

**SENATE
MEETING 284 HELD ON 11th JULY 2018
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	Please see minutes of Meeting 283 Item 3	Y	Y	
	Deputy President & Provost	Professor David Bolton	2	Y	Y		Y	Y	
	Vice-Presidents	Professor Richard Verrall (Deputy Chair)	3	Y	Y		NM	NM	
		Professor Andrew Jones	4	Y	Y		Y	Y	
		Professor Stanton Newman (p/t)	5	A	A		NM	NM	
	Director of Student & Academic Services	Ms Susannah Marsden	6	Y	Y		Y	Y	
	Chairs of the Standing Committees of Senate:	BoS in Arts & Soc Sciences	Professor Chris Greer	7	Y		Y	Y	A
		BoS in Business Studies	Professor Marianne Lewis	8	Y		A	Y	Y
		BoS in Mathematics, Comp Sci & Eng.	Professor Roger Crouch	9	Y		Y	Y	Y
		BoS in Health Sciences	Professor Debra Salmon	10	A		Y	A	Y
		BoS in Law	Professor Carl Stychin	11	Y		Y	NM	NM
		BoS in Law (March 18-)	Professor Chris Ryan (Interim)	11	NM		NM	Y	Y
		BoS in Learning Development	Professor Susannah Quinsee	12	Y		Y	Y	Y
		Academic Governance Cttee	Professor Richard Verrall	13	Y		Y	Y	Y
		Research Ethics Committee	Professor Ron Douglas	14	A		Y	NM	NM
		Research Ethics Committee (Jan 18-)	Professor Peter Ayton	14	NM		NM	Y	Y
Collaborative Provision Committee	Professor Laurence Solkin	15	A	A	Y	Y			
Dean of City Graduate School	Professor Ken Grattan	16	Y	Y	Y	Y			
(b) 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	Y	Y	
		Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)	Professor Jean Chalaby	2	Y	Y	Y	A	
		Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 19)	Professor Mireia Jofre-Bonet	3	Y	A	Y	Y	
		Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)	Dr Rachel Cohen (Senior Elected Senator)	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 20)	Dr Xenii Dassiou	5	Y	A	Y	Y	
		Business (to Jul 18)	Professor Charles Baden-Fuller	6	Y	Y	S	Y	
		Business (to Jul 19)	Professor Anthony Neuberger	7	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		Business (to Jul 20)	Dr Elena Novelli	8	Y	A	Y	A	
		Health Sciences (to Jul 20)	Dr Dave Flinton	9	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		Health Sciences (to Jul 20)	Dr Chris Flood	10	Y	Y	A	Y	
		Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 19)	Dr Arti Agrawal	11	Y	NM	NM	NM	
		Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 19)	Dr Anton Cox	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 18)	Professor Abdalnaser Sayma	13	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		Law (to Jul 18)	Professor Susan Blake	14	A	Y	Y	Y	
		Law (to Jul 18)	Mr Keith Simpson	15	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		Law (to Jul 18)	Mr Sarwan Singh	16	Y	Y	Y	A	
(b)	One additional elected member from the Visiting Staff	Mr Liam Devine		NM	NM	Y	Y		
(c) Sstudents	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	Y	NM		
		Ms Kristina Perelygina, President (July 2018 -)	1	N/M	N/M	N/M	Y		
		Mr Malek Arab, VP Education	2	Y	Y	Y	NM		
		Ms Tuna Kunt, VP President (July 2018 -)	2	N/M	N/M	N/M	Y		
		Mr Zulkaf Riaz, VP Activities & Development	3	Y	A	A	NM		
		Ms Nazia Bharde, VP Activities... (July 2018 -)	3	N/M	N/M	N/M	Y		
		Ms Aurora Herrera, Research Student Rep	4	Y	Y	A	NM		
		Mr Andrew Tripoli, PGT Rep	5	Y	NM	NM	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 Helen Fitch	Assistant Registrar (Quality)
Ms Hunada Nous	Lay member of Council
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 Ms Hunada Nous, Lay Member of Council and Students' Union Sabbatical Officers; President Kristina Perelygina, Vice President Activities & Development Nazia Bharde and Vice President Education Tuna Kunt.

2. **Highlighted Items**

Senate agreed to 'un-star' item 23; Graduate School Videoconferencing Guidance. This item was not ready for consideration by Senate.

