MEETING OF THE SENATE

5 NOVEMBER 2014

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Provost Professor Greer, Provost Professor Holloway, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Everest, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Beveridge, Professor Begon, Dr A Boyle, Professors Chalker, Elliott, Elsheikh, Gasieniec, Gibson and Hall, Dr L Harkness-Brennan, Professor Herzberg, Dr F Jarman, Dr S Jones, Dr F Marret-Davies, Professors McGrath and O’Sullivan, Mr P Reed, Dr F Shovlin, Professors Vogt (for item 6.1) and Whitehead and Dr Y Zhao.

The Deputy President and two Vice-Presidents of the Liverpool Guild of Students and the student representatives from the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences were present as representatives of the student body.

In attendance: The Academic Secretary, the Senior Executive Co-ordinator and the Committee Services Administrator.

Apologies for absence were received from 26 members of the Senate.

1. 1000TH MEETING OF THE SENATE

Members were informed that this was the thousandth meeting of the Senate.

2. WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS

On behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor welcomed new members who had joined the Senate since its last meeting.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

The Senate received the University’s Statement of Policy and Procedure on Disclosure of Interest, as approved by the Council on 2 July 2014.

Members were asked to declare any interest that could give rise to conflict in relation to any item on the agenda. No such interests were declared.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The unreserved minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 25 June 2014 were taken as read and agreed.

5. MATTERS ARISING ON THE UNRESERVED MINUTES

5.1 JOINT COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES (MINUTE 110)

Reported:

a) That Professor James Keaton, the University’s outgoing Pro-Chancellor, had accepted the invitation to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws to be conferred at a degree ceremony in December 2014.

b) That the following individuals had accepted an invitation to receive an honorary degree to be conferred at degree ceremonies in 2015: Marina Dalglish, Professor Dame Athene Donald, His Honour Judge Henry Globe QC, Sir George Martin CBE and Professor Paul Preston.

c) That, in view of an ongoing Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) enquiry, the University had postponed the awarding of an honorary degree to Sir Bernard Hogan Howe. The award had originally been agreed in 2012 and would be revisited following the outcome of the IPCC’s enquiry.

6. HONOURS AND APPOINTMENTS

The Vice-Chancellor reported that:
a) Professor Gus Baker from the Institute of Translational Medicine had received the Lord Hastings Award from the charity Epilepsy Action in recognition of his national and international role in promoting epilepsy research.

b) Professor Richard Bentall, a clinical psychologist in the Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, had been elected as a Fellow of the British Academy.

c) Dr Alexandra Harris, a senior lecturer in the Department of English, had been awarded a prestigious fellowship from the Royal Society of Literature.

d) Professor Paul Nolan from the Department of Physics had been awarded the Rutherford Prize and Medal by the Institute of Physics for his work on the understanding of nuclear structure at high angular momentum and developing new nuclear detectors.

7. **STUDENT RECRUITMENT**

The Vice-Chancellor reported that:

a) Recruitment for 2014 entry had been extremely positive, with student numbers being significantly above both plan and last year’s recruitment levels. This was very pleasing and credit should be given to colleagues in the Faculties and in Marketing and Communications for this performance.

b) Although it was still relatively early in the recruitment year, the University was also looking set for positive results for 2015 entry.

8. **CAPITAL PLAN/FINANCES**

The Vice-Chancellor reported that:

a) Over the last five years the University had been engaged in a £750M capital plan. A key part of the plan had been the construction of new halls of residence on campus and the refurbishment of much of the existing stock. The work undertaken was now having an incredibly positive impact on student recruitment.

b) It had been agreed at the outset of the Residential Strategy that investments in residential accommodation would be funded from loans. To date, Vine Court and Crown Place had been funded by a revolving credit facility. Consideration was now being given to consolidating previous borrowing and the additional borrowing required to complete the remainder of the residential works into a long term debt vehicle, most likely a public bond. The Council was due to make a decision on this in February 2015.

c) University of Liverpool Construction Company (Special Projects) Ltd should be commended for its completion of Crown Place on time and under budget.

d) The refurbishment of the Guild building was likely to have a positive impact on National Student Survey scores and the Guild should be commended for their bold approach to the project.

