

Minutes Meeting of the Senate

Date: 25 June 2025

Present: The President & Vice-Chancellor in the Chair

Professor T Baldwin, Professor P Bath, Professor S Beck, Professor A Beckerman, Professor B Birdi, Professor R Blakeley, Professor L Brooks, Professor S Brown, Dr J Burr, Professor M Carre, Professor J Clegg, A Clements, Dr C Codina, J Coley, Professor J Derrick, Professor S Fitzmaurice, Professor J Flint, Professor G Gee, L Glover, Dr V Halliday, Professor R Hand, Professor S Hartley, Professor P Hatton, Dr F Henshaw, Professor S Hincks, T Hodgson, Professor J Hodson, Professor V Kadiramanathan, Dr I Kersbergen, Professor J Kirby, Professor R Kirkham, Professor R Lawthom, M J Lourido Moreno, Dr S Marsh, Professor M Marshall, Professor F Matthews, Professor M Mayfield, Professor F McLeay, Professor T Moore, Professor B Morgan, Professor N Morley, Dr S D North, Professor J Oakley, Dr L Preston, Professor S Renshaw, T Rocha Lawrence, Professor S Rushton, Professor M Strong, Dr N Stubbs, R Sykes, Professor M T Vincent, Dr N Walkinshaw, Professor H Woolley.

Secretary: D Swinn

In attendance: E Allan, M Borland, S Callan, K Clements, S Omondi, A Priestley, K Sullivan, S Taylor.

Apologies: The Senate received apologies from 24 members.

Welcome

The President & Vice-Chancellor (P&VC) welcomed members to the meeting. One new member had joined Senate since the last meeting.

1. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

1.1 It was acknowledged there would be a number of conflicts of interest or potential conflicts of interest arising from item 11, Report of the Senate Nominations Committee, where the recommendations related to individuals' appointments on other committees. No other conflicts were declared.

1.2 Pre-Submitted Questions

1.2.1 Two questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting, which were covered under the relevant items. It was noted that one other query had been resolved offline; this was also covered under the relevant item.

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

- 2.1 The President & Vice-Chancellor (P&VC) presented the report, which provided information on key current and forthcoming developments in the policy environment and against each of the themes in the University's Strategic Plan. The report was taken as read and attention was drawn to the following updates and developments since the written report was prepared:
- 2.2 A pre-submitted question, submitted on behalf of the Students' Union (SU), highlighted a noticeable increase in queries from international students about the implications of the Immigration White Paper and asked what steps were being taken to ensure that reassurance about this was being proactively communicated to students, particularly international students.
 - 2.2.1 It was reported that the University had already shared information about how students could seek advice and support through existing student communication channels and the International Student Support, Advice & Compliance (ISSAC) team had updated their webpages with relevant information. However, it was important to note that the White Paper outlined future legislative proposals, without timelines, and did not reflect current UK immigration law or guidance. The University would share further information with international students when this detail was confirmed. In the meantime, the University would continue to work to ensure its international student community felt welcome and valued on campus and in the city. It was highlighted that, in the run up to the White Paper's publication, business leaders across South Yorkshire sent an open letter to the Home Secretary outlining the importance of international students to our communities, and local MPs and the South Yorkshire Mayor had signed a city-wide statement showing their support for international students and the positive difference they make. The University would continue to do all it could to provide reassurance to its international community and advocate for them.
- 2.3 QS Top 100 - It was highlighted that, as already communicated to Senate members, the QS World University Rankings 2026 had recently been announced and the University was very happy to share that it had regained its position in the top 100 (ranking 92nd in the world and 15th in the UK). Noting previous discussions about the QS Top 100 at Senate over the previous year, this was a positive and welcome result. The P&VC thanked colleagues, and their teams, for their help and support to achieve this result, which recognised the University's strengths as a globally leading university. The University would need to continue this work to maintain and improve on this outcome and this would require sustained effort from everyone.
 - 2.3.1 There was a brief discussion about the potential impact of the upcoming external academic reviews on reputation, a key metric for the QS Top 100. During discussion, it was noted that while there was no evidence that there was any reputational impact of carrying out these reviews. It was also acknowledged that there was a risk of disruption, and as a result there was potential reputational risk. To mitigate this, it was important to be proactive in communicating clearly, and as soon as possible, about why these reviews were being conducted and to adopt a thoughtful and inclusive approach. As an example, it was highlighted that the Management School had engaged widely (early on and thoughtfully) with internal and external stakeholders, including external accreditors, who had been supportive.