3. **Minutes**

The minutes of Meeting 283 held on 16th May 2018 were approved.

4. **Matters Arising**

4.1. Item 10 / 26 - Industrial Action Quality and Standards Working Group Update

Senate **received** an update from the DP&P about the activity of the Industrial Action Quality and Standards Group. The DP&P noted that further formal complaints were expected over the summer and into the Autumn Term. A more detailed report would be provided to Senate in October. In discussion the following points were raised:

- Guidance notes had been provided to Senators, as requested at the May meeting of Senate.
- All members of a cohort affected by industrial action would be treated in the same way by the Working Group, when a complaint was made by any member of the cohort.
- The Working Group would note and consider the possibility that if lecture capture was used to mitigate the impact of recent industrial action, some lecturers would be less willing to agree to lecture capture in future.

4.2. Item 21 - Student Attendance and Engagement Policy

Senate **received** an update from the DP&P on plans for the implementation of the Taught Student Engagement and Attendance Monitoring Policy across Schools in 2018/19. The Policy would be implemented in the 2018/19 academic year, but as discussions with Schools were still taking place there would be further modifications to the way forward set out in the paper. In discussion the following points were raised:

- The use of IT software in implementing the Policy would be piloted in Music and Law. Departments not involved in the pilot exercise would implement the Policy using alternative methods.
- When reviewing the guidance it would be important to consider workload implications for staff members.
- Senate would receive a revised implementation document in due course; including a summary of implementation methods in all Schools. **[Action]**

4.3. Item 27 - Innovation Refurbishment and Decant Arrangements Paper – implications for Teaching and Research

Senate **considered** a paper outlining the AGC recommendation for no change to the wording of Regulation 29; Senate's Role in Major Change Projects. The College Secretary noted that in relation to the wording of Regulation 29, AGC had agreed, following consideration and discussion, that the current wording was clear and so did not require amendment. The College Secretary also noted that the Executive Team had agreed that Project Boards relating to estate changes should have representation from colleagues in S&AS so that quality and standards issues could be integrated into

the development of projects; and that a S&AS representative would be appointed to the Sebastian Street Project Board as soon as possible

Senate also **considered** a note circulated to Senators addressing quality and standards issues raised at the 16th May meeting of Senate.

In discussion the following points were raised:

- Personal Tutoring space and student accessibility issues were of concern for staff in the School of Law. Induction week would see a spike in the number of personal tutorials taking place and this underlined the need for a speedy resolution to the concerns raised.
- It would also be important to understand how research would be supported if the space allocated to staff was considered unsuitable. Noise issues, IT provisions and work space arrangements, including working from home proposals, should all be considered further prior to the proposed move.
- The impact on the student experience was also a cause for concern. NSS results, and hence future recruitment, could be adversely affected.
- The Director of Library Services reported that when taking into account all the proposed changes there would be an increase in the number of available study spaces for students who currently used the CIC building.
- The Saddlers Common Room, an area which had been used by some PhD students as a common room, would not be available to all PhD students during refurbishment of the CIC building. Its use over this period would be to provide study spaces for PhD students displaced from the CIC building.
- Other areas were now available for use by students to compensate for this temporary use of the Saddlers Common Room included the Tait Common Room for staff and PhD students.
- It would be important to communicate to students early in the academic year the changes to arrangements and to make them aware of alternative spaces available to them.
- With an increase in the number of Law students it would also be important to assess the impact of the Law library's move to the Pool.
- Senate would receive a further report which would include an update on the following concerns; plans for personal tutoring, plans for supporting research and study space arrangements for students. **[Action]**

4.4 Other matters arising not included on the agenda.

The College Secretary **noted** that items listed on the matters arising relating to the implementation of the Research Students Who Teach Policy would remain on the matters arising until the relevant report was finalised. [See minute 13]

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 TEF Update.

Senate **received** an update on TEF, noting the Department for Education's (DfE) plans for the expansion of TEF to subject-level in 2019/20. Senators were reminded that the information contained in the report had not been widely circulated at this stage and the document should be considered confidential. In discussion the following points were raised:

- The anticipated level of City's performance in subject-level TEF as set out in the paper reflected weakness in City's performance on key TEF metrics.