9. **INDUSTRIAL ACTION**

The Vice-Chancellor reported that, in reaction to proposals for changes to the USS pension scheme, UCU was planning action short of a strike in the form of an assessment and marking boycott to take place from 6 November 2014. A statement would be issued shortly which would set out the University’s response to the industrial action.

10. **RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK (REF) 2014: OUTCOME PLANNING**

The Senate received an update on preparations for the receipt and subsequent analysis of REF results.

**Reported:**

a) That the REF2014 results would be published in December 2014.

b) That a timetable and action plan had been produced and a more detailed plan for analysis and communication was being discussed with Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors, research leads and Research and Knowledge Exchange Managers.
c) That it would be possible to analyse performance at various aggregated levels (e.g. for the University as a whole, or for each Faculty) and at individual Unit (subject) level in a number of areas including: research power; research excellence; outputs, environment and impact; depth/consistency of research excellence across the institution, calculated by percentage of eligible staff submitted; and relative change in performance compared to RAE 2008, where feasible. It would also be possible to determine the contributions of interdisciplinary units.

d) That scenario planning was underway. However, it was difficult to model the financial implications of any results, as the funding formula for QR would not be disclosed until March 2015. It was also difficult to predict outcomes around impact.

e) That the University’s REF submission strategy had been to concentrate on quality and reputation, rather than volume and funding. As such, the key analysis and subsequent internal communication would need to focus on the proportion of research activity that was above internationally excellent as this had been the explicit focus and the basis of the Research Strategy and supporting policies and support mechanisms.

f) That there were initiatives to recognise the range of duties undertaken by academic members of staff aside from the production of 3* and 4* research.

g) That ongoing monitoring and review of REF strategies would be integrated into the Planning and Performance Cycle. Both the preparation and eventual outcomes of REF must be reflected in plans to allow focus and resource to be directed to strategic research priority areas.

**STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE**

11. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Student Experience Committee held on 30 September 2014.

12. **REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE**

The Senate received proposed revised terms of reference and membership of the Student Experience Committee.

(I) **Reported:**

That there had been one addition to the terms of reference (point o, relating to wellbeing of students) and some updating to the membership to reflect new roles.

(II) **Agreed to recommend:**

That the revised terms of reference and membership of the Student Experience Committee be approved.

13. **REVISIONS TO THE GENERAL ORDINANCE FOR MODULAR MASTER’S DEGREES, POSTGRADUATE DIPLOMAS, POSTGRADUATE CERTIFICATES AND POSTGRADUATE AWARDS**

The Senate received a revised General Ordinance for Modular Master’s Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas, Postgraduate Certificates and Postgraduate Awards1.

(I) **Reported:**

a) That the changes were required to reflect the new University Framework for Postgraduate Modular Provision which had been approved by Senate in June 2014.

b) That the changes had been endorsed by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee and the Student Experience Committee.

(II) **Agreed to recommend:**

That the revised General Ordinance for Modular Master’s Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas, Postgraduate Certificates and Postgraduate Awards be approved.

14. **POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF GROUP WORK**

The Senate received a Policy on Assessment of Group Work.
(Senate, 5 November 2014 - Unreserved Business)

(I) Reported:

a) That the Student Experience Committee had received a report from the Academic Quality and Standards Committee recommending approval of a new Policy on Assessment of Group Work, which would be included as a new Appendix G in the Code of Practice on Assessment.

b) That the Policy would have immediate effect for all campus students, but implementation would be deferred for online programmes delivered with Laureate until the Policy had been considered by the Online Programmes Operational Group to determine if specific provisions needed to be included for the online programmes.

c) That it had been agreed that the Policy should be reviewed after a year.

