

Senate

26/01 A meeting of the Senate was held at 2.15 pm on Wednesday 25 February 2026 via Teams.

Present:

Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
Oceiah Annesley
Dr Mona Ashok
Dr Simon Clarke
Laura Clayton
Dr Emma-Jayne Conway
Pam Cottrell
Dr Chris Daw
Professor Richard Frazier
Professor Becky Green
Professor Louise Hague
Dr Craig Hughes
Martina Hudson
Professor Yelena Kalyuzhnova
Dr Stephen Kastoryano
Professor Gunter Kuhnle
Jackie Liu
Dr Shu-Ling Lu
Professor Elizabeth McCrum
Dr Kieran Lee Marshall
Professor Sarah Marston
Professor Peter Miskell
Dr Rachael Neal
Sara Pawar
Dr Karen Poulter
Professor Trish Reid
Dr Karenjit Sandhu
Tamir Sharif
Dr Sokratis Stergiadis
Professor Katja Strohfeldt
Elyn Thompson
Professor Van de Noort
Professor Anne Verhoef
Vin Wijeratne
Professor Adrian Williams
Ella Withington
Aaron Woodcock
Professor Parveen Yaqoob
Professor Dominik Zaum
Louise Sharman (Secretary)

In attendance:

Fiona Blair and Vicky Pearson (External Relations) for Minute 26/03

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed members to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor outlined the format of the meeting to Senators encouraging them to raise any additional items for discussion under the Vice-Chancellor's report.

The Vice-Chancellor paid tribute to the following who had died since the last meeting of the Senate:

Mr Philip (Phil) Taylor who was a long-standing member of the reactive maintenance team in Estates. Phil had worked at the University since 1989 before moving to Greenlands campus in 2014.

Andrew Wilbey – former Food and Nutritional Sciences lecturer and active member of the Senior Common Room. Andrew joined the University in 1983 and retired from lecturing in 2011 but remained heavily involved in the University's activities.

Emeritus Professor Giulio Lepschy – Giulio joined the University of Reading in 1964 as Lecturer in Italian, was appointed Professor of Italian in 1975 until his retirement in 1997.

26/02 Minutes of the last meeting

The Senate approved Minutes 25/39 to 25/58 of the last formal meeting held on 5 November 2025. All relevant matters had been passed in full to the Council at its meeting on 19 November 2025.

Items for Presentation and discussion

26/03 University Strategy Presentation

The Senate received a presentation from the Chief Operating Officer and Director of External Relations on the University Strategy – Vision 2040. The Senate noted that Council were exercising their responsibilities in leading the refresh of the University Strategy. Council had agreed that the University Strategy should set out a long-term vision to 2040 with the aim that the University would achieve global parity with a top 100 university as measured by the QS.

The presentation highlighted to Senate:

- The strategy would be undertaken in three phases:
 - Phase 1 from 2026 to 2030 – a fully developed institutional Strategic Plan with supporting KPIs and thematic plans; aimed at delivering against objectives for the period whilst maintaining an eye on the University's ambitions for the longer-term build on current initiatives, strengthen brand and reputation, and achieve a financial surplus from operating activities; early stages would include implementation work, action plans and alignment
 - Phase 2 from 2030 to 2035 – Deepen global presence, research impact and operational agility; build on changes from Phase 1 with a focus on global, academic and employer reputation building; integrate environmental sustainability; strengthen research breadth and global reputation via a strong regional presence

