Minutes — Meeting of the Senate

Date: 15 October 2025

Present: The President & Vice-Chancellor in the Chair

Dr Asha Akram, Yuliia Artemenko, Professor Thomas Baldwin, Aliza Bano, Professor Peter Bath, Professor Andrew Beckerman, Professor Adrian Bingham, Professor Briony Birdi, Professor Ruth Blakeley, Professor Laurence Brooks, Professor Sarah Brown, Dr Jennifer Burr, Dr Janet Chamberlain, Professor Heidi Christensen, Anna Clements, Dr Charlotte Codina, Dr SJ Cooper-Knock, Professor Lizzy Cross, Professor John Derrick, Professor Kate Dommett, Professor Andrew Fleming, Professor John Flint, Professor Robert Freckleton, Professor Graham Gee, Dr Laura Gray, Professor Russell Hand, Dr Neil Harris, Professor Sue Hartley, Professor Paul Hatton, Dr Francesca Henshaw, Professor Stephen Hincks, Professor Tom Hodgson, Professor Jane Hodson, Professor Rob Howell, Aryan Islam, Amy Jeffries, Professor Visakan Kadirkamanathan, Professor Janine Kirby, Professor Richard Kirkham, Professor Koen Lamberts, Professor Rebecca Lawthom, Professor Stephen Livingstone, Johanna Marriott, Dr Sam Marsh, Dr Chris Martin, Professor Felicity Matthews, Professor Martin Mayfield, Professor Fraser McLeay, Professor Tracey Moore, Professor Ben Morgan, Professor Caoimhe Nic Dháibhéid, Dr Siobhán North, Professor Jeremy Oakley, Sam Omondi, Dr Robyn Orfitelli, Professor George Panoutsos, Dr Abigail Parrish, Professor Cathy Shrank, Professor Mark Strong, Rob Sykes, Professor Mary Vincent, Professor Pirashanthie Vivekananda-Schmidt, Emma Wake, Professor Helen Woolley, Dr Karine Zbinden

Secretary: D Swinn

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

Apologies: The Senate received apologies from 7 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 No conflicts were declared.

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

1.2.1   No questions were submitted in advance of the meeting. Several queries after the deadline were received; these were covered under the relevant items.

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:

2.1.1   External environment: The government had announced the partial reintroduction of maintenance grants for students from underrepresented backgrounds. This was a move the sector had been seeking for some time, though the offer would be targeted to priority subjects aligned with the Government's Industrial Strategy and not across the board. The policy would be paid for by imposing a levy on international student fee income, a move that would have the most significant impact on research-intensive universities, and could cost the University as much as around £10m per year depending on the final approach taken by government. The University, in liaison with its peers, had been pushing against the levy and continued to engage with its advocates in Parliament and beyond to highlight the impact this move would have on the roles universities had in supporting economic growth. The University had been working hard to offer alternative funding models for the reintroduction of maintenance grants, and reflecting on what more it could do to influence the political context in which these decisions were being made, e.g.concern about immigration levels and the benefit of universities not being felt or perceived across society).

2.1.2   League Tables: The report set out the details of positive developments regarding QS world rankings, the Guardian league table, and the Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide. The University had been informed that it had dropped to 108 in the THE World University Rankings, down from 98 last year. This was against the trend seen in every other UK and global ranking, where the University was moving in a positive direction. The University would receive a full breakdown of its results and would undertake an analysis, as was done for all league tables, to understand the movement. It was reassuring that nationally, the University's rank in the UK remained 12th. The rankings would be made public on 9 October.

2.1.3   Briefing staff on the University's recruitment and finance position: A summary update on University's recruitment and finances had been shared with all colleagues via the President & Vice-Chancellor's September all-staff email, which explained that the University expected to be close to its rebased recruitment targets for this academic cycle. It also confirmed the intention to return to a financial surplus in 2027-28. This was explored in more detail at the all-staff briefing on 13 October, which was attended by over 2,600 colleagues, when further explanation was provided on this cycle's targets compared to previous years, and the impact on the University's total student population compared with previous years. It was highlighted again why the University needed to make savings and the rationale for revising its student number targets. Colleagues were also talked through the final student recruitment position this year and student population projections for the next few years, as well as plans to move back into underlying surplus by 2027-28.