- One factor reflected in the Table was the comparative employability of City's students. This might in part reflect the percentage of students at City awarded First and Upper Second Class since many employers now required Upper Second Class degrees or better. City had historically resisted grade inflation, however, unlike some comparator institutions, and it was unlikely that City would now wish to make any change to its current practices, not least as OfS was currently conducting a review of grade inflation (expected to lead to fines for some HEIs). Any change might in any case conflict with Senate's responsibility to maintain City's academic standards.
- Another critical factor in the Table was City's low measured rates of progression. Action to tackle City's low rates of progression had been discussed on several occasions at Senate. That action had included a review both of City's Assessment Regulations, which were generally similar to those of other HEIs, and of City's assessment strategies, where Schools had made a number of changes that might pay dividends in terms of improving performance.
- The Board of Studies in SCMSE had noted at a recent meeting that some comparator institutions permitted full year repeats without extenuating circumstances. The SMCSE Board of Studies believed that allowing this at City, would improve progression rates. When the matter was last considered by Senate, however, there had been no appetite for change. This had also been the conclusion, seen by Senate, of a consultation on this matter across City. Moreover, it was unclear whether such a change would improve recorded rates of progression at City.
- Undertaking benchmarking exercises that showed how City compared to other HEIs would in future be helpful when seeking Senate and BoS input on proposed Regulation changes. S&AS had completed such comparison exercises in the past, and would continue to do so in future, subject to the availability of the necessary resources.

7.2 Senate Election Results

Senate **noted** the results of the 2018/19 Senate election. The College Secretary explained that Senators had received the full election results via email correspondence.

7.3 Approval of Three New Interdisciplinary Centres

Senate **noted** that the following three Interdisciplinary Centres had been approved by email correspondence in June 2018; Health and Innovation IDC, Data Science IDC and Gender and Sexuality IDC.

7.4 There were none.

8. Senate Calendar

Senate **noted** the annual Senate calendar of business. The 'debate' items for 2018/19 had not been determined at this stage and suggestions from Senators would be welcomed. It was noted that the Graduate School Review would be an appropriate topic for debate at the next meeting. **[Action]**

9. Students' Union Standing Report

The Students' Union Standing Report was **noted** by Senate. The SU President explained that core priorities for the next academic year would include building a strong student community, improving representation of postgraduate and international students, developing future student wellbeing campaigns and continuing to improve collaboration with programme representatives.

10. REF2021

Senate **received** a report and presentation from the VP (R&E) on plans for the REF2021. Topics included Vision & Strategy 2026, Key changes since REF 2014, tactical implications for City and City's Preparations and timetable. He explained that REF2021 would reward 4* publications to a greater extent and it was important to consider how the creation of such research would be supported. In addition, there would be an increased role for impact and greater focus on interdisciplinary work. In discussion the following points were raised:

- Research outputs must now be open access. All academic staff were required to include their research outputs on City Research Online, the local open access repository.
- A Strategy Group had convened and work was taking place to model City's position for potential units of assessment. The group, which included REF panel members, was well positioned to advise on City's strategic approach.
- A final set of rules in relation to REF2021 would be made available at the end of year following the Research England Consultation on REF2021.
- A full mock REF exercise would take place in 2019.
- Owing to the changes in REF rules it would be difficult to assess in advance the impact of City's strengthened research on rankings.
- It was within City's wider strategy to increase the number of 4* publications. However, implementation would be complex and would be dependent on context and individual discipline.
- To gain 4* impact it was not necessary to also have 4* output and for some disciplines it would be difficult to have both 4* impact and 4* output.
- The process for selecting among our large number of 3* research outputs for submission required further consideration.

Part Three – Major Items for Discussion

11. Review of Support for PhD Students

Senate **considered** a report from an external consultancy which provided a sector benchmarking analysis of City's existing provision centred on the City Graduate School.

The VP (R&E) explained that it did not represent the final report of the Review group but would be used to inform the report. The report was compiled using both internal and external research, however, some inaccuracies and misunderstandings about City had been included in the report and a note had been tabled that addressed key inaccuracies.

The paper did not cover a range of issues that were also within the scope of the review (for example, PhD completion rates, City's PGR student policies) and Senate would have the opportunity to comment on these matters when Senate revisit the review in the Autumn Term.

