Minutes   Meeting of the Senate

Date:	26 June 2024
Present:	The President & Vice-Chancellor in the Chair
	Professor P Bath, Professor S Bhaumik, Professor B Birdi, Professor R Blakeley, Professor L Brooks, Professor C Buck, Professor C Burns, Dr J Burr, L Byrne, Professor M Carre, A Clements, Dr C Codina, Dr T Cooper, Professor J Cordiner, Professor L Cross, Professor M Dickman, Professor A Fleming, Professor J Flint, Professor G Gee, Dr L Gray, Dr S Hale, Professor S Hartley, Professor P Hatton, T Hodgson, Professor G Jewell, M Jones, N Jones, Dr I Kersbergen, Professor J Kirby, Professor R Kirkham, Professor W Kitchen, Professor D Lambert, M Lourido Moreno, Dr A Majid, Dr S Marsh, Professor M Marshall, Professor C Miller, Professor R Mokaya, Professor T Moore, Professor N Morley, Professor D Mowbray, Dr C Nic Dháibhéid, Dr S D North, Professor J Oakley, Professor G Panoutsos, Dr L Preston, Professor D Robinson, Professor L Robson, T Rocha, H Sadiq, Professor M Strong, R Sykes, Professor C H Tan, Professor K Taylor-Jones, Professor M T Vincent, Dr N Walkinshaw, C Williams, Professor H Woolley.
Secretary:	J Strachan
In attendance:	E Allan, S Callan, K Clements, A Davison, A Morgan, Dr E Smith, K Sullivan, D Swinn, S Taylor, Professor A Tiwari.
Apologies:	The Senate received apologies from 17 members.

Welcome

The President & Vice-Chancellor (P&VC) welcomed members to the meeting. There were 2 new members of Senate. Alix Morgan was in attendance for item 5, Proposal for New School Names (Phase 2), and Professor Ashutosh Tiwari was in attendance for item 6.2, an update on Translational Innovation Centres.

The President and Vice-Chancellor apologised for any inconvenience caused by the late decision to move the meeting online. The University Secretary explained the circumstances leading to this decision.

1.   Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

1.1   It was recognised that there would be a number of actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest arising from the Proposal for New School Names at item 5, below, and, while individual members were invited to declare any such conflict if they wished, the Chair acknowledged the matter as potentially affecting all staff and student members of Senate. It was agreed that all members could participate in the discussions and decision making process.

1.2   In addition, it was recognised that there would be a number of actual conflicts of interest arising from the report of the Senate Nominations Committee at item 12, below, which recommended the

appointment or reappointment of a number of members of Senate to University committees, who would not take part in decisions relating to themselves.

1.3   No further conflicts were declared.

1.4   <u>Pre-Submitted Questions</u>

1.4.1   It was highlighted that nine questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting, which would be covered under the relevant items.

1.4.2   Two further points had been raised after the deadline for pre-submitted questions, in relation to the Safeguarding Policy; these had been responded to directly. Actions arising from the points raised were highlighted under the Senate Education Committee report (see minute 9.8a).

1.4.3   A question submitted by Sarah Hale (SH) in advance of the previous meeting had been deferred due to time constraints. The question related to whether or not guidance shared by the University Secretary with Senate in December 2023 constituted legal advice. The question, which sought (i) clarification on which elements of the Guidance for Senate Members constituted legal advice, (ii) details of the source of any legal advice contained within the document and (iii) the status of the document had been circulated to members in conjunction with the response from the University Secretary and alongside the meeting papers. At the request of SH, the question and the response were read out at the meeting.

It was highlighted that:
- The guidance did not constitute legal advice (it was the advice to Senate members from the University Secretary) but it was produced on the basis of appropriate legal advice
- The status of the document was that it was advice for Senate members and it would be shared as part of the induction material for new senators.

1.4.4   A pre-submitted question, which linked to the response to SH's questions (see minute 1.4.3), asked for clarification on how the setting up of an informal Senate group to discuss matters relating to Senate business outside meetings risked undermining good governance. There was concern that some members might feel that this did not differ materially from Senate members discussing issues with others outside of meetings (e.g. in breaks), which was routine and could be seen as supportive of good governance.

