

Senate

17/22 A meeting of the Senate was held in The Nike Theatre, Agriculture Building, Earley Gate, on Thursday 29 June 2017 at 2.15 pm.

Present:

The Vice-Chancellor

Dr Maarten Ambaum
Dr Cindy Becker
Professor Dianne Berry
Dr Helen Bilton
Dr Sarah Brewer
Professor Gavin Brooks
Professor Laurie Butler
Dr Ann Chippindale
Dr Claire Collins
Professor Richard Frazier
Professor Clare Furneaux
Professor Roger Gibbard
Professor Jon Gibbs
Professor Ginny Gibson
Professor Roberta Gilchrist
Professor Stuart Green
Professor Paul Hadley
Dr Rebecca Harris
Dr Paul Hatcher
Dr Orla Kennedy
Professor Peter Kruschwitz
Dr Elizabeth McCrum
Dr Emma Mayhew
Professor Steve Mithen
Dr Matthew Nicholls
Professor Julian Park
Mr Enzo Raimo
Professor Patricia Riddell

Professor Jane Setter
Mr David Stannard
Dr Catherine Tissot
Professor Richard Tranter
Professor Sue Walker
Professor Adrian Williams
Professor Parveen Yaqoob
The University Secretary

Students:

Mr Ben Cooper
Mr Niall Hamilton
Mr Sed Joshi
Ms Pip Oppenheimer
Ms Molly Philpott

Ms Leen Alnajjab
Ms Charlotte O'Leary
Ms Rose Lennon
Mr Tristan Spencer
Mr Ed White

In attendance:

Ms Sam Foley
Mr Billah Qureshi
Ms Louise Sharman

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the new RUSU Full-Time Officers to the Senate.

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

Mr William (Bill) Barclay, A representative on the University Court 1981-1992, Lay Member of the Council, University Treasurer 1995-2000.

Ms Helen Boddington, Graduate of the University, current member of the

University staff in RISIS since 2016.

Emeritus Professor Martin Froy, Professor of Fine Art, Head of the Department of Fine Art from 1983 to 1987. He retired from the University in 1991.

Mrs Muriel Hirst, alongside her husband, Professor Wallace Hirst, founder of the Wallace and Muriel Hirst Fund which provided an annual scholarship for an MSc student from the developing world.

Mr Peter Swallow, IT and Network Administrator in the School of Chemistry, Food and Pharmacy from November 1996 to his retirement in February 2015.

17/23 The Minutes (17/01-17/19) of the meeting held on 8 March 2017 were approved.

17/24 Reports of Committees of Selection (Item 2a)

The Senate received the following Reports of Committees of Selection:

- i) Chief Financial Officer – It was noted that the Committee of Selection consisted of: Mr Preston, Mr Beardmore-Gray, Mrs Owen, the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Van de Noort, and Professor Yaqoob.
- ii) Associate Professor of Coaching
- iii) Associate Professor of Human Geography
- iv) Professor in Entrepreneurship and the Creative Industries
- v) Director of Strategic Marketing
- vi) Professor in Leadership
- vii) Professor in Accounting

17/25 Appointments (Item 2b 2c)

The Senate noted the following appointments:

- (a) Professor Chris Harty appointed as Head of the School of the Built Environment from 1 August 2017 for a six year term.
- (b) Professor Robert Jackson appointed as Head of School of Biological Sciences from 1 August 2017 for a six year term.

17/26 Presentation on the Medical School (Item 3)

The Senate received a presentation from Professor Butler and Dr Hough in regard to the ongoing work to develop a case for a Medical School at the University.

At this stage the Senate was being asked to give its assent for further work to be undertaken to enable a full business case to be brought forward for formal approval in the Autumn Term 2017. The Senate noted that at its meeting on 10 July 2017 the Council would be asked to approve the submission of the first stage GMC screening application which would begin the eight stage process of review towards gaining

power for Primary Medical Qualifications; beginning this process of GMC review did not commit the University to make a formal submission for a medical school.

The Senate noted that the case for establishing a medical school would be undertaken in partnership with key NHS partners, the Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust (RBH), the Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust (BHFT), and with local primary care providers. The case was being developed in anticipation of the government launching a competition in autumn 2017 to allocate 1000 additional medical undergraduate training places for a 2019 start, open to new providers.

A Medical School would help in the strategic development of health-related teaching and research at the University, linking with a number of cross-curricula themes.