(II) Agreed:

a) That the Policy on Assessment of Group Work be approved.

b) That further consideration should be given to how to encourage the inclusion of group work as a module objective/learning outcome, given the potential lack of opportunity for group work resits during the summer if only one, or some, of a group fail.

15. NEW FRAMEWORK FOR THE CERTIFICATE/DIPLOMA IN PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

(I) Reported:

a) That the Student Experience Committee had received a report from the Academic Quality and Standards Committee recommending approval of a new University Framework for the Certificate/Diploma in Professional Studies (C/DPS).

b) That the C/DPS awards were in Appendix C (i) to the Code of Practice on Assessment which had been superseded by the new University Framework for Postgraduate Modular Provision which did not cover C/DPS awards. Therefore, a separate Framework for the awards was required and it was proposed that it should be included in the Code of Practice on Assessment as a new Appendix P.

c) That the Framework would be applicable for all new entrants from 2014-15.

(II) Agreed:

That the new Framework for the Certificate/Diploma in Professional Studies be approved.

16. NEW WORKING GROUPS

Reported:

That the Student Experience Committee had approved the setting up of two new working groups, as follows:

- Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) Working Group, which would consider how ESD would be taken forward within learning and teaching activities; and
- Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR) Working Group, which would look at specifying the full system requirements for the HEAR and would undertake a cost-benefit analysis for possible technical solutions.

RESEARCH AND KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE COMMITTEE

17. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee held on 22 October 2014.

18. OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATION POLICY, AMENDMENT TO PUBLICATION AGREEMENT ADDENDUM AND UNIVERSITY REPOSITORY DATA POLICY

The Senate received a report from the University Research Communications Advisor presenting an Open Access Publication Policy, an Amendment to Publication Agreement and a University Repository Data Policy designed to govern re-use of data.
(I) Reported:

a) That the draft Open Access Publication Policy had been formulated after assessment of the external landscape and extensive consultation with staff and Level 2 Heads and was designed to facilitate Green or Gold Open Access wherever possible.

b) That the Policy would facilitate the Gold route via either funder block grants or by encouraging inclusion in grant applications, as applicable, with the additional provision of an institutional fund (up to a maximum of £300k per annum) to support a small proportion of further publications subject to the submission of a strong supporting case. While this would require additional costs to be borne by the University, the benefit of impact in key publications and potential credit in the next REF would be substantial. It was anticipated that such a fund would be centrally administered but devolved to Faculties and below for decision making.

c) That the early introduction of the Open Access Publication Policy would mitigate the risk of non-compliance with REF Open Access requirements, although it was recognised that a great deal of work remained to be done on changing researcher culture with regard to the depositing of publication data. The decision to only include research outputs deposited in the Institutional Repository as part of Portfolio of Activity/Professional Development Review discussions would aid in this regard.

d) That the Amendment to Publication Agreement was intended to retain for researchers as many rights as possible in terms of re-use of material and meeting funder requirements.

e) That the Repository Data Policy would strengthen the institution’s records of publication from its staff, providing clarity on how data stored would be available for re-use.

(II) Agreed to recommend:

That the Open Access Publication Policy, the Amendment to Publication Agreement and the University Repository Data Policy be approved.

19. REVISED FRAMEWORK FOR ONLINE PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATES

The Senate received a report recommending the adoption of a revised Framework for Online Professional Doctorates.

(I) Reported:

a) That the revisions embedded decisions already taken by the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee at its September 2013 meeting in relation to arrangements for the supervision and examination of students registered on these programmes.

b) That widespread consultation had been undertaken in compiling the proposed changes, including with the online professional doctorate programme teams, the Online Programmes Planning and Policy Committee, Faculty PGR Directors and the Academic Lead for Online and Technology Enhanced Learning.

c) That revisions to the Framework formed part of a strengthening of the academic governance and operational arrangements for the delivery of online professional doctorate programmes.

d) That the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee had agreed to recommend that the revised Framework be approved and had noted that further detailed scrutiny would need to be undertaken around alignment of the pre-thesis stage of the online professional doctorate programmes and the University’s Code of Practice on Assessment.