It was clarified that there was no issue with discussing Senate business during breaks or over a coffee. That was different from setting up an on-line discussion group with a self selecting set of Senate members to discuss Senate business outside of meetings, which was the situation that had given rise to the advice being issued. The risks to good governance were set out in the guidance, shared with Senate on 14 December 2023. The guidance highlighted that the way Senate operated should respect the Nolan principles of standards in public life (openness and accountability); members of Senate declared conflicts of interest, received the same information at the same time and were party to the same discussion at Senate meetings. That discussion and any decisions taken were minuted. That was the way Senate and all its committees should operate.

An informal on-line discussion group of self-selecting members of Senate did not operate in that way. Members of that group may be unduly influenced by other members of that group who hadn't declared a conflict of interest. It also meant that members of Senate were receiving different information and were party to different discussions and the sub-set of members in any informal discussion group would invariably not have the benefit of subject or professional experts on a particular topic, who were present at Senate to present papers and supporting evidence, and to answer questions. All members of Senate (or any committee) had the right to receive the same

information at the same time to inform discussions and decisions in their formal meetings. Similar principles were followed in relation to Council, whereby any information sent to members of Council individually, or any subset of them, was provided to the Secretariat and shared with all of Council. In addition, there were no agendas or minutes and the content of any informal discussions were not reported, which again did not align with the Nolan Principles of accountability and openness.

1.4.5 There was an in depth discussion during which several additional questions and further concerns were raised. Among these were the perception that the guidance was an attempt to constrain discussion amongst, and freedom of speech of, Senate members. Following discussion, it was agreed to set up an information session for Senate members, with appropriate external governance experts, to clarify some of the distinctions made and advice given and to answer any other question senators may have. **[Action by: JS]**

2. President & Vice-Chancellor's Report to Senate

The President & Vice-Chancellor (P&VC) presented the report and provided updates:

2.1 <u>University of the Year</u> – The University was maximising exposure of three award wins at the WhatUni Student Choice Awards (University of the Year, Student's Union of the Year, and Best Student Life).

2.2 <u>General Election</u> – At the time of reporting, polls pointed to Labour winning the General Election, but there was no detail on Labour's plans on financial sustainability for the sector. Labour Shadow Science Secretary Peter Kyle MP had pledged that the "war against universities will stop" if Labour won, which was a welcome message. Labour's manifesto said it "will continue to support the aspiration of every person who meets the requirements and wants to go to university and it recognised that the higher education funding settlement "does not work for the taxpayer, universities, staff, or students" and that Labour would "act to create a secure future for higher education." Labour had also committed to setting ten-year research and development budgets to provide stability for researchers and investors; this was again welcome but detail about the level of funding was to be confirmed.

2.3 <u>Graduate Visa Route Retained</u> - The independent Migration Advisory Committee had published the outcome of its rapid review of the Graduate Visa Route, which recommended that the Route be retained in its current form. There were some concerns in the sector that a commitment to remove the Graduate Visa Route might be included in the Conservative manifesto and that Labour would come under pressure to make a similar commitment. However, the Conservative manifesto did not make such a commitment and the Conservative commitment to cap worker and family visas excluded students. The University would continue to make the case to the next Government for policies that attracted and recognised the value of international students to the UK.

2.4 <u>Reportable Event</u> – The University Secretary shared an update on a reportable event that had arisen since the time of circulating the papers, which was relevant to the business of Senate. The University had notified the Office for Students.

2.5 A pre-submitted question from the Students' Union expressed concerns about partnerships and projects with external companies with links to the defence sector and referred to statements made by the Sheffield Campus Coalition for Palestine (SCCP), which stated that the university received more funding from arms companies than any other university in the UK.

Senate was reminded of a recent communication from the Vice Chancellor to all staff and students, which addressed specific questions and concerns, including the concerns raised by the Student Union at Senate, about research partnerships and projects with external companies with links to the

defence sector. Senate was updated on the details of that communication, which explained how the University ensured its research collaborations were appropriately conducted within the law and in line with the University's values.

With regard to the statements made by the Sheffield Campus Coalition for Palestine, it was noted that their definition of an 'arms company' included partnerships with many engineering and energy companies that did not primarily work in defence. The assertion that the University received more funding than any other university for these partnerships had also not been independently assessed and may not be accurate.