- Phase 3 from 2035 to 2040 – achieve global parity with top-ranked institutions and assess structural changes needed for long-term competitiveness; consolidate global positioning and visibility, strengthen global research network
- Only by taking a long-term approach could the University change meaningfully whilst addressing short-term issues. An incremental approach would identify significant long-term changes and required investment, in parallel with shorter term objectives for each strategic phase
- The Road Map – Council had approved the approach to Vision and Strategy in November 2025
- Initial engagement had taken place with the Council and Senior Leadership Group. The period from January to April 2026 would involve targeted internal and external engagement designed to further inform and iterate attributes, KPIs and implementation. It was intended that a draft proposal would be submitted to the Senate in June 2026 ahead of final sign-off by the Council in September 2026
- The proposed attributes were: Community, Excellence, Environmental Sustainability, Civic University all underpinned by financial sustainability
- Engagement Plan - both internal and external engagement were being developed:
 - The aim was to reduce duplication and survey fatigue by building on extensive internal feedback from previous strategy consultation (2019), staff survey (2025) and from brand review work (2025-26)
 - Other targeted methods of engagement with colleagues:
 - Via leadership structures: Senior Leadership Group, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellors
 - Heads of School/Directorate led sessions to obtain contextual feedback
 - Targeted focus groups and drop-ins
 - The 2019 strategy development had involved some limited external engagement; this would be more extensive this time
 - The University would engage across the full range of University activity, including:
 - Employer and sector bodies
 - Civic leaders and community groups
 - Policy orgs and funders
 - Key University partners
 - Education sector groups
 - International partners
- Scope of Engagement:
 - Council had already determined: Vision, Strategic principles and attributes
 - Open for engagement:
 - Necessary enablers
 - Localised implications (internal)
 - Impact on relationship building/engagement
 - Impact on interdisciplinarity/collaboration
 - The focus was on how to create a 'golden thread' from the strategy to on-the-ground activity
- Having the opportunity to refresh brand alongside the strategy was key – often these were undertaken as two separate activities

- The brand work was not starting from scratch; the University already had a strong brand resonance. The brand proposition needed to be honed so that the University could stand out more in an increasingly competitive environment
- Redefining brand proposition to become first choice:
 - Developing an authentic, stand-out brand proposition is key to achieving strategic ambitions and competing on the world stage
 - A values-driven approach and commitment to environmental sustainability has traction and become a key part of the Reading story, especially in the UK
 - Gen Z/A are values-driven, but perceive that they struggle to reconcile their values with the choices they face, about their education, career and future?
 - Our challenge is to build on our foundations and hone our proposition (not just for students) in a credible, distinctive and motivating way that, showing how Reading can address the dilemma.
- Brand project – phases and progress
 - Phase 1: Research, creative development and testing (Sept '25-June '26)
 - Internal research (complete)
 - External research (aligned to strategy engagement)
 - Brand creative development (tender live to appoint creative agency)
 - Market testing (UG/PG, UK and Int)
 - Phase 2: Campaign Development and Asset Production (Jun-Aug '26) - Brand campaign ideation and exploration; Brand asset definition and creation
 - Phase 3: Implementation and activation (Sept '26-Sept 2031) - Planning and delivery of a multi-channel/multi-audience/multi-market and multi-year media brand campaign in the UK and in key markets around the world.

The following comments and questions were raised by the Senate:

- Colleagues across the University were involved in a huge number of projects that were rarely visible, or perhaps quite niche – what could be done to capture these and make them more impactful?
The Chief Operating Officer noted that it was an aim from a project perspective to identify all projects taking place across the institution so that they could be put into a searchable database. The golden thread from the strategy to activity on the ground was key – showing good practice on the ground and how colleagues could deliver strategic objectives every day, wherever in the world the University operated.
The third phase of the strategy would look to show/evidence/tell a story in an authentic way – it was intended that a website would share stories that evidenced the strategy narrative
- How would the strategy ensure parity with academic standards across the globe?
- Had colleagues spoken with Schools/Departments to understand what activities were taking place as well as to identify key stakeholders to engage with?
It was intended that following the Senior Leadership Group that Schools and Departments would have mechanisms to engage within their own areas; this would be in addition to thematic engagement across teaching and learning, research, and global engagement. These would form part of a long-term engagement plan
- Had the last brand proposition been reviewed, was it effective, was it successful, how was it evaluated?

The Director of External Relations confirmed that the brand was evaluated in 2019, with follow up brand perception work in 2021. It was always intended to repeat the exercise but that had been limited by the pandemic. It was hoped that the University could get into a pattern of regular pulse surveys with measures, so that progress over time could be measured. Despite a challenging student recruitment market, the University's campaigns had performed well against sector benchmarks

- The Vice-Chancellor asked the Senate whether they supported the direction of travel to have the attributes of a top 100 university
- It was noted that many of the top 100 universities were full-service institutions providing all of the traditional academic subjects – how did that align with the University's approach of focussing on a few key areas of strength? The environment and sustainability were a selling point (along with a few others) and could push us higher, but nonetheless should the University stay broad, in the image of other leading institutions

It was the intention to remain as a broad-based institution, but one that was known for specific disciplines – different scenarios would be developed to help accelerate the University towards the attributes of a top 100 university. This work would look at what a top 100 would look like for this University

- There was support for the Strategy, but it was noted that it would need a lot of work on the action plan and some resourcing to achieve what was set out
- Heads of School would be keen to lead a session within their Schools – highlighting the golden thread was a good idea
- Consistency and continuity were hugely important – when the University of Reading came to mind certain consistent principles should resonate with the individual

The Senate thanked Laura Clayton, Fiona Blair and Vicky Pearson for the presentation. The Senate noted that there would be more opportunity for colleagues to be involved in focus groups and through their Schools.