- 2.4 Impact Strategy Action Plan - It was highlighted that the University recently published its new Impact Strategy Action Plan, which set out a clear roadmap to embed its Impact Strategy into everyday practice. The Impact Steering Board had agreed institutional priorities for the plan, aligned to the Research and Innovation strategic priorities for the next two years, drawn from the existing vision, to produce the highest quality research to drive intellectual advances and address global challenges, and to deliver innovation and commercialisation that supported growth for the region and the country. It was noted that the Deputy Vice-President for Innovation had already been in touch with FDRIs, SDRIs and School Impact Leads with the action plan and, alongside the Assistant Director of Researchers and Culture and the University Impact Lead, would be attending Faculty Executive Board meetings in the coming months to discuss the action plan and the University could support schools to implement it as part of their plans for Impact.
- 2.5 Freedom of Speech - Further to the update in the written report, it was noted that the OfS had published its guidance relating to [freedom of speech](#). It was highlighted that all universities had an obligation to assess whether their practices were compatible with this guidance. Therefore, this would be reviewed by the University's Free Speech Group as the University prepared for the new legal provisions and OfS requirements taking effect from the beginning of the next academic year. Any amendments to the Code of Practice would need to be approved by Council. It was anticipated that Senate would be provided with a more detailed update on all of this work in the autumn.
- 2.6 Admissions/Recruitment Update - Senate received an update on the latest Student Recruitment position, based on figures received by UEB as of 15 June. It was highlighted that with the June UCAS deadline now passed and most undergraduate applicants having made their firm/insurance choice, the University had received the vast majority of responses to UCAS offers issued. While PGT Overseas applications remained down when compared to the previous year, there had been a very slight improvement on the previous reporting period. The June and July pre-application undergraduate open day bookings were up by 18.3% when compared to the previous year. Many of these bookings were generated by the undergraduate acquisition campaign, which began in March, and had driven significant online engagements. In all areas, the University continued to do all it could and the effort of staff was appreciated, but the recruitment picture was still extremely challenging, as it was for the sector as a whole. It was highlighted that, at this stage, there was no evidence that the University regaining its position in the QS Top 100 would make a significant impact on overseas recruitment; work would continue and Senate would be updated on any developments.
- 2.7 In response to a question about whether plans for the Student Mental Health, Counselling and Therapies Service and the Disability & Dyslexia Support Service to come under joint leadership would impact the provision of these services, it was clarified that the University was committed to maintaining the quality of these services and there were no plans to reduce either service.

3. Matters Requiring Approval

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

4. Proposal to Change the Name of the School of Allied Health Professions, Nursing & Midwifery

- 4.1 It was noted that the Faculty of Health had recently launched an undergraduate Pharmacy degree with the first cohort starting in 2025/26. In order to maximise opportunities for future portfolio growth and meet the requirements of the General Pharmaceutical Council, the accrediting body for the course, which was strongly supportive of the University's plans for pharmacy provision, the Faculty wished to change the current school name to provide greater external recognition of the broader portfolio of health care workforce training now provided.
- 4.2 Senate supported this proposal and, in accordance with Regulation II (6.2.2) and (6.2.3), whereby Council reserved to itself the power to approve the establishment or abolition of faculties or departments and their titles and other major changes in the University's organisational structure, Senate's advice would be to recommend to Council the approval of:

The change of a school's name from the School of Allied Health Professions, Nursing and Midwifery

to

The School of Allied Health Professions, Pharmacy, Nursing and Midwifery, to take effect from 15 October 2025.