The university had many partnerships, in research and education, with hundreds of companies, agencies, charities, campaigning organisations and academic institutions around the world. The University upheld academic freedom, and empowered staff and students to identify and initiate collaborations with partners across the globe that furthered research, innovation and international understanding. These partnerships could be on any subject within the law, and in collaboration with partners in any country that was not the subject of UK sanctions. It was recognised that not everyone would agree with or support this approach. However, it was important to note that this work was not undertaken to directly support other governments, and it had no links to specific global wars or conflicts.

2.6   During discussion the following was noted:
● Some of the concerns expressed related to partnerships with aerospace, engineering and manufacturing companies that worked in or with the defence/security sector. It was noted that the majority of research with industrial partners in these areas focused on improving manufacturing processes and materials that boosted productivity and sustainability.
● A question was raised about Senate's role in providing advice to Council on research. It was noted that responsibility for research sat with Senate and it delegated responsibility for the oversight of research to the Senate Research and Innovation Committee. Following discussion it was agreed to give further thought to the role of Senate and the responsibilities of Council with regard to research in the context of governance at the university. **[Action by: JS]**
● Some students had expressed concern about potential disciplinary action in relation to their previous involvement in the encampment on campus. It was noted that the University's position had been clearly communicated to students; it was clarified that no action would be taken against anyone no longer involved in the encampment.

2.7   A pre-submitted question highlighted that the Vice Chancellor had previously assured Senate that the University would not pursue a recruitment policy based on maximising the number of recruits from the China postgraduate student market and that its 'dynamic' recruitment strategy would not include the lowering of IELTS scores or academic entry requirements. Concern was raised that subsequent presentations to staff directly contradicted this and clarification was sought on the University's position.

Senate was assured that the University had not lowered academic or English language requirements for any PGT programmes this year. The approach to staged admissions had changed this year, in light of the sector wide international recruitment position/challenges and this applied to all prospective postgraduate applicants and aligned with Russell Group peers. These changes related to deadlines and timescales for prospective students to apply, receive and respond to offers and pay tuition fee deposits. It was reiterated that Academic & English language requirements remained unchanged. It was also clarified that when confirming students this year, there was no flexibility applied to the English language requirements; this was explicitly stated in the Confirmation &

Clearing Strategy approved by UEB. Details were shared of the level of flexibility that could be applied.

During discussion, it was again highlighted that this position stated did not align with messages being relayed on the ground and there was a clear opposition of statements; details of the source of the conflicting message were shared. It was agreed to speak directly with the colleague sharing these messages to ensure the University's agreed approach was being accurately communicated. **[Action by: RS]**

3.   Matters Requiring Approval

3.1   Senate received and noted a summary of the matters for which Senate's formal approval was sought.

4.   Schools Governance Review

4.1   The University had commissioned the Halpin Partnership to conduct a review of governance. The review aimed to: understand the changes required to support the move to a Schools based model; ensure that governance arrangements met external legal and regulatory requirements and mitigated associated risks; ensure that governance arrangements continued to meet the needs of the business and ambitions as stated in the Education Strategic Delivery Plan.

4.2   Senate received and noted a presentation on the review. It was highlighted that Halpin conducted extensive research, including interviewing colleagues, conducting a number of focus groups and carrying out benchmarking. They made a number of recommendations, including:
- The implementation of committee governance structures within faculties and schools that connected directly with the University pillars and mirrored UEB and/or Senate.
- The implementation of clear and consistent terms of reference for each committee, including roles and responsibilities of membership.
- The standardisation of University policies and processes, particularly those directly linked to regulatory compliance.
- Changes to Senate, to provide more clarity on the role of Senate and ensure its membership was representative.

4.3   Senate received a detailed update on work to progress each of the recommendations. The following was highlighted:

4.3.1   Committee governance structures and ToRs - Work had begun with the creation of consistent terms of reference for School Education Committees and School Research and Innovation Committees. In support of this, work was underway to develop a core business cycle with suggested business plans and report templates.

4.3.2   University policies and processes - Proposals were being developed for shared institutional definitions, including for Policies, Processes, Regulations, Procedures and Codes of Practice. There would be a phased approach to the implementation of this work and supporting guidance would be provided.