Benefits for the University were outlined as follows:

- Uplift in high-tariff student numbers: 600 (by year 5) with AAA+ tariff;
- Reputational gains, driven by high tariff students and resultant league table impact, but also the status of being a University with a medical school;
- Increased attractiveness of taught courses in other cognate disciplines;
- Enhanced inter-professional teaching opportunities for other allied health programmes, particularly pharmacy, speech and language therapy, and physician associates;
- Increased research income, quality and impact.

A number of benefits for partners and for the local region were also noted.

Risks to the University were also outlined as follows:

- Financial
- Space
- Staff capacity/time
- Opportunity cost
- Reputational exposure

The Senate noted the challenging timeline involved in preparing a bid.

A number of questions and comments were raised by the Senate in response to the presentation:

- The RUSU Education Officer expressed concern around the costs of such a project and reminded the Senate that the University had recently undertaken a number of cost cutting exercises, including PAS, and had not made sufficient funds available for a number of less costly initiatives that would enhance the student experience such as lecture capture, mental health support, extending Library opening hours. It was suggested that the University was consistently trying to increase student numbers without sufficient investment in infrastructure improvements. A number of students were concerned that the University was focussing more on a vision for the

University rather than on enhancing the student experience.

The Vice-Chancellor acknowledged that a Medical School was a substantial project and reminded the Senate that in the past the University had not made enough progress to even bid for such an initiative. A decision on whether to proceed with submission of a bid would be a significant decision for the University.

It was suggested that Professor Butler and Dr Hough meet with the Student Officers outside of the meeting to address concerns.

- Professor Butler and Dr Hough were asked whether they had undertaken a sensitivity analysis as part of their work, to look at the financial model if less students were recruited, or building/other costs increased.

It was reported that this work would be undertaken. The Senate noted that the financial model developed to date did not include any international student numbers. It was also acknowledged that start-up costs could be at different levels depending on which model was pursued.

- Infrastructure implications were being underestimated given that there were issues with available lecture theatre space currently. If teaching was to start in 2019, stress testing should be undertaken now on available teaching space.

It was noted that Estates and Facilities were working to identify space implications.

- A number of members of the Senate also shared the concerns of students that the University was not investing in services to support students.
- It was suggested that the costs of exiting from such a project should be built into any financial models and considerations around any building works.
- Given the ambitious start date, the Senate questioned whether any consideration was being given to halls accommodation.

It was noted that separate discussions were being undertaken in regard to increasing accommodation in the Halls of Residence.

- Whether this ambitious project could be achieved without impacting other academic schools.

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the Chief Financial Officer was currently undertaking a piece of work on the forward position of the University's finances which would help in considering future projects.

The Senate thanked Professor Butler and Dr Hough for the presentation and, for its part, gave its assent for work to continue noting that a more formal proposal would

be submitted to the Council in the Autumn Term.

17/27 Review of the Effectiveness of the Senate (Item 4)

At its meeting on 30 June 2016 the Senate approved the establishment of a Group to review the Effectiveness of the Senate with the following membership and terms of reference:

Dr David Carter
Professor Richard Frazier
Professor Ginny Gibson (Chair)
Professor Peter Kruschwitz
President of RUSU or his nominee
Head of Governance (Secretary)

- (a) to consider whether the terms of reference of Senate are being fulfilled;
- (b) to consider the membership of Senate, both in terms of size and composition, including but not limited to reference to the University's diversity target for membership for the Senate;
- (c) to consider whether the format of Senate would benefit from alteration;
- (d) to consider whether the volume and nature of paperwork is optimal;
- (e) to consider how well the Senate discharges its responsibility to ensure that the quality of the University's teaching and research is maintained;
- (f) to make recommendations to the Senate by the end of the summer term 2017.

The Senate now received the final report from the Review Group.

Professor Gibson, as Chair of the Review Group, presented the Report. It was noted that the Review Group had spent time reflecting on what Senate's role was given that it was the University's most senior governance body in relation to academic standards, the education provided to students, and research. Early in the Review Group's discussions it became apparent that the role and responsibilities of Senate were impacted by a range of internal and external factors and that the Review Group were mindful of these in its deliberations.

External factors included:

- requirements of the CUC Code that the governing body (Council) should receive assurance that academic governance was effective, that academic risk was effectively managed, and that quality was maintained.
- Annual Provider Review which required Council to consider a report and action plan relating to the continuous improvement of the student academic experience and of student outcomes. Senates would need to ensure that strategic issues were brought to the fore.
- The Higher Education and Research Bill which was changing the policy and governance architecture for HEIs.