(II) Agreed:

That the revised Framework for Online Professional Doctorates be approved.

20. UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL DOCTORAL COLLEGE

The Senate received a report on proposals initiated by the Research Strategy Group to introduce a major uplift in PGR student numbers from 2015-16.
(Senate, 5 November 2014 - Unreserved Business)

(I)  Reported:

a) That, to achieve a major uplift in PGR student numbers from 2015-16, it was proposed that a Liverpool Doctoral College be established.

b) That ideas had been discussed with Faculty research leads and Directors of PGR, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors, many academic leads of doctoral training centres or equivalent, and professional services areas involved in PGR support. There was now a strong consensus that focused activity would be required over the next six months to generate a new Liverpool PGR offer with institutional spread and targeted to the specific needs of different student markets. Funding support would be explored through the HEFCE Catalyst scheme, and a new digital and social media presence would be implemented.

c) That the work would be managed over the next six months as a project, with a working group defining the characteristics of the offer and a project board overseeing delivery.

(II)  Agreed:

That the approach be endorsed.

OTHER ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT

21. COLLABORATIVE STRATEGY

The Senate received a proposed Collaborative Strategy.

(I)  Reported:

a) That the QAA Quality Code Section B10 required ‘degree awarding institutions’ to take a strategic approach to their collaborative partnerships for the delivery of learning and teaching provision and to ensure that ‘All arrangements for learning opportunities to be delivered or supported by organisations other than the degree-awarding body are compatible with this considered strategic approach, in order to secure institutional commitment to them and to facilitate the planned allocation of appropriate resources to support and oversee them’.

b) That, in order to demonstrate the compliance with this requirement, the University’s strategic approach to collaborative activity had been articulated in a formal Collaborative Strategy. A short consultation on the Strategy had been carried out and no comments had been received.

(II)  Agreed to recommend:

That the Collaborative Strategy be approved.

22. REVISED CODE OF PRACTICE ON THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The Senate received a revised Code of Practice on the Freedom of Speech.

(I)  Reported:

a) That the University had duties to secure freedom of speech within the law under section 43 of the Education Act (1986).

b) That the existing Code of Practice had been updated to ensure compliance with good practice identified by Universities UK in its 2014 report ‘Freedom of Speech on Campus: rights and responsibilities in UK universities’.

c) That the revised Code of Practice retained the same principles as the previous Code but introduced new procedures for dealing with potentially controversial speakers or events. Key changes were:

- The requirement for each event to have a named principal organiser;
- The introduction of a checklist to identify whether a particular event might present issues which require a risk assessment;
- The introduction of a risk assessment based process for considering whether an event can proceed safely;
- The identification of individuals with responsibility for co-ordinating risk assessments;
(Senate, 5 November 2014 - Unreserved Business)

- The introduction of a risk assessment template highlighting some of the potential risks and allowing for risks specific to an event to be considered;
- Provision of opportunities for individuals from groups wanting to put on an event and those who might object to an event to raise their concerns and responses with the risk assessment panel;
- Provision of a mechanism for individuals to object to an agreed event; and
- Clarification that gender segregation was not permitted at events unless the purpose of the event was religious observance.

The risk assessment process was based on an approach which had been used successfully this year when a controversial speaker wished to visit the University. Following the dialogue which accompanied the risk assessment process, the group wishing to organise this event had cancelled it and the group which had objected to it had attended an alternative event organised by the first group to build their understanding of the others’ viewpoint. This approach had helped to build positive campus relations.

d) That the revised Code of Practice had been recommended for approval by the Guild Liaison Sub-Committee and the Senior Executive Team. Since then an additional clause had been included in view of guidance about gender segregation produced by the Equality and Human Rights Commission in July 2014.

(II) Agreed to recommend:

That the revised Code of Practice on the Freedom of Speech be approved.

23. ACADEMIC YEAR DATES: 2016-17, 2017-18 AND 2018-19

The Senate received a report setting out proposed academic year dates for 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19.