4.3.3   Changes to Senate - Halpin recommended a shift in the membership of Senate, such that it retained existing skills and experience, with priority being given to representation from faculty and school committee members. They also stated that the current published powers of Senate lacked clarity and transparency and recommended that this be addressed as part of the changes in governance. Advance HE was supporting this work, which built on the work of Advance HE in their role as

external facilitator to the Council Effectiveness Review. The proposals would be presented to Senate and Council in October 2024. It was noted that the outcome of this work would require amendments to the Regulations of Senate; this work would take place over the course of 2024/25 to take effect in either 2024/25 or 2025/26.

4.4   During discussion, Senate shared feedback on the review and the following was highlighted:

- In terms of the committee governance structures, there was currently a lot of variability at school level and there needed to be clarity around where accountability and responsibilities sat. It was noted that accountability and responsibility would sit with the School Executive and there should be clear and strong links between the School Executive and the relevant committees. There would be regular check-ins at school level as this work progressed to ensure understanding.
- A query was raised about the timeframe for the proposed changes to Senate, which were felt to be compressed given the potential extent of the changes, and concern was raised about the timeframe Senate would be given to consider proposals before the October meeting; it wasn't possible to pre-empt the Advance HE proposals at this stage, or how substantial the proposals would be but Senate was assured that the proposals would be shared as early as possible (two weeks before the next meeting). **[Action by: JS]**

5.   Proposal for New School Names

5.1   Senate considered the proposed 'Phase 2' school names for the new schools to be formed by September 2025. The 'Phase 1' school names, being those to be established by September 2024, were considered by Senate on 20 March 2024, with final Council approval given on 25 March 2024. 'Phase 2' faculties and departments had worked together over the last few months to review options and propose names for the new schools. Following Senate's consideration, each proposal would be considered for ratification by Council on 8 July 2024.

5.2   In response to a pre-submitted question about the rationale for the naming of the School of Languages, Arts and Societies and whether the use of the term 'societies', rather than 'cultures', signalled a shift in disciplinary emphasis for the new school, it was noted that the new name did not reflect any change in the teaching and research in the school. A range of names had been considered by the faculties and departments and this was felt to acknowledge the broad range of research and teaching and encompass more explicitly what the school did.

5.3   A pre-submitted question raised concern that there had been inconsistencies in student engagement in the Phase 1 School Names decision making process and asked what steps the University had taken to rectify this for the Phase 2 names. The University recognised that all Phase 1 Schools had engaged with students in different ways, but it was satisfied that all students were given a range of opportunities to engage with the proposed changes. It was critical that opportunities for student engagement continued to be offered in determining the proposals for the Phase 2 names. In all cases, undergraduate and postgraduate students were invited to actively feed back their views through written mechanisms and existing local Student Staff Committees; additional Focus Groups were also offered where appropriate and all the views offered by students were fed into the overall decision making process.

5.4   Senate approved the proposed 'Phase 2' school names noting that each proposal would be considered for ratification by Council on 8 July 2024.

6.   Research

Senate received and noted reports and presentations and on the following:

6.1   Centres of Research Excellence

6.1.1   Senate received and noted a report and accompanying presentation, which outlined the outcomes of the Research Entities review as part of the strategy delivery plan for Research. It was highlighted that the University had undertaken a review of >300 research entities. Senate received an overview of the hallmarks of an effective research entity and was updated on the review process, the findings of the review, proposed internal designations, proposals for new governance processes for Faculty and University Research Centres, proposals to establish a new University Research Centre and communications.

6.2   Translational Innovation Centres

6.2.1   Senate received and noted a report and accompanying presentation, which outlines a proposal to establish a new governance structure for the Translational Innovation Centres through the establishment of a Steering Board which would provide a mechanism for effective communication and engagement and enable the centres to play an active role in the delivery of the innovation pillar. Senate was updated on the various Translational Innovation Centres at the University, examples of exciting developments and overview of how the Translational Innovation Steering Board would operate.

REPORTS FROM STATUTORY BODIES

7.   Report on the Proceedings of the Council
        (Meetings held on 25 March 2024 and 29 April 2024)

        Senate received and noted the Report on the Proceedings of the Council.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

8.   Report of the Senate Academic Assurance Committee
        (Meeting held on 5 June 2024)

        Senate received and noted the Report of the Senate Academic Assurance Committee (SAAC) noting that there were no specific matters requiring approval.