26/04 Finishing the URS Refurbishment

The Vice-Chancellor informed the Senate that as part of the University's phase 1 agreement, agreed in 2020, all new proposals in excess of £10M would be discussed at the Senate, as well as with UCU and the Staff Forum. This was part of the University's commitment to be transparent around large capital projects. The Senate's comments would then be passed to the Council so that they were fully aware of colleague's opinions.

The Senate received a presentation on the URS Refurbishment from the Chief Operating Officer Laura Clayton and Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Elizabeth McCrum for its comment ahead of submission to the Council on 9 March 2026.

It was noted that URS was one of the most important buildings not just on campus, but in the region — a nationally recognised, Grade II listed modernist landmark. Refurbishment of URS presented the University with a pivotal opportunity to not just enhance the Whiteknights campus but also create a cutting-edge centre for learning.

It was the University's vision that URS would become the flagship academic building of the 2020s — a distinctive, accessible, sustainability led space that embodied the University's ambition to adopt the

attributes of a world top 100 university. It would be a place where students learn, collaborate and belong; where staff worked in modern, flexible environments; and where the University demonstrated leadership in heritage preservation and low-carbon transformation.

The strategic importance of this refurbishment was set out in the Estate Strategy, re-approved by University Council in June 2025, and the business case set out in the strategy remained valid. In practical terms there was a critical need to vacate the Chancellor's Building whilst ensuring appropriate provision of suitable teaching and learning facilities. True to the University's sustainability commitment, the project also took one of the University's least efficient buildings and would turn it into one of the greenest buildings on campus — a visible, measurable commitment to sustainability leadership.

The refurbishment would unlock consolidation, improve estate utilisation, reduce operational costs, and enable strategic sequencing for the wider estate transformation. Indeed, it was integral to the sequencing of the academic portfolio through centrally managed teaching in a prime location, the URS refurbishment provided the headroom required to consolidate activities currently dispersed across less efficient buildings. This supported timetable resilience, improved utilisation, and enabled a planned programme of repurposing, releasing and commercialising lower-performing space.

The refurbishment was a once-in-a-generation opportunity to transform the heart of the main campus to create a modern, vibrant academic hub that united high quality teaching environments, informal study areas, student support and staff collaboration under one roof. This configuration strengthened the relationship between teaching, learning support, and research visibility, improving the conditions for student attainment, progression, and belonging, whilst enabling collaborative ways of working for academic and professional staff. The design had focussed on what students tell us they want, what best practice from across the sector and industry showed students of the future would need, and what the pedagogy of the future would demand. This meant - safe, inclusive, technology-enabled, socially connective environments that activated the entire safeguard-to-shine spectrum. It would also provide students with a learning environment that supported and enabled the development of their digital capabilities, skills formation, and experiences needed to thrive in a changing global workforce. It would enhance capacity to further embed employability into the future curriculum - with technology-enabled collaborative learning, digital modelling environments and employer engagement spaces, all enriched through modern infrastructure.

As the social and demographic makeup of the student body continued to evolve, the campus environment and infrastructure needed to adjust accordingly. This project provided an opportunity to do just that, and to ensure that the campus environment remained a powerful attraction for future generations of students.

The increasing financial pressures of students meant that most now need to take on part time work during teaching weeks, and increasing numbers were choosing to live at home and commute to campus. Assumptions about what it meant to be a 'full-time' student were changing, and this was causing a rethink on how key systems and infrastructure were designed. The provision of new teaching spaces not only improved the quality of the learning environment, but it also created capacity to reshape the University's approach to timetabling – allowing a more student-centred timetable that better suited the circumstances of learners. With many students living many miles from campus, it was also

increasingly important to provide social and study spaces on campus where students felt at home, and where they could spend time between classes. The URS refurbishment created an exciting opportunity to expand the provision of such spaces in the heart of campus.