(I) Reported:

a) That the proposed dates were based upon the established organisation of the academic year, assuming a 12 week block of teaching in each semester and a one week revision period immediately prior to each two week examination period.

b) That the first semester 12 week block of teaching in each year was followed by a three week break for Christmas. The second semester 12 week block of teaching in each year was interrupted with a three week break for Easter (based on the Western published dates).

(II) Agreed:

That the following academic year dates be approved:

2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 26 September 16</td>
<td>Friday 16 December 2016</td>
<td>12 weeks teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19 December 2016</td>
<td>Friday 6 January 2017</td>
<td>3 weeks break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 9 January 2017</td>
<td>Friday 13 January 2017</td>
<td>Revision week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 16 January 2017</td>
<td>Friday 27 January 2017</td>
<td>First semester examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 30 January 2017</td>
<td>Friday 31 March 2017</td>
<td>9 weeks teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 3 April 2017</td>
<td>Friday 21 April 2017</td>
<td>3 weeks break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 24 April 2017</td>
<td>Friday 12 May 2017</td>
<td>3 weeks teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15 May 2017</td>
<td>Friday 19 May 2017</td>
<td>Revision week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 22 May 2017</td>
<td>Friday 2 June 2017</td>
<td>Second semester examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 17 July 2017</td>
<td>Friday 21 July 2017</td>
<td>Graduation ceremonies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Friday 15 December 2017</td>
<td>12 weeks teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 18 December 2017</td>
<td>Friday 5 January 2018</td>
<td>3 weeks break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 8 January 2018</td>
<td>Friday 12 January 2018</td>
<td>Revision week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15 January 2018</td>
<td>Friday 26 January 2018</td>
<td>First semester examinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. ACTION TAKEN BY THE VICE-CHANCELLOR ON BEHALF OF THE SENATE

The Senate received a report outlining action which had been taken on its behalf by the Vice-Chancellor.

25. ADDITIONAL NOMINATION FOR THE 2013-14 FITNESS TO PRACTISE PANEL POOL

(I) Reported:

That, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved a request that an additional nominee, Mr Steve Milner (a part-time member of staff in the School of Health Sciences), be appointed to serve on the Fitness to Practise Panel Pool for the 2013-14 session. This appointment had been requested in order to ensure compliance with constitutional requirements.

(II) Agreed:

That the above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate be endorsed.

26. PROTOCOLS FOR THE ELECTION OF THE ELECTED SENATE REPRESENTATIVE ON COUNCIL

(I) Reported:

a) That, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend approval of the protocols/approach to conducting the election of the elected Senate representative on Council to replace Dr Stuart Marshall-Clarke.

b) That the President of the Council, acting on the Council’s behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

(II) Agreed:

That the above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate be endorsed.

27. CHANGES TO THE ORDINANCE FOR THE DEGREES OF BACHELOR OF MEDICINE AND BACHELOR OF SURGERY

(I) Reported:

a) That, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend approval of changes to the Ordinance for the Degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (MBChB) to reflect modifications made to the MBChB programme.

b) That the President of the Council, acting on the Council’s behalf, had approved the above recommendation.
(II) **Agreed:**

That the above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate be endorsed.

28. **REVISIONS TO THE ORDINANCE FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR IN PHILOSOPHY**

(I) **Reported:**

a) That, at its meeting held on 25 June 2014, the Senate had agreed to recommend approval of a substantially revised Ordinance for the Degree of Doctor in Philosophy. The Ordinance had subsequently been approved by Council.

b) That, following this approval, the PGR Policy Working Group had commenced its review of the Ordinance for the award of Master of Philosophy. As a result of this review, it had become apparent that minor changes to the Ordinance governing PhD study would provide greater clarity.

c) That, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend approval of changes to clauses 14, 15, 23 and 28 of the Ordinance.

d) That the President of the Council, acting on the Council’s behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

(II) **Agreed:**

That the above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate be endorsed.