8.1   It was highlighted that SAAC's role was to provide assurance that quality and standard were met across research, education and the student experience. One way SAAC did this was by examining select activities to assess whether the University had met external regulatory requirements as well as its internal commitment to continuous improvement. At its meeting in June 2024, SAAC examined two areas of activity: the University's work on research culture and its apprenticeship provision. The following was highlighted:

        a) Research culture – It was noted that SAAC was assured that the University had a sector-leading understanding of research culture. It was further assured the University had set a clear and appropriate agenda via its Research Culture Action Plan. While PGRs were not directly within the scope of the work on research culture, with separate work to enhance the PGR experience, SAAC was keen to see further thinking to ensure that these separate but related workstreams aligned. This should help to ensure both that PGRs benefit from broader work on research culture and avoided any duplication of effort. Another area where SAAC encouraged further thinking was around how best to evidence the effectiveness of the University's work on research culture. It was difficult to reliably measure research culture, which was why the Deputy Vice President for

Research and the research culture team were keen to give this increasing attention, something SAAC fully supported. Research culture was an increasingly important focus for the sector and was therefore an area to which SAAC may wish to return in the near future, especially as and when the rules relating to the People, Culture and Environment limb of the next REF exercise became clear.

b) Apprenticeship provision – It was noted that SAAC was assured that the provision was high quality and was improving. An Ofsted inspection of the University's apprenticeship provision was anticipated in the next few months. This would be a critical test of the quality and consistency of our provision, and SAAC may wish to revisit this topic after the outcome of an inspection; SAAC was assured that sensible preparations had been made for an inspection. Apprenticeships represented only a small proportion of the University's education provision. Inevitably, there were varying levels of understanding of apprenticeships, including in key governance forums. This had the potential to lead to regulatory risk, if for example those governance forums failed to bring challenge and scrutiny to the quality and consistency of our apprenticeships. Further thought should therefore be given to ensure staff in key governance forums were supported to bring appropriate scrutiny and challenge to senior stakeholders responsible for apprenticeships.

9. Report of the Senate Education Committee
(Meeting held on 22 May 2024)

9.1 Senate received the report, noting that it included several recommendations relating to: the Safeguarding Policy; the oversight of fair means; a new Academic Appeals Policy; a new policy for Academic Tutoring; a new Assessment Retention Policy Statement; new General Regulations for Apprenticeships; updates to the General Regulations; and new, significantly amended, and closed programmes, title changes and new exit routes approved by Faculties between 26 January 2024 and 10 June 2024.

9.2 Questions relating to the Safeguarding Policy:

9.2.1 Two points relating to the Safeguarding Policy were raised (after the deadline for pre-submitted questions); Senate noted a summary of the points raised and the response shared directly with the member before the meeting, which confirmed that the points raised had given rise to two proposed amendments to the wording in the policy (see minute 9.8a).

9.3 Pre submitted question relating to the Academic Tutoring Policy: It was important to ensure that academic tutors were sufficiently resourced within individual School workload allocation models to effectively discharge their responsibilities to individual students. Noting minimum expectations outlined in the Policy in terms of meeting frequency, tutee communications, and training, a question was raised about whether guidance would be provided for expected baseline allocations per student.

9.3.1 During discussion it was highlighted that there had been an extensive pilot around academic tutoring, as part of which the question raised had been considered. After consideration, baseline workload allocations / specific tutee ratios had not been stipulated at this stage, due to the level of variation. The expectation would be that schools should consider appropriate allocations locally. The Academic Tutoring Oversight Board would oversee and review the success of academic tutoring through a range of both staff and student considerations; details of how this would be worked through would be agreed once the Oversight Board was established. It was highlighted that baseline workload allocations / specific tutee ratios may be revisited in the future; it was agreed to keep this

under review and to update Senate on the progress and implementation in 12 months (June 2025). **[Action by: MV]**

9.3.2   During further discussion, it was highlighted that one of the key drivers for the new Schools Structure was to reduce workload and while the policy was welcomed, concern was raised about the potential additional workload burden these new processes may put on academics, for example in terms of training requirements. The Vice President for Education acknowledged the concerns and agreed that the University needed to ensure that training was not onerous. Senate was assured that the University would be mindful of the points raised and that the administrative burden would be as light as possible. It was agreed to provide an update when the SEC reported back on the implementation of the Policy in June 2025. **[Action by: MV].**

9.4   Pre-submitted question relating to the Degree Algorithm: Concern was highlighted about the rationale behind the decision to calculate all degree classifications using the new algorithm, rather than awarding the best result calculated by the old or new system, which had been an approach taken in the past. Concern was raised that students would need to request a review if they believed they may be due a higher award using the previous classification mechanism, and it was felt that some students could miss out on a higher degree classification and that the process was potentially inequitable for a number of reasons, including that some students may be travelling and that the level of advice received from different departments may vary.