The development would differentiate Reading from its competitors by being one of the UK's most significant heritage-led, sustainable refurbishments. Competitor universities were investing in modern teaching hubs; URS would ensure the University remained competitive—and in key areas, surpasses peers—through digital capability, sustainability, and academic infrastructure.

In terms of why now the Senate noted the buildings worsening condition, the need to vacate Chancellors Building, inflation costs, and the impact on recruitment giving a poor first impression of the University.

Approval was now being sought from the Council to recommence work on the building. The cost of completing the remaining works was estimated a c£47m as was included with the capital expenditure allocation.

The Senate made the following comments on the proposal:

- There was huge enthusiasm about the potential the refurbishment had for teaching and learning and the student experience
- Full endorsement for the proposal, in some respects it felt late given that many Schools with large cohorts had needed large flexible space in order to avoid double teaching for some time
- The refurbishment was critical – flat/flexible space in the heart of campus was crucial. The opportunity to unlock this as well for events space opened up exciting opportunities
- This was a massive opportunity to think about teaching for the future – the ground floor space would allow different types of teaching for large cohorts
- The building would be designed to meet accessibility needs and would help future proof the estate
- The transformation was crucial to enhance the student experience, especially for growing cohorts and those students with accessibility requirements
- The case was strong and convincing, but £47M was a considerable amount of money – was there anything that would not be funded as a result?

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the project would be funded over three financial years and that the budget was available within the amount allocated to capital projects each year

- Given the experience with previous building projects on campus were there any risks of slippages against the timescale?

The Vice-Chancellor noted that a number of previous building projects had started from scratch – with URS, the building had already been stripped out, tenders were already agreed, and planning permission agreed. Whilst no guarantees could be given many risks had already been mitigated against

The Senate unanimously endorsed the proposal to finish the URS Refurbishment; there was no dissent from any Senator in the meeting.

The Senate thanked the Chief Operating Officer Laura Clayton and Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor McCrum for the presentation.

26/05 Report from the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience on Quality Assurance and Standards in Education

The Senate received a number of items from UBTLE (also see Minute 26/09) explicitly concerned with Academic Quality and Standards.

One of those items - the Annual Learning and Teaching Report (ALTR) – was submitted for comments but also approval ahead of submission to the Council on 9 March 2026.

The Annual Learning and Teaching Report (ALTR) provided Council with assurance that the University was maintaining appropriate academic standards while enhancing the student academic experience and outcomes. It supported Council in fulfilling its responsibilities for teaching and learning under Ordinance A2 and demonstrated that the University met the expectations of the Office for Students (OfS).

The Senate was asked to consider the contents of the report and provide assurance for Council as to the quality of provision.

The Senate noted:

- In addition to assurances given in the ALTR, the report detailed the Annual Quality Assurance Report (AQAR) for 2024/25, as well as detail on: School Teaching Enhancement Action Plans (STEAPs); continuation, completion and progression data; educational gains; graduate outcomes, TEF; interactions with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies; sector bodies and national initiatives
- The educational gains data could be shared – at present only one year was available, but it was hoped this could be built up over time
- It was confirmed that all of the data was mostly in the public domain
- Subject level data (TEF) was often difficult to translate to specific programmes/areas of activity within the University – it was noted that the Planning and Strategy Office could provide further information on areas covered, a link would be provided
- In regard to league tables and the value-added score was the University being penalised against other institutions by holding the line in terms of the standards of its awards/grade inflation? Was the University more rigorous than others?
It was confirmed that long-term data was available, but this would be skewed if institutions were game playing
- It was noted that leagues table could distort behaviour, but some institutions were just better than Reading

The Senate unanimously approved the report for submission to the Council, confirming that the UBTLE report provided assurance and evidence that the University was maintaining quality and standards in learning and teaching.

26/06 REF 2029

The Senate received a presentation from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor in respect of REF 2029. On 10 December 2025 REF had published updates and resumed criteria setting following its pause (4 September 2025).