2.2 <u>Defence and Security</u>: In response to a query about an article in the Sheffield Tribune over the summer, which alleged that the University was involved in a defence research project linked to the development of new nuclear weapons, clarification was provided that the University had robust oversight of this, and all defence projects, which must be aligned with the University's Defence and Security Framework and a risk-based scoring system, which triggered escalation to a dedicated UEB sub-group to ensure they aligned with the University's stated position and if appropriate, projects were escalated directly to UEB. It was also noted that the specific project in question did not involve the manufacture of deployable components of weapons.

3. Matters Requiring Approval

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

4. National Student Survey

4.1 Senate received and noted a detailed presentation on the outcome of the 2025 National Student Survey (NSS), which was shared with members after the meeting.

4.2 It was highlighted that this was the most important source of student views available, being the largest survey of students, which captured student feedback on a more diverse range of areas than other exercises. While it was often perceived in terms of being a source for league tables, this was most important to the University as a source of student voice.

4.3 Headlines: This was the third consecutive year of ranking first in the Russell Group on aggregate performance; ranking 1st in three of the seven themes and no lower than 4th. On aggregate the University ranked 7th in Universities UK (UUK), an improvement of 14 places from 2024. At an institutional level, the positivity score had improved for every question, with an aggregated positivity score of 86.7% (an increase of 2.1% from the previous year). The University was above the UUK average and the Office for Students (OfS) benchmark for each theme; however, in five themes the difference was smaller than last year. The University ranked 3rd in the UUK for Student Voice.

4.4 Senate received and noted an overview of performance in each of the 7 themes, and performance against the OfS Benchmarks. While the improved performance was welcome it was important to recognise that there was more work to do. The results showed that there had been improvement in areas of focus and this work needed to continue, particularly with regard to Assessment & Feedback in all areas.

4.5 It was encouraging to note that the data showed a closer alignment of overall student satisfaction across schools, demonstrating good progress to ensure a consistent student experience across the University. However, there were no schools without some substantial student dissatisfaction and this needed to be addressed; colleagues were encouraged to look at the data for their areas at a granular level.

4.6 In response to a question about Assessment and Feedback practices across the sector and whether the University had taken any learning from this, it was highlighted that the

University was undertaking active benchmarking in this regard. One learning point so far was that some institutions had more guidance on the structure of assessments and feedback and this was something the University was starting to discuss.

5.   Good Research and Innovation Practices (GRIP)

5.1   Senate received and noted a detailed presentation on the revised Good Research & Innovation Practices (GRIP) policy, which was shared with members in the meeting papers, including a link to the policy. The GRIP policy set out how the University expected its researchers to carry out their research and innovation (R&I) projects, drawing on the principles of honesty, rigour, transparency, care and respect, and accountability from the Concordat to Support Research Integrity. It applied to anyone undertaking R&I under the auspices of the University. It was noted that the policy had been revised from scratch and this had been a significant undertaking; on behalf of Senate, the many colleagues involved in this were thanked for their hard work.

5.2   Key Changes: Senate was updated on key changes to the policy. Not only had it been brought up to date, new sections had been added to reflect developments in the R&I landscape. The word count had been significantly reduced, the content made clearer and structured so that it was more easily accessible and supplemental guidance and links to other resources and support services had also been provided.

5.3   It was highlighted that it was also clearer to see what the University expected of researchers in terms of whether or not it was mandatory to follow specific parts of the policy by using the terms 'You must' where it was mandatory and 'You should' where it was recommended that researchers follow a part of the policy; this would apply in circumstances where researchers could justify not doing so, or only doing so partially.

5.4   Next Steps: Two short myDevelopment training modules were being created, one for researchers new to the University and another for researchers familiar with the old policy. An interactive guidance tool would also be developed. It was noted that the policy would be reviewed annually by the Research Integrity Steering Group.