9.4.1   As had been discussed at Senate in June 2023, when Senate had received a presentation on the new degree algorithm, it was highlighted that, based on analysis of data going back to 2016, the final degree classification for around 95% of students would not be impacted by the new algorithm. Around 3.5% of students would receive a lower classification using the new calculation, with the remainder receiving a higher classification. Dual running of the new and old systems for an extended period of time had been considered but, on balance, this would not be proportionate, for such a small percentage of students, given that it would require Exam Boards to run dual processes for all students over several years.

9.4.2   Instead, a simple process had been put in place for students to request a classification check once their results had been published. Senate was assured that this had been communicated extensively through a number of channels and would be clearly signposted on the student results page, visible when students viewed their classification. This required submitting a short google form, which required minimal information. It was noted that students would have a 15 working day window from the date of publication of their degree classification to submit the form; this was to allow time for the check to be processed and any change to be enacted ahead of the Graduation Ceremony.

9.4.3   Further concern was raised by the Students' Union about students potentially being disadvantaged by the requirement to submit a rechecking request and a query was raised about whether the process had been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment. Senate was assured that there would be scope to accept late requests for checking and consideration would be given to extenuating circumstances. It was agreed to look into whether there was anything more departments could be doing to raise awareness of the classification check request process.

9.5   Pre-submitted questions raised by the Student's Union relating to changes to Regulation 53 of the General Regulations, relating to Attendance Monitoring: It was highlighted that some employers and placement providers asked for attendance monitoring data to be shared with them. Assurance was sought that this data would not be shared and that data protection policies would not be breached. A further question highlighted that the policy did not detail home student regulation and it was felt that procedures for all students (home and visa sponsored students) should follow the same process.

9.5.1   It was noted that the addition to Regulation 53 was to clarify that the University was required to report on the attendance of students funded through/by the Student Loans Company/Student Finance, which reflected established practice.

9.5.2   Senate was assured that attendance monitoring data would not be shared without explicit consent from the student. It was noted that attendance monitoring data was processed and managed in line with GDPR requirements and met the University's data and privacy policies. This data was not shared with employers or placement providers unless the student requested it or provided consent to do so. When responding to a direct request to provide a reference commenting on attendance, this information could be drawn upon but the data would not be shared.

9.5.3   It was clarified that the University policy related to monitoring attendance and engagement for both visa sponsored and home students. This had been in place from the academic session 2023/24, and ensured that the University was compliant with external regulatory requirements for a number of bodies including UKVI, Student Finance/Student Loans Company and the OfS. For (home) students receiving funding from the Student Loans Company, the University was required to report students who were deemed withdrawn so that they were paid the right amount of student finance; otherwise they may be overpaid and experience financial hardship when they had to pay it back. The inclusion of Regulation 53b brought the Regulations in line with the practice that had been in place for home students from the 2023/24 academic session. It was highlighted that information was provided about attendance monitoring in the Terms & Conditions on Accepting an Offer, at the point of registration and on the web pages and was signposted by schools and departments.

9.5.4   It was noted that the Vice President for Education was happy to have discussions with the SU Officers about specific cases offline.