Internal factors included:

- The Revised Academic Structure – which had changed following the removal of the faculty structure, creation of new roles such as Research Deans and Teaching & Learning Deans, and the establishment of more communities of practice.
- The Leadership Group – which had emerged as a new forum. Although it had no governance status, it did have a significant overlap with the membership of the Senate.
- The University’s relationship with students - there was a developing tension between students who were increasingly seen as consumers, as defined by contractual arrangements, and students as partners in learning and part of the wider collegiate community. Increasingly students expected more consultation and engagement. With the increasing emphasis on the student experience, it was important that students felt that they could have a voice in how the University works and changes that are made.

It was apparent from discussion that there was some frustrations amongst Senators that Senate was simply a ‘rubber stamping’ body and that too much time was spent on routine reporting that had been seen by Senators on several other occasions. It was felt that Senate in its current guise did not fulfil its responsibilities in a fully effective manner

It was noted that the Review Group had focussed on what the Senate should be doing and its composition; the Group’s recommendations would result in a different look and feel to the Senate.

In regard to specific recommendations:

Recommendation 1

It was proposed that in the future the agenda would be divided into the following sections:

- a) One or two substantive items that would help the University reflect on continuous improvements in academic standards. These items would encourage debate and a more open conversation. The Senate should not be seen as an opportunity to block items of business or to delay or hinder the workings of the University, but instead should be seen as a critical friend. Examples of possible items might include: reports from the Pro-Vice-Chancellors, major thematic items, post project reviews, plans for major change projects, items raised by the Council, items brought forward by Senators.
- b) The Vice-Chancellor’s address.
- c) Routine reports.

A Senate Agenda Group would be established to set topics in advance; the Group would comprise the Vice-Chancellor, the University Secretary, the Senate representative on Council, a Head of School, a Teaching and Learning Dean, and a Research Dean.

Changes to format of the Senate would be implemented during 2017/18.

Members of the Senate were supportive of the proposed new ways of working which would enable an earlier dialogue on proposals and more opportunity for consultation and discussion. The Senate noted that this new format would also address a number of concerns raised in the staff survey around staff feeling that they had no opportunity to raise issues or that their views were being listened to.

Recommendation 2

In regard to composition it was noted that the Senate had over 80 members, over half of whom were there because of their positions. The Review Group was keen to ensure that there was wider representation from across key communities, whilst trying to reduce the Senate's size in order to promote better discussion.

It was suggested that there would be a smaller ex officio membership of the Senate and that representation would be elected by and from amongst Heads of School, Heads of Department, Research Deans, Research Division Leads, Teaching & Learning Deans, Schools Directors of Teaching and Learning, Senior Tutors, University Teaching Fellows; RUSU and student representation would remain as currently. A role description would be adopted for Senators so that they could fully understand the role being undertaken. Senators would be responsible for seeking the view of the constituencies that they represented.

The Senate were broadly content with the proposals in relation to membership and composition but made a number of suggestions:

- It was agreed that a representative should also be sought from the PDRA community.
- Further clarity into the Head of Department or 'equivalent' category would be helpful.
- It was agreed that the Provost of University of Reading Malaysia would move to the ex-officio category.
- Some rationale around the proportion of numbers in each category would be helpful.

The Senate noted that all Schools would be represented in the proposed composition.

The Senate discussed the use of elections to select Senate members and expressed concerns that it might not meet its diversity and inclusion targets through this method. Professor Gibson informed the Senate that the Review Group had also discussed this concern and that the challenges raised by elections had been discussed with the Deans for Diversity and Inclusion. When Senate elections were held all constituencies would be asked to take diversity and inclusion issues into consideration, and this matter would be kept under review.

The Senate noted that no changes would be made to Senate membership in 2017/18, other than, where necessary, changes to *ex-officio* roles. Where terms of

office were due to expire on 31 July 2017 these would be extended to 31 July 2018 to allow Senators the opportunity to comment on whether the new ways of working were effective and also to decide whether they wished to stand again having experienced the new format. The new membership and composition would be implemented from 2018/19.

Recommendation 3

It was proposed that changes would also be made to reporting arrangements from sub-committees, including changes to the timing of submission of reports, and their structure and format. In the future a strategic and reflective recruitment report would be submitted to the Senate twice a year.