5. Governance Matters

5.1 Scheme of Delegation

- 5.1.1 Senate received a detailed report on proposed changes to the Scheme of Council Delegation (Regulation III), specifically relating to the delegation of Senate's powers, which Senate was asked to provide advice on before the proposals were presented to Council for formal approval at its July 2025 meeting. This followed changes to Senate's current powers (set out in Regulation IX) which had been discussed previously at Senate and approved by Council in November 2024 as part of the recommendations from Advance HE following its review of elements of academic governance to support the move to Schools. At that time, it had been expected that a wider, externally supported review of the whole of Regulation III would be undertaken in time for Senate and Council's consideration by the end of 2024/25. However, that wider review would now take place in 2025/26, once a permanent University Secretary has been appointed.
- 5.1.2 In the meantime, it was necessary to make some amendments to the delegations from Senate to ensure that they were aligned to Senate's revised powers, were clear and consistent, and could be included in the 2025/26 University Calendar and taken into account from the start of the 2025/26 academic year, including in Committees' annual review of their terms of reference as necessary. It was noted that the delegations had been developed reflecting advice from the Advance HE report and further feedback from key internal

stakeholders, including having been reviewed and supported by Senate's principal committees.

- 5.1.3 The vast majority of delegations had not changed at all and reflected existing and previous practice in a clearer and more consistent, user-friendly way, linking back to the specific power of Senate, other than where specific proposals had been made to further delegation of some activities from Senate to its committees. These proposals were consistent with the AdvanceHE report, particularly the suggestion to increase formal delegations from Senate to improve the speed of decision-making, and the principles to delegate as far as possible, and to avoid unnecessary escalation by empowering the appropriate groups to make and implement decisions, which were set out in the revised preamble text to the Scheme.
- 5.1.4 It was highlighted that one query had been received in advance of the meeting which had flagged up a lack of clarity in Appendix 1 (Example Activity). The document had been amended and the updated appendix circulated to members and replaced in the Senate papers prior to the meeting.
- 5.1.5 During discussion some concerns were raised about the proposal to further delegate some of Senate's powers. The following key points were noted:
- i. The principal changes related to the ability of the Senate Education and/or Research & Innovation Committee to approve certain Regulations and policies, with Senate retaining power to approve the overarching Regulations, and the ability of the Research Ethics Committee to approve minor and routine amendments to the Ethics policy without requiring formal Senate approval. By delegating some of these powers, it was intended that some of Senate's capacity and expertise could be redirected to focus on other substantive areas of business.
 - ii. One member, who strongly opposed the proposals, urged senators not to advise Council to approve the changes as drafted without further consideration, highlighting that the delegation of the power to approve amendments to certain regulations to Senate's committees was, in their opinion, a dilution of Senate's powers that represented a significant risk. The member highlighted the potential for Chair's action being taken by the Chairs of Senate's Committees and proposals being presented without due consultation, as further risks. It was felt that this took away from Senate its ability to test proposals before they were approved, removing an important layer of scrutiny, which Senate was stated to be uniquely placed to offer, given the breadth and depth of its membership. This raised the question of Senate's ability to provide assurance to Council on these matters and risked Senate becoming only an oversight body.
 - iii. Other members welcomed the move towards greater subsidiarity and the opportunity for Senate to focus on using its time to add more value and focus on discussion of substantive items that would support Senate in discharging its primary role of maintaining and receiving assurance over the quality and standards of education, teaching and research and providing assurance to Council over the same.
 - iv. It was highlighted that in all cases, Senate retained overall responsibility for all of the activities it delegated and which would be reported by committees to the Senate for assurance purposes, and for providing onward assurance to the Council. This approach was consistent with that adopted by the Council, for example with respect to the University's Financial Regulations which were delegated to the Finance Committee. Senate would retain the power to seek assurance on and/or refer back any matters as it saw fit.

- v. One of the aims of these changes was to move towards greater subsidiarity where this was felt to be beneficial and appropriate, to improve the speed and agility of decision making and facilitate decision making by the bodies closest to the activities. As with any delegated powers, it would be important to ensure that appropriate processes and checks and balances were in place to ensure that Senate's committees were reporting appropriately on the exercise of their delegated powers.
- vi. As an example of how Senate's time was not currently being used as well as it could be, it was highlighted that the Senate Education Committee report to this meeting, which included proposed changes to various regulations, was over 150 pages, including a significant number of proposals related to non-material wording changes, for example to change the word 'department' to 'school'. However, in light of the concern raised, it was noted that with regard to the proposed delegation referred to at 4.1.8 of the report, to delegate decision-making responsibilities for internal institutional education and research policies to Senate committees, there was a willingness to revisit this and to clarify the extent to which this might apply.
- vii. Over the course of the discussion, several questions were raised about how the administration and governance of these matters would work in practice and how Senate could contest any decisions; it was noted that all matters relating to delegated powers were and would be routinely reported to Senate as part of the existing standard reports from its committees; for example this could include details of any proposals relating to delegated powers included as appendices. This also reflected the approach taken for Council and reporting from its committees, including Senate. In terms of contesting decisions or referring matters back to a committee for further consultation / consideration, Senate held the power to do this in all cases relating to its delegated powers, as was the case for Council. The role of Senate was to scrutinise decisions made on its behalf by its committees and to hold them to account for those decisions and their implementation.
- viii. A point was made about a recent report about governance failings at another University noting that one of the issues identified related to the delegation of powers. It was noted that in that instance, a policy had been approved by a body without the necessary delegated authority and it appeared that there had been little or no consideration as to whether the appropriate group was being asked to approve that proposal. The University's governance structures and delegations were sufficiently clear that the risk of such a scenario occurring here was deemed to be low.