The VP (R&E) explained that Senator input was welcomed during this early stage of review and comments raised would help feed into the final report. In discussion the following points were raised:

- It would be important to consider how City could provide the core Graduate School functions found at other universities and the implications for student recruitment and attracting funding if City were unable to offer comparable functions.
- The figures on support staff required further review. It would be important to have accurate figures in the final report.
- The report highlighted inconsistencies across Schools and currently there were not enough resources in the Graduate School to address the challenges.

- It would be helpful to include in the final report plans for doctoral training centres, research grants and REF Strategy.
- When completing funding council applications that involved funding for doctoral students there were questions which staff could not answer, e.g. Athena SWAN related questions and questions regarding policies that needed to be in place to be eligible to take part. Such challenges were a barrier to staff wishing to make applications.
- Several policies would be revisited as part of the review and Senate would be provided with recommendations for consideration, along with a proposed programme of work. A further report would be received by Senate in October 2018. **[Action]**

12. **Module Evaluation Process Review**

Senate **considered** the report which included key findings of the module evaluation process review and an ExCo approved action plan. The DP&P explained that Schools, students and staff were consulted during the review process and the document was coming to Senate as recommended by the Educational Quality Committee and ExCo. Senate approval was not currently being sought, however, input from Senate was welcomed at this early stage of the review. In discussion the following points were raised:

- Many of the recommendations were contingent on clarification of the following two recommendations; Recommendation 1 - 'develop a Module Evaluation Policy to provide clarity on the purpose and approach' and Recommendation 2 - 'clarity on parameters to be used for module evaluation'.
- The primary purposes of module evaluation needed to be determined and there would be an opportunity to revisit the other recommendations once recommendations 1 and 2 had been clarified.
- Further discussions with Associate Deans (Education) were due to take place over the summer and EQC would be considering the review once more in early 2018/19. A draft Policy would be one of the first proposals to be taken forward next academic year.
- Module evaluations were sensitive and the impact on academics who taught modules with multiple academics should be given due consideration. If the evaluation was to be multi-purpose students should be informed of how the data would be used.
- In relation to Recommendation 4; 'implement online surveys...' it was noted that staff and students had urged S&AS in consultation to look into increasing the use of online surveys. But there was a possibility that the number of responses and the quality of the data would be reduced; and arrangements that worked well for Cass postgraduate groups might not work well for students more generally. The SU reported that students felt strongly about online evaluations and offered to assist with any initiatives for bringing online evaluations to students.

13. **Research Students Who Teach Policy Implementation**

Senate **considered** the report on the implementation of the Research Students Who Teach Policy. The report provided a brief summary of postgraduate research students who had been engaged in teaching and teaching-support roles (e.g. seminar teaching, lab demonstrating, marking) in the Academic Year 2017/18.

The Dean of the Graduate School explained that the data were incomplete and Senate would receive a further report in the Autumn Term once the missing information had been received from Schools. Chairs of Boards of Studies were asked to encourage data providers in their Schools to provide the missing information to the Graduate School to enable the report to be finalised. It was anticipated that a centralised system for recording teaching would be adopted for future years which would reduce the reliance on multiple sources to obtain the data.

Part Four – Items for Approval

14. Proposed Amendments to Regulation 10 - Fitness to Study Regulation and Policy

Senate **received** proposed amendments to Regulation 10; Fitness to Study Regulation and its associated Policy. The DP&P explained that feedback from Schools, Student Services, Student & Academic Services, Boards of Studies, Academic Governance Committee and Educational Quality Committee had been reflected on when bringing forward the proposed amendments to Senate. In discussion the following points were raised:

- The Regulation would be re-drafted to include details of the Students' Union Advice Service. **[Action]**
- Appendix 2, which provided an example 'Risk Assessment Report' was not a 'traditional' risk assessment. It would be important to check whether there was a compliance rationale for naming the form a 'risk assessment'; and if not, consideration should be given to renaming the appendix. **[Action]**

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed amendments, subject to the resolution of the above two considerations.

15. Proposed Amendments to Regulation 13 -Student Disciplinary Regulation

Senate **considered** proposed changes to Regulation 13, Student Discipline. The DP&P explained that the changes brought the Regulation into line with City's current Terms & Conditions, better reflected interactions with other City policy and aligned the Regulation with the City guidance on terminology. The revisions had been considered and recommended to Senate by AGC and EQC.

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed amendments.