5.5   Senate welcomed the revised policy and commended colleagues for their work on it. During discussion the following points were noted:

    i.   It was agreed to review the consistency of reference to the University ('University of Sheffield' as opposed to 'The University of Sheffield').

    ii.   Data Storage - In response to a query about how and where data was stored it was confirmed that there was work to do on this. Research generated vast amounts of data and there were known challenges in terms of specific data sets. The University also recognised the challenge of how long data should be retained. A team of colleagues was working on this. Colleagues were reminded that data storage was becoming increasingly expensive and challenging and colleagues were reminded that costs for data storage arising from projects must be included in Research Bids / business cases.

    iii.   Student Accessibility - In response to a query about whether there were plans to make the policy accessible to students, it was clarified that training was currently provided for PGRs; the University was looking to widen this to other student groups.

    iv.   In response to a query about the rationale behind and definitions of the use of the terms 'you must' and 'you should' (see minute 5.3) and concern that 'you should'

rather than 'you must' had been applied to some Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) considerations, it was clarified that 'you must' had been applied to areas of the policy where there were legal, regulatory or funder obligations. However, this was an evolving process and as elements of the policy became embedded they could be changed to 'you must'.

v.   Following a brief discussion about linking statements on defence research to sustainability and the feeling that there was a need to look at this in a wider context, it was acknowledged that there needed to be a broader discussion on this and further thought would be given to facilitating that discussion. **[Action by: SH]**

6.   Scheme of Delegation

6.1   It was highlighted that in June 2025, advice was sought from Senate on proposed delegations of the revised powers of Senate, which were approved during 2024-25. At that time some concerns were raised about certain elements, for example powers to approve Regulations and institutional policies and some questions were raised about matters like Chair's Action, how delegation works in practice and Senate's role and ability to seek and receive assurance about work and action taken on its behalf. The version received in June reflected AdvanceHE's previous recommendations and the spirit of that review and its findings as well as detailed engagement and feedback with and from Senate's committees and key professional services stakeholders involved in those areas of work.

6.2   In response to the concerns raised in June 2025, the proposals had been reviewed, revisited and updated. Senate noted that all the changes and detailed responses to the questions raised at the previous meeting were covered in the accompanying report, which included an appendix with further information about various types of activity and decision, how they might come about, clarification of processes, where decisions may be made and how Senate received recommendations or reports and assurance.

6.3   Senate was updated on the key changes since June, noting that in relation to approval of the Regulations (of Senate) and institutional policies, only minor or inconsequential amendments would now be delegated to Senate's committees. It was also highlighted that some additional wording had been included to explain the parameters of Chair's Action and more accurately state how this works in practice.

6.4   Recognising that ultimate responsibility for approving amendments to this Regulation sat with the Council, Senate was invited to offer advice insofar as the amendments related to Senate's remit.

6.5   In response to a question about how a minor amendment was defined, it was clarified that this would be administrative amendments, rather than material changes to a policy or regulation, for example changes to role titles, numbering or alignment of wording with legal or regulatory guidance.

6.6   In response to a question about Regulation IX 1.1.7, which stated that there would be "further delegation to Senate's committees" and whether this could be more specific, it was clarified that this related to all of Senate's committees. It was highlighted that this was a general power and so all of Senate's committees had some role in performing the monitoring, maintaining and enhancing activity. The elements of activity a particular committee would be looking at would depend on that committee's specific remit; this was clearly set out in the Terms of Reference for each committee, which Senate itself approved.

6.7 A question was raised about Regulation XI 2.1, which related to circumstances where the University may need to consider withdrawing a Degree. Noting that Senate was informed of these decisions after the event, as part of normal reporting, clarification was sought about the level of Senate involvement in the scrutiny of this process, given the impact of such a decision on the graduate. It was suggested that Senate should have oversight of these considerations at an earlier stage. It was clarified that the withdrawal of degrees was exceptionally rare (as far as the University Secretary's Office was aware there has only been one instance of this in over ten years). Senate was assured that a robust detailed procedure was in place (which Senate approved in 2020). This was a four stage process that was comparable to other similar student processes, comprising an investigation into the issues or concerns raised, a panel hearing (if required), a decision making stage (if required), and a final right of appeal to the Senate Appeals Panel. The affected student would also be entitled to seek a further external review from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

6.8 It was suggested that, in its advice to Council in relation to the delegation of powers, Senate might note a difference from corporate governance per se, in that there was significant variation in the seniority of colleagues amongst the membership of Senate and that many of Senate's committees were chaired by senior leaders or members of UEB.

6.9 Senate welcomed the update and recommended the amendments to both Regulations III and IX to Council, subject to highlighting the point raised (at minute 6.8) to Council.