5.1.6 Recognising the strength of the views expressed, both in support of and in opposition to the recommendation, and that there appeared to be scope for a reworked proposal to be supported by Senate, whilst also recognising that ultimately this was a matter for Council to approve, it was agreed:

- (i) to record that Senate does not recommend the proposal to Council at this time;
- (ii) to share Senate's feedback with Council (via the draft minutes); and
- (iii) to refine the proposals based on the feedback, including clarifying how delegated decisions would be reported to Senate, with a view to bringing an updated proposal to the October Senate meeting. **[Action by: DTS]**

5.2 Senate Standing Orders

- 5.2.1 Senate received a report on the annual review of the Senate Standing Orders, with proposed amendments to the Senate Standing Orders provided for consideration (shown in tracked changes). It was noted that there were no substantive changes proposed and the amendments reflected current practice and/or regulations. Key changes included an update to clarify which regulations set out Senate's powers and the delegations of Senate's powers, updates to reflect the accepted ways Senate (and Council) worked in practice, and how Senate's new membership had changed the quoracy arrangements.
- 5.2.2 Senate approved the updates to the Senate Standing Orders.

REPORTS FROM STATUTORY BODIES

6. Report on the Proceedings of the Council

(Meetings held on 26 February, 23 April and 1 May)

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

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

7. Report of the Senate Academic Assurance Committee

(Meeting held on 3 June 2025)

- 7.1 Senate received and noted the Report of the Senate Academic Assurance Committee (SAAC), noting that there were no specific matters requiring approval. It was highlighted that at its last meeting SAAC undertook a deep dive on academic tutoring to assess how the Academic Tutoring Policy that Senate approved in 2023/24 was being embedded and socialised across the University. This included student and staff engagement with the new policy; approach; the effectiveness of the governance structures underpinning it, with particular regard to the Academic Tutoring Oversight Board (ATOB); and the extent to which the work complemented other institutional activities, such as implementation of the Access and Participation Plan (APP). SAAC was assured that the initial roll-out of the Academic Tutoring Policy had been effective, laying clear and strong foundations for a consistent and effective institutional approach.
- 7.2 It was also highlighted that, having conducted a deep dive on Apprenticeships in 2023/24, SAAC undertook a second assessment as part of the current year's Business Plan. This followed an inspection by Ofsted of the University's apprenticeship provision in November 2024. The focus this time was the University's response to the inspection and related work. The deep dive also enabled SAAC to revisit some areas where it was unable to reach a definitive assurance determination last year. SAAC was pleased to note that Ofsted has assessed the overall effectiveness of the University's apprenticeship provision assessed as "Good" and had spoken positively about governance arrangements. SAAC also welcomed work SAAC welcomed recent work to enhance the student voice in apprenticeship provision.
- ### **8. Report of the Senate Education Committee**
- (Meetings held on 13 March, 15 May and 29 May 2025)
- 8.1 Senate received the Senate Education Committee (SEC) report, noting that there were specific matters requiring approval relating to: the new Policy on Marking Criteria; the new

Policy on Leave of Absence and associated amendments to the General Regulations; the updated Degree Outcomes Statement; amendments to the General Regulations on Intellectual Property; adoption of the opt-in model for “with industrial placement year” programmes; new, significantly amended, resumed and closed programmes and title changes; amendments to four of the General Regulations, and significantly amended programmes arising from programme simplification. The following was highlighted:

- 8.2 New Policy on Marking Criteria - Senate received and noted a recommendation for a new Marking Criteria Policy for Taught Students. This responded to several key drivers, including the need for the University’s assessment criteria to accord to the FHEQ level to which it was teaching and clarity where different FHEQ levels were being taught on the same module and, importantly, student voice. The National Student Survey (NSS), including the contextual comments, had consistently shown that students perceived a need for greater clarity on marking criteria.
- 8.2.1 It was noted that considerable stakeholder engagement had fed into the development of the policy; in addition, attention was drawn to its alignment with the inclusive education agenda, and the benefits to greater transparency and consistency in assessment it could deliver. It was highlighted that additional materials would be developed to support implementation of the policy.
- 8.2.2 In response to a pre-submitted question, which queried whether the Marking Criteria Policy for Taught Students had been progressed through School and Faculty Education Committees prior to coming to Senate, and sought clarification on which SEC sub-committees had recommended the policy, it was noted that the Policy had been developed by the University’s Assessment Working Group, an ongoing group with cross Faculty representation, with input from students and from Professional Services colleagues who supported assessment.
- 8.2.3 It was highlighted that the draft policy was formally discussed and recommended to SEC by its Academic Programmes and Quality Standards Sub-Committee, the Student and Academic Experience Sub-Committee and was subsequently discussed and endorsed by SEC. School Directors of Education had also been briefed on the topic in their regular monthly meetings and by their Faculty Directors of Education. It was noted that, if Senate were to endorse the Policy, it would be shared, along with support and guidance for implementation at Faculty and School level. The Faculty Education Committees would assume oversight of implementation, which would be the responsibility of School Education Committees, which would organise and manage their taught academic programmes in line with university policies, in accordance with their respective terms of reference.
- 8.2.4 During discussion, some examples of how the policy would be implemented in practice were discussed. Several queries and points were raised. The key matters covered were:
- i. Reflecting on the importance of the golden thread through governance structures, one member shared some anecdotal feedback on the policy from their school/faculty and suggested that there was a need to ensure that the policy, and the detail of how it would be implemented, was owned at a local level. The member sought assurance that this would take place.

- ii. The University recognised the importance of ownership of the policy and Senate was assured that, following Senate approval of the policy, work would commence on the implementation phase, with ownership at local level.
- iii. Marking criteria varied across the organisation. It was important to move to a student centred approach for different forms of assessment, and therefore there was a need to have institutional level guidance around programme level and assessment level criteria. There would be support processes in place to develop this locally, but it was important to arrive at a common understanding of the framework and local level responsibility for its application.
- iv. Several members welcomed the policy, on a practical and principle level, noting that it was sufficiently general to develop locally.
- v. Some members shared feedback from some students about their experience of inconsistencies with marking criteria. The new policy would address this and would be particularly helpful for dual-award students and for facilitating greater consistency across disciplines in Schools.
- vi. It was noted that there were existing areas of good practice that could be shared with students and across the organisation.
- vii. The VP for Education thanked colleagues for their feedback and thanked the SU Officers and the many other students involved in the working group to develop the policy.

8.2.5 Senate approved the policy in principle as an institutional framework, which would facilitate an implementation phase with further discussions at a local level to take place as part of that process.

8.3 New Policy on Leave of Absence and associated amendments to the General Regulations XIII, XIV and XV - It was noted that SEC had received and discussed the proposed policy on Leave of Absence. It was noted that this reflected much of the current practice with the following key additions: introduction of a 2 year time limit for leaves of absence, although this could be exceeded in exceptional circumstances; stipulation of the roles that could approve leaves of absence; and a stipulation that the student would return on the current version of the programme structure.

8.3.1 It was noted that the new policy would support decisions being made in the best interests of the student, given that students undertaking lengthy periods of leave of absence often struggled when transitioning back into study. In response to a query about the wording of the policy in relation to the stipulation that the student would return on the “current” version of the programme structure, it was agreed to review the wording to make it clear that this meant the version of the programme in place at the time the student returned.