There was support for reducing the size of reports submitted to the Senate.

The Senate approved recommendations in relation to reporting from its sub-committees.

Recommendation 4

The Senate approved revisions to its Ordinance A3, to take effect from 2018/19, and to its Standing Orders.

Recommendation 5

It was proposed that up to five meetings would be held each year; one formal meeting in the Autumn Term, one formal meeting and one reserve meeting during the Spring and Summer Terms. The formal meetings would include any items of formal reporting from the sub-committees. The Senate Agenda Group would determine whether the reserved meeting were to be used; if used these meetings would focus on items for discussion. Afternoon Tea would be provided after each meeting to foster more networking opportunities.

The Senate thanked the Review Group for the report and noted that changes to the format of the meetings would start to take place in 2017/18 and that changes to membership would take place for 2018/19.

17/28 Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Item 5)

The Vice-Chancellor addressed the Senate, referring in particular to:

- a) The General Election and implications for Higher Education.
- b) The Teaching Excellence Framework – the award of ‘Silver’ acknowledged the University’s high quality teaching and learning coupled with excellent outcomes for students, and would provide a platform from which to move upwards. Thanks were recorded to all those involved in the submission.
- c) Capital Expenditure Priorities – members of the Senate were aware that the University was in the middle of the major capital programme; options were being reviewed for the medium and long term in relation to issues that had arisen around the URS building.

- d) Doctoral Loans – following an announcement in the 2016 budget the Government had confirmed that doctoral loans of up to £25,000 would be available for courses up to eight years in time for the 2018/19 academic year.
- e) Graduate Outcomes – the new name for the Destination of Leavers from Higher Education survey, following an extensive consultation exercise on the subject new arrangement would be introduced in autumn 2018. Key differences in the new survey included graduates being surveyed 15 months after completing their studies, four survey points a year, and the administration being done by a single central survey contractor.
- f) Higher Education Research Bill – the Higher Education Research Bill was approved ahead of Parliament being dissolved, there were questions about how the reforms would work. In the case of the Office for Students it would need to balance its market regulator role with its overarching concern about the sector and its health.

17/29 Report of the Strategy and Finance Committee (Item 6a)

There was no report on this occasion.

17/30 Report of the University Executive Board (Item 6b)

The Senate received a Report of the meetings of the University Executive Board held on 6, 27 March, 18 April, 2, 15 and 30 May, and 12 June 2017.

In regard to matters for recommendation 1) the Senate approved revisions to the Ordinances.

In regard to matters for recommendation 2) the Senate received the Review of the Probationary Review Process. The Review had been established to:

- 1) Review the length of the probation period and approach to setting of probationary objectives;
- 2) Review and consider appropriate criteria/indicators to assess and monitor academic performance in the probation period;
- 3) Review and update the procedure and process/guidance documentation;
- 4) Consider roles and responsibilities in relation to decision making, consideration of opportunities for automation and training and development needs for all stakeholders.

As part of the Review consultation had taken place with UCU, Heads of School, Teaching and Learning Deans, Research Deans, and professional and administrative functions. The Review Group had made a number of recommendations, as follows:

Length of probation period and approach to setting probationary objectives –

- The probation period be kept at three years but a formal review of progress would take place at 18 months. In exceptional circumstances the Academic Probation Review Sub-Committee could confirm probation at this point.

- Mid-probation review would be an opportunity to provide formal feedback to the probationary lecturer and/or Head of School.
- Probationary objectives to be agreed within six weeks of starting.
- A Probationary Lecturer Review Form would be submitted to the Sub-Committee in order to formally sign off the proposed probationary objectives.

Review and consider appropriate criteria/indicators to assess and monitor academic performance in the probation period

- Introduction of a new Academic Probation Framework which set out criteria against which new Probationary Lecturers needed to demonstrate competency, based in selecting appropriate elements of the Framework on the basis of contract classification.

Review and update the procedure and process/guidance documentation

- A Policy Statement which outlined the broad principles and aims of the probationary period.
- The Academic Probation Procedure had been updated to reflect changes to the procedure. This clearly stated expectations of various stakeholders, outlined the process to be followed should there be any performance concerns during the probationary period, and when and how a decision on non-confirmation would be taken and the appeals process.
- The Probationary Lecturer Form would be used as a continuing professional development tool to record evidence of meeting probationary objectives throughout the probationary period.
- Mentoring guidelines relating to the Mentoring scheme for Academic Staff had been revised.

