduate end of module feedback returns were 50%, which was down from 100%. It would be important to understand the impact this result would have on student expectations.

25 Overview of Assessment Boards 2016/17

Senate **considered** a report in relation to the maintenance of academic quality and standards. The report highlighted key themes, good practice, feedback from External Examiners and areas for improvement. In discussion it was noted that further consideration of the statical information to be provided to Assessment Boards would be required. The proposal was to put basic information standardise information in place

initially; and then to consider further what further intelligent interrogation of the data would be possible within Schools.

Senate **approved** the 11 recommendations in the report and the Action Plan which included work to improve City's oversight of module and student performance.

26   Feedback on Assessment Regulations (Regulation 19) 2016/17 and further action.
Senate **considered** a paper regarding feedback on the Assessment Regulations and **approved** the recommended actions contained in the paper. The proposals had been discussed at Education and Students Committee and had been made in response to feedback on the implementation of revised Regulations during 2016/17.   In discussion the following points were raised:

- The rationale for a proposed consultation with Schools on revisions to the Regulations to support student progression was set out in Appendix 1.
- Education and Student Committee had considered the possible removal of the clause that a mark of no more that 10% below the pass mark must be achieved for a module to be compensated. However, no change to the current Regulation was recommended due to the impact on standards of enabling students to fail a module at each stage of an UG programme without demonstrating any engagement with the module requirements.
- Further consideration (and consultation) would be given to the trailing of up to 15 credits for students with extenuating circumstances.
- Dr Cox would liaise with colleagues in Student and Academic Services on the possibility of changing the compensation rules to increase from 15 to 30, the units of credit that could be compensated. Senate would receive an update at a future meeting. **[Action]**
- Further consideration (and consultation) would be given to the option of offering a repeat year to a student who had failed a programme stage.

27.1   Board of Studies Minutes
Senate **noted** the minutes.

27.2   Reports from the Graduate School Committee, Education & Student Committee, Academic Governance Committee
Senate **noted** the minutes of the Committees.

Part Six – Other Items for Discussion

28.   Biannual Report on KPIs/PIs
Senate **considered** the report on KPIs/PIs which included progress at institutional level against the four Academic Output KPIs and fifteen supporting PIs which underpin the *Vision & Strategy 2026 (V&S26)*.

29.   External Examiner Appointments (Research Degrees) 2016/17
Senate **noted** the list of examiner appointments, made on behalf of Senate, for research degrees approved from June 2016 to October 2017. This included appointments for research students registered on a validated research degree programme.

Part Five – Items for Information

30.   Register of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)
The Register was **noted** by Senate.

31.   Current and Terminated Programmes
The programmes were **noted** by Senate.

32.   Internal Audit Report
Senate **received** the Internal Audit Report on Annual Programme Evaluation and Periodic Review.

33.   Student Surveys 2018
Senate **noted** the student survey arrangements for 2018.

34.   Annual Research Integrity Report to Council 2016/17
Senate **noted** the report.

35.   Minutes for Information
Senate **noted** the minutes from the following meetings:

35.1   Council

35.2.1 Academic Governance Committee
35.2.2 Senate Research Ethics Committee

35.3.1 Research & Enterprise Committee
35.3.2 Education and Student Committee
35.3.3 Graduate School Committee

36.   Honorary Visiting Professors
Senate **noted** the Honorary Visiting Professors appointed since its last meeting.

Part Six – Concluding Items

37.   Freedom of Information Review
No comments.

Date of Next Meeting
7th March 2018 from 2.00pm to 5.00pm

Professor Sir Paul Curran
President and Chair of Senate
October 2017

Note: **[Action]** = to be recorded in matters arising.