[Action by: MV]

*[Post meeting note 25-07-01: The wording at 9.3 has been amended to read: The University amends programmes and modules over periods of time. A returning student will join the ~~current~~ version of the programme **that is being delivered when they restart their studies** and may therefore take different modules to the ones **they** originally expected. In the event that the student’s original programme is no longer available, the student may be offered a different programme in line with the Student Protection Plan.]*

8.3.2 Subject to the amendment at 8.3.1, Senate approved the New Policy on Leave of Absence and associated amendments to the General Regulations XIII, XIV and XV as set out in the report.

- 8.4 Updated Degree Outcomes Statement - Senate received and approved the updated Degree Outcomes Statement for publication, noting that the University was looking closely at awarding gaps and how they could be addressed. For example, colleagues were exploring how the University could use the academic tutoring system to support groups of students. The report would also be shared with Council in July.
- 8.5 Amendments to the General Regulations on Intellectual Property - Senate received and approved proposals, as set out in the report, to amend the General Regulations on Intellectual Property, which had been recommended to SEC by the Senate Research and Innovation Committee (SRIC), to clarify when IP would be invested in the University.
- 8.6 Adoption of the opt-in model for “with industrial placement year” programmes, aligning fully with the standard institutional model for 2026-27 entry - Senate approved the adoption of the opt-in model, noting that this addressed the matter of the University currently having two models in operation, one for a year of employment or year abroad and one for an industrial placement year. The Schools that would be affected by this had been consulted and had been supportive of the move to a single offer.
- 8.7 New, significantly amended, resumed and closed programmes and title changes approved by Faculties between 17 January and 21 May 2025 between 22 May and 11 June - Senate approved the new, significantly amended, resumed and closed programmes and title changes approved by Faculties as set out in the report. In response to concern raised about the level of overseas students on some of the programmes reported as suspended, specifically in landscape / sustainable architecture, it was noted that colleagues had closely scrutinised this before making the recommendations. In the case of the School of Architecture and Landscape, significant work had been undertaken to review and consolidate a range of programmes with very similar titles in such a way as to retain their attractiveness.
- 8.8 Amendments to the General Regulations - Senate received and approved a proposal to make amendment to the following General regulations:
- Regulation XII: General University Regulations
 - Regulation XIV: General Regulations for First Degrees
 - Regulation XV: General Regulations for Higher Degrees, PG Dips and PG Certs
 - Regulation XXI: General Regulations relating to the Discipline of Students
- 8.8.1 During discussion about the proposed changes to Regulation XXI: General Regulations relating to the Discipline of Students, a Senate member from the SU requested clarity on some of the terms/language used in the list of actions that could constitute misconduct and whether some of these terms were defined. Specifically, in relation to the proposed addition of ‘behaviour which includes any action that encourages, assists, or facilitates misconduct by others.’ noting that the SU felt it was important to define the meaning of ‘encourage’ and ‘assist’. During discussion, it was highlighted that, because there was scope for the exact meaning of these terms to vary, depending on the context of the accusations, it could be unhelpful and confusing to try to define these terms. Senate was assured that there were a relatively small number of discipline cases each year, all of which were investigated

thoroughly and entailed the University applying a reasonableness test on the circumstances and facts of the case, as was appropriate in any such quasi-legal process..

- 8.8.2 During further discussion, it was acknowledged that, currently, Senate did not receive detailed updates on student discipline and appeals cases, other than the summary contained in the annual report on student procedures. It was agreed that, in order to provide Senate with assurance and sufficient oversight of how the relevant Regulations were being applied in practice, the way in which these cases were reported to Senate would be reviewed. **[Action by: MV]**

- 8.9 Significantly amended programmes arising from programme simplification - Senate noted that at a dedicated additional meeting (on 29 May 2025), the Committee discussed the significantly amended programmes arising from programme simplification, as approved by faculties. The Committee agreed to recommend these for Senate approval with the assurance that effective Faculty scrutiny had taken place. Senate noted that, at the request of SEC, the President & Vice-Chancellor, acting on behalf of the Senate, had approved this recommendation.

- 8.9.1 The reason for the out of cycle Chair's approval request was to ensure the University was able to provide clear, accurate and up to date information at an Open Day held prior to the meeting of Senate, thereby supporting recruitment and compliance with consumer protection legislation and OfS Registration Conditions C. This was also reported to Senate formally in the Report on Action Taken at item 14 on the Senate agenda. It was highlighted that this had been scrutinised at Faculty and SEC level and SEC had been assured that the principles agreed by Senate, when it approved the Framework for Undergraduate Programme Design (March 2025), had been applied appropriately.