The Presentation highlighted updates since the unpasing and what the University was doing by way of preparation, in particular:

- Weightings had been confirmed for REF 2029 – 55% contributions to knowledge and understanding (CKU); 25% to engagement and impact (E&I); 20% to strategy, people and research environment (SPRE). CKU had increased from 50 to 55%, People, Culture and Environment was now SPRE, and this had reduced to 20%
- December 2025 update had confirmed: weightings, guidance, an updated timetable, and the People, Culture and Environment Pilot Report (PCE)
- The PCE pilot exercise had involved 40 diverse HEIs, covering a submission phase from November 2024 to March 2025 and an assessment phase March to July 2025. It looked to identify: which indicators worked/did not, burden, unintended consequences
- Outcome of PCE:
 - It was possible to assess excellence in PCE, but not ready for full implementation in REF 2029
 - Pilot scores were not reliable indicators of how institutions would perform in REF 2029, because there was no formal calibration across assessment panels
 - Scores tended to be lower than in REF 2021's Environment assessment, reflecting the experimental nature of the exercise
 - The pilot framework was useful but too complex. More indicators and evidence types than needed to make robust judgments. Panels suggested simplifying and rationalising the set of indicators for the full REF process
 - Feedback from participating institutions and panels will shape the final guidance for the SPRE
- PCE Pilot – indicators and evidence with potential value:
 - Institutional strategy & plans with clear priorities, objectives & monitoring
 - Alignment with research integrity standards, e.g. concordat, and monitoring of policies
 - Support for career progression & professional development opportunities across varied roles and career stages. Support networks and mentoring
 - Inclusion & equity embedded
 - Collaboration within and across disciplines and external partners
- Disciplinary statements and representativeness – prior to the pause it was suggested that narrative statements would need to be written, now contributions to knowledge and understanding and engagement & impact would be included as part of SPRC Unit Level Statement (ULS)
- Contribution to knowledge and understanding – volume measure and code of practice was now dissociated from individuals and would use HESA data
- Outputs general:
 - Outputs do not have to be authored by individuals in the volume measure
 - Outputs do not have to be returned to the UOA where the author/s contribute to the volume measure
 - Outputs can be returned in more than one UOA (but may trigger audit)
 - Submission will need to demonstrate how the pool is representative of the research of the unit
 - Journal articles and conference proceedings needed to be OA compliant
 - Advise was to deposit on acceptance to ensure OA compliance for REF
- Outputs eligibility:

- Publicly available within the REF period and substantive link with an author (HESA ID) who made a substantial contribution
 - If more than 5 outputs with same substantive link, then need to explain why (in SPRE)
 - Substantive link is evidenced via an eligible employment relationship: minimum of 0.2 FTE for at least 12 months continuous employment by the HEI making the submission AND explicit expectation of research activity within the role. 'Research activity' not restricted by profession and an eligible employment relationship may be with any staff member who undertakes, enables or supports research
- Outputs were not eligible if:
 - No substantive link, as defined by guidance
 - Output is sole-authored by, or where the only substantive link to the institutions is through the following groups:
 - postgraduate research students (including PhD theses)
 - visiting or honorary staff
 - staff on teaching only contracts
 - individuals employed on academic or other contracts with no explicit expectation of research within the job role, technical teaching or support only contract
 - certain exceptions can be applied (including for TI staff moving to TR within the period, where certain criteria are met)
 - Outputs made publicly available before there was a substantive link [exception for long form/extended process]
- Limited portability introduced for longform/extended process research outputs for 5 years
- Engagement and Impact:
 - Template and approach retained from REF 2021
 - Minimum case studies reduced to one
 - 2* quality threshold removed
 - Guidance encouraged discussion of engagement strategies and responsible practices
 - Unit level statements from CKU and E&I removed
- REF 2029 programme: 2026 Spring - Expert panels meet to develop guidance. Autumn Final full guidance set. Winter Special requests open and publication of SG papers. 2027 Spring survey of submission intentions opens. Summer submission intentions and special requests close. Autumn submission window opens and additional panel recruitment. 2028 Autumn submission deadline
- University REF preparations involved four workstreams: CKU, systems, impact, ILS/DLS
- A code of practice would define: significant responsibility for research how to define research independence
- Code of Practice Outputs would include a selection process, and bias analysis and training
- REF Preparations:
 - Spring 2026 Outputs stock take, High Priority Impact Case Studies write up starts (selected ICS), HP ICS QA process, draft institutional statement
 - Summer 2026 UOA statement strategy outline, continue outputs assessment, continue ICS write up, Code of Practice finalised, PURE testing
 - Autumn 2026 Mock exercise: Outputs mock selection, ICS mock selection, Draft (partial?) of UOA statement, Mock audit, PURE operational
- Noted activity to date

The Senate:

- Queried whether there was more openness for colleagues without research as a primary part of their contract

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the REF was open to more colleagues but that they still had to pass the bar of research independence. In terms of moving from a TI to T&R contract, the criteria would be for the University to determine

- Noted that it was possible that further updates/changes might be published later in Autumn 2026, if this were the case a further update would be given to the Senate. The outcome of the mock exercise in 2027 would also be reported back to the Senate

The Senate thanked the Deputy Vice-Chancellor for the presentation.