Consider roles and responsibilities in relation to decision making, consideration of opportunities for automation and training and development needs

- The Policy and Procedure documents articulated more clearly the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.
- Briefing and training sessions would be arranged.

The Senate approved the proposals put forward for Probationary Review which were thought to be supportive for new staff and also helpful for managers. However, one comment was raised in regard to the wording of criteria C3 as to whether 'leadership' was too strong and that perhaps 'development of leadership' might be more appropriate.

The Senate noted that implementation would take place from 1 August 2017.

The Senate noted that a piece of work was now to take place in regard to the promotion and probation of Grade 6 Teaching Fellows.

In regard to recommendation 3) the Senate received a paper summarising feedback on the first year of the new Personal Titles Process. As was to be expected with any new process a number of changes had been suggested. In order to plan changes for next session the University Secretary advised the Senate that the start and end of the process would be delayed. The Senate discussed the proposed delay and agreed that it was preferable to push the start date back by a few months in order to address

changes required. It was noted that Professor Cosh and Professor Frazier had agreed to represent the Senate on small working group to address feedback given on the process which would be held over the Summer. Any comments or feedback on the process could be made by the Senate to Professor Cosh and Professor Frazier. The Senate agreed that, given its representation, the small group could make decisions on its behalf on the matters set out under recommendation 1 of the report.

In regard to matters for report 4) the Senate noted the Report of the Project for the School of Law. A number of comments were raised by the Student Officers in regard to specific recommendations. It was noted that these issues would be taken forward by the implementation group and that the School were looking at a number of these as part of the review of the curriculum framework.

In regard to matters for report 8) the Student Officers requested representation on the Fees Sub-Group.

17/31 Report of the University Board for Teaching and Learning (Item 7a)

The Senate received the Report of the meetings of the University Board for Teaching and Learning held on 15 March, 24 April, 16 May and 13 June 2017.

In regard to items for approval, the Senate approved:

Item 2 – the Senate approved for transmission to the Council a proposal for a revised format for the Annual Learning and Teaching Report (ALTR) on standards, quality and enhancement. HEFCE’s new quality regime, introduced in August 2016, required that governing bodies of universities provide HEFCE with a set of assurances relating to standards, quality and enhancement as part of the Annual Provider Return (APR). The APR was HEFCE’s core mechanism for assessing quality in funded higher education providers and determined eligibility to participate in the Teaching Excellence Framework. The purpose of the ALTR was to provide the Council with an account of the University’s management of the quality and standards of its education, enabling it to make an informed judgement in respect of the assurances required by HEFCE. The ALTR outlined how the University would ensure the continuous improvement of the academic student experience and student outcomes through its strategic teaching and learning projects and through its regular cycle of quality assurance and enhancement processes.

Item 4 – amendment to Ordinance C3 1.3 from 1 August 2017/18 to reflect the introduction of a Master of Strategy (MStrat).

Item 5 – the Admissions Policy for Taught Programmes at Undergraduate and Postgraduate and Policy on Disclosure of Criminal Convictions (Student Applications)

In regard to matters for report, item 17, the Senate noted that the Skills Funding Agency had approved the University as a main provider of Degree Apprenticeships and the Chartered Management Institute had approved the Henley Business School as a provider of the level 6 Chartered Manager Degree Apprenticeship. It was noted

that the QAA had provided guidance on QA for Degree Apprenticeships, this was being reviewed by the Director of the Centre for Quality Support and Development.

In regard to item 25) the Student Officers questioned whether there was more that could be done to support international students as it appeared that a disproportionate number of these students had been subject to academic misconduct procedures. The Senate noted that a project was in hand to look at supporting international students through work with international tutors, ISLI, Support Centres and the Library.

17/32 Report of the University Board for Research and Innovation (Item 7b)

The Senate approved the Report of the meeting of the University Board for Research and Innovation held on 13 June 2017.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor referred to the REF 2021. It was noted that following review of responses to the early spring consultation, the funding bodies would be making initial announcements in August with some rules confirmed and an indication of direction of travel in others. In the autumn a second document would be published addressing in more detail issues such as output portability, number of outputs, and staff eligibility. The process for appointing main panel chairs had been initiated; suitably qualified staff at Reading were encouraged to apply for the sub-panel chair posts.

17/33 Report of the Global Engagement Strategy Board (Item 7c)

The Senate noted that the Global Experience Strategy Board was to meet the following week. The main item for discussion at that meeting was the International Student Experience Project.