7. Senate Annual Academic Assurance Report

7.1 Senate received and noted the Senate Annual Academic Assurance Report, which SAAC drafted on Senate's behalf and which set out the activities of Senate and its committees in 2024/25 to maintain and enhance the University's academic standards and quality in relation to education and research, to identify and manage academic risks, aspects of the student experience relating to these areas and, at a broader level, to assure the effectiveness of academic governance. Senate was updated on the background to the report, feedback received from Council on last year's report and the report's high level conclusions; the following was highlighted:

7.2 Background - Council was responsible for overseeing quality and standards in education and research. It delegated this function to Senate and as such it required assurance on an annual basis that Senate effectively and robustly fulfilled its delegated function to maintain and enhance academic quality and standards. The annual report was the main way Senate provided Council with that assurance. The report aimed to assure Council that academic governance at the University of Sheffield was robust and effective, and in line with the external expectations to which the University was subject, thereby facilitating the University's regulatory compliance.

7.3 Feedback from Council on the previous year's report - Academic assurance at the University had been an area of significant activity over the last few years. In part this had been to respond to the increasing expectations on Council to seek and receive such assurance , but it also recognised the turbulence of the external environment, including the changing regulatory landscape. Last year's SAAA Report had been commended by Council members and in light of this minimal changes had been made to the format and approach of this year's report.

7.4　High-level conclusions - Based on its own activities in 2024/25 and those discharged through its committee structure, Senate was assured that:

    i.　Academic governance continued to be robust and effective;

    ii.　Academic quality and standards were being maintained, as evidenced by compliance with relevant external regulatory requirements;

    iii.　Appropriate work was being undertaken and/or was planned to enhance academic quality and standards as part of the University's commitment to continuous improvement;

    iv.　Relevant academic risks were being identified and effectively managed; and

    v.　The ongoing work to implement the recommendations of the Advance HE Report regarding the membership and Powers of Senate should result in an academic body that has a clearer grasp of its devolved responsibilities and greater capacity to dedicate to both internal and external strategic issues regarding Education, Research, and the broad student experience.

7.5　It was highlighted that while the report found that academic governance continued to be robust and effective, it also identified areas for improvement.

7.6　During discussion, concern was raised about some of the assurance determinations in the report, with some suggestions made for alternative forms of wording or additional caveats or qualifications to the statements as drafted and these were discussed:

    i.　Regarding the assurance determination relating to the work on the membership and Powers of Senate (see minute 7.4v), one member raised concern about the stated expectations that this work 'should' result in the stated outcomes and assurance that Senate would be more effective, given that these recommendations had only recently been implemented and in light of the views expressed by members of Senate at the time that Senate was invited to advise Council on the recommendations. It was noted that along with this assurance determination, all the feedback from Senate had been shared with Council in detail and, recognising it had not been unanimous, the results of Senate's vote on the matter had also been shared with Council.

    ii.　Undergraduate Programme Design - Regarding the assurance determination relating to the expectation that the adoption of the Framework for Undergraduate Programme Design would, amongst other things, 'result in a portfolio that was more attractive to students', a member questioned how Senate could be sure this would have such positive effects in the absence of any evidence; while it was recognised that Senate had ultimately voted to adopt the Framework, members had also raised concerns about this; therefore, the member proposed to remove this statement from the report. It was highlighted that the report did not disregard the concerns and feedback raised by Senate at the time, all of which had been shared with Council at the time and was summarised in the annual report.

    iii.　During further discussion, it was clarified that the SAAA was a record of the work Senate undertook and the decisions it had taken in 2024-25 and it aimed to capture the decisions and conclusions Senate arrived at on these matters. In effect it was a restatement of decisions already taken, but it also captured where there had been disagreements so that Council was aware of this, including, where necessary, being reminded of the outcome of any votes, which were also reported to Council at the

time of the decision, through the Senate minutes. It was clarified that Senate's assurance recognised that a majority voted in favour in both of the instances raised and that Senate operated on the principle of consensus or collective decision-making. It was also highlighted that Senate should be careful not to be seen to reverse or undermine decisions it had already made without having had cause to debate them again and in the absence of further relevant information or data.