16.1 Proposed Amendments to Regulation 19 – Assessment Regulations

Senate **considered** proposed changes to Regulation 19, Assessment Regulations. The DP&P explained that Boards of Studies and the Students' Union had been consulted on two proposals that had arisen from feedback received on the implementation of the 2016/17 approved Regulation. The first revision related to section 4.7 Failure of a Module and involved broadening the offer of trailing a limited amount of resit assessment to students who had approved Extenuating Circumstances at any point during the academic year. The second revision was a minor change to align the Academic Misconduct Panel membership with Appendix 2 of the Regulation. The proposed changes had previously been scrutinised by AGC and EQC who had recommended the changes to Senate. In discussion the following points were raised:

- Current arrangement for trailing 15 credits may not benefit students studying certain postgraduate and Law courses where there were several 30 credit modules. There was a risk to progression if a student failed a module.
- The 30 credit module adopted for postgraduate courses reflected the one-year length of the degree.
- In Law, there were plans to adopt 15 credit modules. Trailing 15 credits for an undergraduate in Law was feasible, but not training 30 credits.
- Currently Schools varied on their stance regarding progressing to dissertation.
- There was a 20 credit system in operation in Engineering and it was possible for exceptions to be approved in this area.

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed revisions.

16.2 Proposed Amendments to Regulation 19 - Programme Regulations

Senate **considered** proposed revisions to the Regulation 19 Appendices. The Appendices included proposed variations for individual modules and programmes. In discussion the following points were raised:

- The differences across Schools were a cause for concern. It was noted that the differences were largely historical but that it might be difficult to now standardise arrangements in the short term. If Senate were to request standardisation Schools would require clarity about when this would become effective.
- In relation to Appendix 1.1 it was reported that Cass students were not permitted resits at Programme Stage 3. Compared with other Schools there was arguably not the same opportunity to progress. The Chair of the BoS in Business reported that she would discuss the matter further with colleagues in Cass. In addition, a brief report outlining the impact on cohorts in Cass for the past five years would be shared with Senate. **[Action]**
- Senate agreed to approve the changes for 2018/19 on the understanding that a clear rationale would be presented when Senate next considered the matter in 2018/19. The Chair of the BoS in SMCSE and the Chair of the BoS in Business would review their School's arrangements over the year in anticipation of the paper being brought back to Senate for consideration in July 2019. **[Action]**

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed revisions subject to a rationale accompanying the paper in 2018/19.

17. University Admissions Policy: Complaints and Appeals Procedure

Senate considered proposed amendments to the complaints and appeals procedure, as outlined in the University Admissions Policy. The revisions related to the process applicants should follow across undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes, should they wish to complain about the way in which their application was managed and/or appeal the decision on their application. The DP&P explained that the changes were part of a wider piece of work on updating policies and processes to support a university-wide admissions policy, which would be scheduled for discussion at a future meeting of Senate.

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed revisions to the complaints and appeals section of the University Admissions Policy.

18. Proposed Amendments to Regulation 5D

Senate **noted** the establishment of a new City Learning and Teaching Committee (CLTC) which would report to the revised Education & Student Committee. In addition, Senate **considered** revised Terms of Reference for School Learning and Teaching Committees which had been updated to include an additional reporting line to the new CLTC. The School Learning and Teaching Committees would continue to also report to BoS.

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed revisions to Regulation 5D.

19. Student Records Management Policy and Retention Schedule

Senate **considered** the Student Records Management Policy and Retention Schedule. The Policy had been devised following an Internal Audit recommendation that identified a need for a policy and guidance on data retention of student records. It

was important for this information to be made available to all staff. In discussion the following points were raised:

- The Policy should be considered a 'living document' and would be subject to ongoing review as required.
- The Policy was central to the process of reporting to OfS and HESA.
- The Policy focussed on core student records. Colleagues in S&AS would liaise with the Head of Information Assurance on whether it would be possible for future iterations of the policy or guidance to include information on data about students that staff shouldn't be keeping on an individual basis. **[Action]**

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed revisions.