26/07 Report of the Vice-Chancellor

The Senate received the Vice-Chancellor's address to the Senate, noting in particular:

Centenary

- India delegation - The University's centenary global events programme commenced in India, where a week of engagement activities (30 January–4 February 2026) led by Deputy Vice-Chancellor Professor Parveen Yaqoob and Pro-Vice-Chancellor International Dr Caroline Baylon brought together academics, government representatives, industry stakeholders, University partners, and alumni to celebrate the University's heritage and discuss future collaboration.
- On 17 March 2026, the University's official birthday, University Court would meet in the Great Hall, where the University would premiere its centenary film.
- The Community Festival would take place in May and would bring back the RAG parade through the town, (17 and 18 May), the newly commissioned play based on shared memories, Sparks, Parks, Balls and Halls and a special concert at the Hexagon with the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra. June will bring the Climate Festival and the opening of one of a legacy project - the Outdoor Learning Garden next to the Harris Garden on Whiteknights Campus.

Excellence

- Earlier this month, the University hosted the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) on campus from 10–12 February on Whiteknights, offering researchers, students and staff a rare opportunity to engage directly with the world's leading climate science assessment body.
- In December, the Chinese Ministry of Education approved the University's application for a second Joint Institute. The partnership with Tianjin University (TJU), China's oldest university, would see the co-delivery of three undergraduate and three Masters Henley Business School programmes (with the University of Reading Global Academy providing foundation year content). Based in the International Education Innovation Zone in Hainan, three joint programmes would launch in September 2026 with others to follow.

Sustainability

- There were emerging sector-wide developments relating to student litigation over tuition fees during the Covid-19 period. As reported in recent national coverage, Student Group Claim had issued pre-action letters to 36 universities and was expanding its activity following a confidential settlement reached with UCL last week. It had been reported that the University of Reading was among the institutions expected to receive a letter.

Items for report and approval

26/08 Report of the University Executive Board

All items were covered throughout papers submitted.

26/09 Report of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience

The Senate received and noted the Report of the meetings of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (UBTLSE) held on 4 November, 2 December 2025 and 12 January 2026.

The report contained updates on:

- Key decisions and changes to policies
- Continuation Rates Taskforce
- Academic Year Changes
- Post-16 Education & Skills Strategy implications
- Education for Environmental Sustainability
- Commuter Students
- Learning Engagement Analytics Project (LEAP)
- Assessment and Feedback

26/10 Report of the University Committee for Research and Innovation

The Senate received the report of the University Committee for Research and Innovation held between November 2025 and January 2026, along with some headline areas of work for the remainder of this academic year. It was noted that the strategic meetings had covered the following areas:

- AI in research action plan
- Research Division Operating Plans (RDOPs) and maturity matrices
- Interdisciplinary Research Centre (IDRC) five-year plans 2025 – 2030
- Response to the Government White Paper
- Knowledge Exchange and Impact Growth Plan and HEIF Accountability Statement

26/11 Report of the International and Global Engagement Strategy Board

The Senate noted the report of the International Global Engagement Strategy Board which had met once since the last meeting of the Senate. It was noted that discussions had focussed on:

- University of Reading Malaysia Strategy 2025-2030
- Strategic initiatives – global engagement hubs and development of Reading Global Academy
- Global Rankings Strategy

26/12 Report from the Council

The Senate received a report from the Council for its information.

Items for note

26/13 Chair's Action

The Senate noted that the following items had been approved by Chair's action: appointment of external examiners for a DSc candidate

26/14 Reports of Examiners for Higher Degrees by thesis

The Senate approved recommendations for the award or otherwise of Higher Degrees.

26/15 Dates of next meeting 2025/26

Wednesday 29 April 2026 at 2.15 pm – reserve meeting (online)

Thursday 17 June 2026 at 2.15 pm (in person)