29. **REVISIONS TO THE POLICY ON RESEARCH STUDENT SUPERVISION**

(I) **Reported:**

a) That, at its meeting held on 25 June 2014, the Senate had considered a substantially revised Policy on Research Student Supervision. It was agreed that the Policy should be referred back to the PGR Working Group for further clarification in some areas, e.g. in relation to the criteria for the appointment of supervisors, the definitions of supervisors (Primary and Secondary) and the expectations around the recording of interactions.

b) That the PGR Policy Working Group had reviewed the Policy and had proposed a number of changes:

1. To remove all references to the MRes degree that was now covered from 2014-15 by the PGT Taught Framework and the Code of Practice on Assessment.
2. To restructure Section 3 - criteria for appointment of supervisors. In particular, following comments at Senate, subsections a) and b) had been amended to remove ‘desirable’ criteria and clarify the essential criteria.
3. To amend Section 4i to reflect concerns that supervisors were expected to record very informal minor contact with the student.
4. As concern had been expressed over the term ‘Secondary Supervisors’, to amend the term to ‘Second Supervisors’ and clarify that this encompassed all supervisors other than the Primary Supervisor.

c) That, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the revised Policy on Research Student Supervision.

(II) **Agreed:**

That the above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate be endorsed.

30. **ELECTIONS OF ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES ON SENATE 2014 AND ELECTED SENATE REPRESENTATIVE ON COUNCIL - RESULTS**

The Senate received a report setting out the outcomes of recent elections.
Reported:

a) That elections had been held recently to appoint to a number of vacancies for representatives from each Faculty elected by and from among the academic staff employed on substantive contracts on either Teaching and Research or Teaching and Scholarship pathways. The outcomes of the elections were as follows:

i. Faculty of Health and Life Sciences

The number of nominations had not exceeded the number of places available and Mr Peter Reed and Dr Natasha Savage had been declared elected to membership of the Senate for the period from 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2017.

Mr Reed and Dr Savage had filled the two vacancies that had been carried forward last year for academic staff members within five years of their first substantive academic appointment. One other vacancy had been carried forward until next year.

ii. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

At least one of the two vacancies needed to be filled by an academic staff member within five years of their first substantive academic appointment. As none of the nominees had fallen into this category, a ballot had been held in accordance with Alternative Vote procedure to appoint to one vacancy and the vacancy for an academic staff member within five years of their first substantive academic appointment had been carried forward until next year.

As a result of the ballot Dr Freya Jarman had been elected to membership of the Senate for the period from 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2017.

iii. Faculty of Science and Engineering

As the number of nominations had exceeded the number of places available a ballot had been held in accordance with Single Transferable Vote procedure to appoint to two vacancies, at least one of which needed to be filled by an academic staff member within five years of their first substantive academic appointment.

As a result of the ballot Professor Paul Chalker and Dr Laura Harkness-Brennan had been elected to membership of the Senate for the period from 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2017.

b) That an election had been held recently to fill the vacancy vice Dr Stuart Marshall-Clarke for a member of the Senate elected from and by Senate’s elected membership to serve on the Council. Nominations had been received for Professor Bruce Gibson and Dr Fabienne Marret-Davies and, as a result of the subsequent ballot, Dr Marret-Davies had been elected to membership of the Council for the period from 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2017 or until she ceases to be a member of the Senate, should that be an earlier date.

31. THANKS TO THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

On behalf of the Senate, Professor McGrath extended thanks to Professor Sir Howard Newby and paid tribute to his contribution to the work of the University.

32. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Reported:

That the next meeting of the Senate would be held on Wednesday 21 January 2015 at 2pm.

Appendices

1 General Ordinance for Modular Master’s Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas, Postgraduate Certificates and Postgraduate Awards
2 Protocols for the election of the elected Senate representative on Council
3 Revised Ordinance for the Degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery
4 Revisions to the Ordinance for the Degree of Doctor in Philosophy