9.6   Academic Appeals Policy: During discussion, concern was about the section in the Academic Appeals Policy relating to the evidence required from students to substantiate grounds for appeal (section 4a), which set out the circumstances under which the University would consider a request for a review of an assessment result or classification. A point was made that a student may not be able to provide evidence in circumstances where they suspected an error or misconduct and did not have access to the information required to substantiate the grounds. Following discussion, it was agreed to review past cases and provide clarification to Senate on what would be expected in these circumstances. **[Action by: MV].**

9.7   Following discussion Senate:
a)   Approved the revised Safeguarding policy, subject to the following amendments:
   i.   The word 'prejudice' would be removed from section 1c.
   ii.   The correction of a typographical error in section 1e (additional "the").
b)   Approved the recommended actions relating to the oversight of suspected unfair means (Section 2).
c)   Approved the new Academic Appeals Policy, noting the action agreed at minute 9.6.
d)   Approved the new policy for Academic Tutoring, noting the action agreed at minutes 9.3.1 and 9.3.2.
e)   Approved the new Assessment Retention policy statement.
f)   Approved the new General Regulations for Apprenticeships.
g)   Approved updates to Regulation XIV: General Regulations and Regulation XV: General Regulations for First Degrees.
h)   Approved the new, significantly amended, and closed programmes, title changes and new exit routes approved by Faculties between 26 January 2024 and 10 June 2024.

10.   Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Committee
       (Meeting held on 8 May 2024)

10.1   Senate received and noted the report which included updates on; the Research Excellence
       Framework (REF); the work of the Research Governance Sub-Committee; the work of the University
       Early Careers Researcher Committee; the work of the University Postgraduate Researcher
       Committee; and the work of the Research Culture Steering Board.

11.   Report of the Senate University Research Ethics Committee
       (Meeting held on 15 May 2024)

11.1   Senate received the report and approved a minor change to the 'General Principles and Statements'
       section of the Ethics Policy Governing Research Involving Human Participants, Personal Data and
       Human Tissue.

12.   Report of the Senate Nominations Committee
       (Meeting held on 4 June 2024)

12.1   Senate approved the report, which set out the Committee's recommendations for the appointment
       and re-appointment of Senate representatives on University committees.

12.2   In response to a pre-submitted question about what specific actions had been taken to improve the
       representation of staff from various backgrounds across university committees, Senate noted a
       detailed update on the work the University had been undertaking to maximise the diversity of
       committees, including not only protected characteristics but also matters such as diversity of
       thought and lived experience, e.g. socio-economic background. It was highlighted that all
       committees were actively encouraged to reflect on the balance of membership at least annually,
       when they confirmed their terms of reference, and through the annual review of committee
       memberships. The University was also looking at ways to strengthen the process of providing
       feedback to unsuccessful nominees and sharing other opportunities colleagues might consider as a
       way to build their experience and harness their interest in supporting institutional governance with
       a view to a future appointment, e.g. by getting involved in school or faculty level groups first.

REPORTS FROM JOINT COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND COUNCIL

13.   Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee
       (Meeting held on 7 March 2024)

13.1   Senate noted an update including details of the nominees agreed by the Committee for the
       conferment of Honorary Degrees at Degree Congregations in 2024. It was agreed to share the names
       of the nominees with Senate outside of the meeting; it was noted that the names of the nominees
       were not for wider sharing (outside of Senate) at this stage. **[Action by: JS]**

OTHER MATTERS

14.   Student Formal Procedures Cases: Report to Senate 2022-23

14.1   Senate received and noted the report, which summarised Student Formal Procedure Casework in
       the previous academic session (2022-23). The report updated Senate on the volume and nature of
       activity in each area (Appeals, Complaints, Discipline, Fitness to Practise, Progress, and external
       review by the OIA).

15. Military Education Governance Review

15.1 Senate considered the report, which outlined the case for change in respect of the current governance framework for Military Education and matters relating to the wider armed forces communities of both Universities and proposes a new structure.

15.2 Senate noted the report and:
   a) Approved the proposed new MEC governance framework and next steps, as set out in the report.
   b) Approved the revised 2024-25 MEC Terms of Reference and membership.

16. Returning Officer's Report

16.1 A report on the outcome of the Senate elections for six vacancies on Senate was received and noted.

17. Report on Action Taken

17.1 It was noted that no action had been taken on behalf of the Senate since the last meeting.

18. Major Research Grants and Contracts

18.1 A report listing major research grants and contracts awarded since the last meeting of the Senate was received and noted.

19. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
(Meeting held on 20 March 2024)

19.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2024 were approved.

20. Dates of Meetings of Senate in 2024-25

20.1 Senate noted the dates for the 2024-25 meetings, which had been shared on the agenda.

21. Other Business

21.1 On behalf of Senate, the Chair thanked members whose term of office on Senate were due to end this academic year for their valued contribution to the Senate agenda.