20. Staff Eligible to Sit on Stage 2 Appeal & Disciplinary Panels

Senate **considered** the list of staff nominated by their Deans to sit on final stage institutional panels (considering student appeal, disciplinary and Fitness to Study cases). In discussion the following points were raised:

- The number of staff nominated in the report who had not received training was disappointing. It was likely, however, that some staff had been trained at other Universities, and where the training was comparable to City's training this would be considered acceptable.
- Currently Deans of Schools nominated individuals and encouraged them to undertake the training. Training dates should be made available to Deans and Department Heads so they can actively encourage staff to undertake the training at appropriate times.
- In addition to offering training for those not yet trained it would be helpful to offer refresher sessions. Future reports should include a column outlining when training had taken place - although it may not be possible to include backdated information due to the lack of accurate historical records. **[Action]**
- Senate could emphasise the importance of training by prescribing that a panel should not be convened if there was a lack of trained panel members.
- It may be helpful to broaden the pool of staff nominated by Deans to sit on the panels, as there was a risk of increasingly drawing on the same people each year.

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed revisions subject to the provision of appropriate training for panel members.

21. Professor Emeritus Nomination

Senate **considered** the nomination and approved the recommendation for the award.

Part Five – Committee Reports

22 Reports from Sub-Committees and Executive Advisory Committees

22.1 Board of Studies Minutes

Senate **noted** the minutes.

22.2 Reports from the Graduate School Committee, Educational Quality Committee, Academic Governance Committee

Senate **noted** the minutes of the Committees. The VP (R&E) noted that the Research & Enterprise Committee minutes would be circulated to Senate in due course.

23. City Graduate School Committee – Videoconferencing Guidance

Senate **deferred** this item.

- 24. Progress Report on Education & Student Strategy**
Senate **considered** the report, which included an update on the redevelopment of the Education & Student Strategy, the implementation plan for 2018-19 and next steps.
- 25. Student Survey Activity**
Senate **noted** the Student Survey Activity report. The report outlined survey response rates and participation for the 'Your Voice, Our Action' campaign. In discussion the following points were raised:
- Given the importance OfS placed on NSS results, it would be important to improve response rates for student surveys.
 - The timing of the NSS might have made it more likely for City to be negatively impacted by the Industrial Action. But it was noted that different departments would be affected in different ways and an overall institutional assessment of the impact would not be possible.
- 26. Assessment Feedback Turnaround Times - Autumn Report**
Senate **considered** the bi-annual Assessment Feedback Turnaround Times Report containing information on the compliance of Schools with the Assessment Feedback Turnaround Times Policy in term one of the academic year 2017/8 up to and including the Examination Period of Autumn 2017/8. The DP&P explained that the average compliance rate for all Schools was 89%, a 6% drop on the same period in 2016/17. In addition, it was noted that some of the reasons supplied for non-compliance were counter to policy and would require addressing and would be taken forward by ExCo.
- 27. APE Summary Report: Postgraduate Research**
Senate **considered** the APE Summary Report for Postgraduate Research. The report focussed on best practice and issues for institutional action raised in the individual reports. Actions identified at programme level that required institutional action would be discussed at Graduate School Committee and/or Education Quality Committee/Senate, as appropriate. The Dean of the Graduate School encouraged Schools to share good practice with colleagues, for example, through local Research Committees.

Part Six – Items for Information

- 28. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Applications**
Senate **noted** the report.
- 29. Programme Approval Schedule**
Senate **noted** the report.
- 30. Report on Student Case Activity (Appeals, Complaints, Disciplinary) in 2017**
Senate **noted** the report.
- 31. Office for Students (OfS) Application**
Senate **noted** the report.
- 32. Minutes for Information**
Senate **noted** the minutes from the following meetings:
- 32.1 Council**
 - 32.2.1 Academic Governance Committee**
 - 32.2.2 Senate Research Ethics Committee**
 - 32.2.3 Education and Student Committee**
 - 32.3.1 Graduate School Committee**
- 33. Interdisciplinary Centres**

34. Honorary Visiting Professors

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

Part Seven – Concluding Items

24. Freedom of Information Review

No comments.

25. Any Other Business

The Chair thanked the following members of Senate for their contribution to Senate during their tenure as Senators: Professor Richard Verrall, Deputy Chair of Senate & Chair of AGC, Professor Giulia Iori, elected Senator and member of AGC, Professor Abdunaser Sayma, elected Senator and Mr Sarwan Singh, elected Senator.

26. Date of Next Meeting

17th October 2018 from 2.00pm to 5.00pm

Professor Sir Paul Curran
President and Chair of Senate
July 2018

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