- 8.9.2 During discussion, a member highlighted that an exception to the framework appeared to have been made (in relation to the BSc programmes in Biological Sciences and Biomedical Science); and while the rationale for this was understood, clarification was sought as to whether this was the case. A concern was raised about this not being reported to Senate accurately or clearly. It was clarified that the instant example related to portmanteau programmes. These were provided for within the Framework and SEC had been assured that the Faculty's proposals for the two Biosciences programmes were aligned with it. Nevertheless, for the avoidance of doubt it was agreed that the position would be checked offline and an update provided as appropriate. **[Action by: MV]**

9. Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Committee

(Meeting held on 7 May 2025)

- 9.1 Senate received and noted the Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Committee (SRIC) noting that there were several matters requiring approval. It was noted that SRIC had received an update on the University's internal preparations for REF2029. This included the annual stocktake of research outputs which was about to conclude. This year saw the first parallel system for impact case studies. This had been a positive process in that it had led to the creation of a robust pipeline to aid prioritisation and resource allocation but it had also highlighted the need for greater focus in order to achieve the level of 4 star cases needed to achieve the required outcomes for impact. Senate was asked for the support of its members in prioritising this work.

- 9.2 Senate approved the following proposals, noting that details of the rationale for the proposals, including tracked changes versions of policies and regulations, were contained in the Report:
- a. Proposed amendments to Regulation XV General Regulations for Higher Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates, which had been updated to streamline, correct and clarify the regulation.
 - b. Proposed amendments to the University Intellectual Property Policy and associated amendments to Regulation XXII, to clarify the University IP Policy in relation to Student IP.
 - c. The revised University policy on Good Research and Innovation Practice. This had involved a re-write of the previous policy. The refreshed policy was much shorter and more accessible and had been brought up to date to be clearer and reflect current working practices and expectations. It was noted that this had been a significant piece of work, on behalf of Senate, the Vice President for Research and Innovation thanked all colleagues involved in developing the policy.
 - d. Proposed amendments to Regulation XIII - General Regulations, to provide clarity on part-time hours, for the avoidance of doubt, and to formalise a route some Faculties have been using informally, to ensure it is transparent and available to everybody equally.

10. Report of the Senate University Research Ethics Committee

(Meeting held on 14 May 2025)

- 10.1 Senate received and noted the Report of the Senate University Research Ethics Committee (SUREC). It was highlighted that the Committee had received a report relating to the new Academic Misconduct policy for taught students and how this aligned with the procedure for investigating potential breaches of the Research Ethics Policy for UG and PGT students. A number of actions had been agreed, including updates to reference the Ethics Policy requirements and ethics breach process.

11. Report of the Senate Nominations Committee

(Meeting held on 9 June 2025)

- 11.1 Senate received the report of the Senate Nominations Committee (SNC) and approved the following:
- a) A recommendation to amend the Senate Nomination Committee's (SNC) membership, specifically to reflect recent changes in the University's EDI governance arrangements whilst ensuring that the membership of SNC would always include representation from the Council Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee. It was noted that the membership document had not been available in the meeting papers on Google Drive, and had since been added.
 - b) Recommendations relating to Senate representation on committees as set out in the Report.

REPORTS FROM JOINT COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND COUNCIL

12. Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee

(Meeting held on 6 March 2025)

- 12.1 Senate noted an update on the nominees agreed by the Committee for the conferment of Honorary Degrees at Degree Congregations in 2025.

OTHER MATTERS

13. Student Formal Procedures Cases: Report to Senate 2023-24

- 13.1 Senate received and noted the report, which summarised Student Formal Procedure Casework in the previous academic session (2023-24). 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).

14. Report on Action Taken

- 14.1 Senate received and noted the report which provided a summary of one instance where, on the recommendation of the Senate Education Committee (SEC), the Chair of Senate had taken action on behalf of Senate; this had been reported on in detail in the SEC Report.

15. Major Research Grants and Contracts

- 15.1 Senate received and noted the report, which listed major research grants and contracts awarded since the last meeting of the Senate.

16. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(Meeting held on 19 March 2025)

- 16.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2025 were approved.

17. Matters Arising on the Minutes

- 17.1 There were no matters arising not covered on the agenda.