17/34 Report of the Joint Standing Committee of Council and Senate on Honorary Degrees (Item 7d)

The Senate, for its part, approved the Report of the meeting of the Joint Standing Committee of Council and Senate on Honorary Degrees held on 12 June 2017.

Members of the Senate were encouraged to make nominations for 2019 and thereafter.

17/35 Report of the Committee on the Personal Title of Professor and Associate Professor (Item 7e)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Senate Committee on the Personal Title of Professor and Associate Professor held on 5 May 2017 and congratulated all those staff on their promotions.

17/36 Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Examination Results (Item 7f)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Senate Standing Committee on Examination Results and noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

17/37 Report of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct (Item 7g)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct held on and noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

17/38 Report of the Standing Committee on Academic Engagement & Fitness to Study (Item 7h)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Academic Engagement and Fitness to Study held and noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

17/39 Report of the Standing Committee on Fitness to Practise (Item 7i)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Academic Engagement and Fitness to Study held on 3 February, 27 April and 12 May 2017 noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

17/40 Report of the Student Appeals Committee (Item 7j)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Student Appeals Committee held on 11 May 2017.

17/41 Report on behalf of the Standing Disciplinary Committee on disciplinary sanctions imposed in the Halls of Residence (Item 7k)

The Senate received a Report on behalf of the Standing Disciplinary Committee of disciplinary sanctions imposed for breaches of discipline other than academic misconduct and neglect of work.

17/42 Appointments to Committees and other bodies (Item 8a)

The Senate:

Student Appeals Committee:

- (a) Re-appointed Professor E.M. Page to the Student Appeals Committee to serve until 31 July 2020.
- (b) Re-appointed Professor R.S. Sherratt to the Student Appeals Committee to serve until 31 July 2020.
- (c) Appointed Dr R. Green to the Student Appeals Committee to serve until 31 July 2020.

Joint Standing Committee of the Senate and the Council on Honorary Degrees

- (a) Appointed Professor L. Farrelly to the Joint Standing Committee of the Senate and the Council on Honorary Degrees to serve until 31 July 2020.

Committee for the Museum of English Rural Life

- (a) Appointed Dr H. Geoghegan to the Committee for the Museum of English Rural Life to serve until 31 July 2019.

Joint UCU

- (a) A vacancy remained for an academic representative.

Standing Committee on Examination Results

- (a) Re-appointed Professor D. Brauner to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to serve until 31 July 2020.
(b) Re-appointed Professor D. Oderberg to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to serve until 31 July 2020.
(c) Re-appointed Professor P. Miskell to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to serve until 31 July 2020.
(d) Re-appointed Professor C. Sutcliffe to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to serve until 31 July 2020.
(e) Re-appointed Professor H. Osborn to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to serve until 31 July 2020.
(f) Re-appointed Dr E. McSorley to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to serve until 31 July 2020.
(g) Re-appointed Dr K. Ayers to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to serve until 31 July 2020.
(h) One vacancy remained

17/43 Retirement of Professors (Item 8b)

The Senate approved under the provisions of Ordinance B7 the title of Professor Emeritus/Emerita be conferred upon the following with effect from the date indicated:

Professor A. Alexander (31 March 2017)
Professor R. Richards (30 June 2017)
Professor P. Darbre (30 September 2017)

17/44 Other Retirements (Item 8c)

The Senate approved that that the following be accorded the title of Honorary Fellow for a period of five years with effect from the date indicated:

Mr P. Smith (16 April 2017)
Dr S. Bryant (26 April 2017)
Ms H. Hathaway (28 April 2017)
Dr M. Blackburn (30 April 2017)
Mr D. Morton (12 May 2017)
Mrs B. Tribe (31 May 2017)
Mr P. Lawther (28 July 2017)

17/45 List of Meetings 2017-18

The Senate received the final version of the list of meetings for 2017-18 for its information.

17/46 Any other business

The Senate thanked the outgoing RUSU officers.

.....
Student representatives withdrew from the remainder of the meeting
.....

RESERVED BUSINESS

17/47 The reserved minutes (17/20-17/21) of the meeting held on 8 March 2017 were approved.

17/48 Reports of Examiners for Higher Degrees by thesis (Item 11b)

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

17/49 Examinations for Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (Item 11c)

The Senate authorised the Vice-Chancellor to approve May/June 2017 examination results on its behalf.