iv. Degree Algorithm - Classification review Update - One member indicated that, while they were supportive of the change to the Degree Algorithm and agreed it was simpler, they were concerned about the assertion that the it introduced greater fairness; which the member felt was a mathematically flawed statement depending on the use of median or mean in the calculation. It was clarified that the statement about fairness related to consistency for all students and introducing a system that was being applied uniformly across the institution. On this basis, the reference to 'fairness' would be replaced with 'consistency'. **[Action by: CD]**

v. Deep Dive into PGR Experience - The Report noted that an increased number of students were submitting within the fee-paying period; one member highlighted that there were concerns in their faculty about new measures introduced around submission in this period having a disproportionate adverse impact on international students. A query was raised about whether an Equality Impact Assessment had been undertaken on the impact of the new measures. It was noted that EIAs were not part of SAACs processes. There was no enforcement of the new processes at PGR level; these measures were an aspirational KPI and colleagues had been working with schools on this, including providing support for PGRs. It was noted that there was also a self help tool for international PGRs.

vi. It was agreed to review the report to ensure that the language used in relation to attainment/awarding gaps was consistent. **[Action by: CD]**

7.7 Senate agreed that, subject to the feedback at minute 7.6 being shared with Council, which was noted to be the case as standard practice, the Annual Academic Assurance Report 2024-25 be submitted for consideration at Council's November meeting without further amendment, noting that a Joint Sub-Group of Council and Senate would be convened in the intervening period to discuss the report. Dr Sam Marsh requested that their concern over the assurance statements relating to Senate's powers and membership, the framework for undergraduate programme design and the degree algorithm be recorded explicitly in the Minutes.

REPORTS FROM STATUTORY BODIES

8.   Report on the Proceedings of the Council
Meetings held on14 July 2025)

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

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

9.   Report of the Senate Academic Assurance Committee
(Meeting held on 9 September 2025)

9.1 Senate received and noted the Report of the Senate Academic Assurance Committee (SAAC) and:

    a. Approved SAAC's updated Terms of Reference and Membership for 2025/26.
    b. Approved SAAC's Business Plan for 2025/26, noting that a future report would include more detail on planned deep dives.

10. Report of the Senate Education Committee
(Meeting held on 17 September 2025)

10.1 Senate received the Senate Education Committee (SEC) report, noting that there were specific matters requiring approval relating to: new, significantly amended, resumed and closed programmes and title changes; formal closure of low recruiting programmes which had been suspended for 2025-26 entry; and formal closure of programmes of study that involved replacement study abroad for 2026-27 entry onwards. The following was highlighted:

10.2 <u>New, significantly amended, resumed and closed programmes and title changes approved by Faculties between 30 May and 8 September 2025</u> - Senate approved the new, significantly amended, resumed and closed programmes and title changes approved by Faculties as set out in the report.

10.3 <u>The low recruiting programmes</u> - Senate approved the formal closure of programmes which had been suspended for 2025-26 entry, as set out in the report.

10.3.1 During discussion about the closure of low recruiting programmes the following was noted:

    i. In response to concern raised about the number of low recruiting programmes proposed for closure that included philosophy, Senate was assured that the School of History, Philosophy and Digital Humanities supported these proposals and the broader strategy for philosophy.
    ii. In response to a query about the accuracy of data to support the proposals, Senate was assured that significant work had been undertaken to ensure the proposals were based on accurate student number projections and market demand. It was highlighted that student numbers on each programme changed as the application and offer process progressed.
    iii. Senate was assured that processes and governance structures were now in place to ensure that school level leadership teams were aware of these proposals at the appropriate stage.
    iv. There was a brief discussion about the extent to which the University felt it had a broader responsibility to protect niche areas of study despite low recruitment, particularly those with national importance and/or wider strategic value. It was noted that, because no university had a regulatory obligation or duty to protect any subject and had to act in their own strategic best interests, this was an area of significant concern across the sector and amongst groups such as learned societies. The Vice-President for Education and other senior colleagues were already engaged at a national and regional level in these discussions. While recruitment to some areas of study might not support a standalone degree, the University would be

looking to find ways to retain these disciplines, which may need to be provided in different ways or through innovative pathways.

10.4   Programmes of study that involved replacement study abroad: Senate approved the formal closure of programmes of study that involved replacement study abroad for 2026-27 entry onwards, as set out in the report.

10.4.1 In response to a query about whether this would impact the degree codes students could choose at a UCAS level, it was noted that this represented very small numbers of applicants and the recruitment team were confident that having a single clear institutional offer was more attractive to prospective students.

10.5   Updates to two matters arising from the June meeting were provided as follows:

10.5.1 Minute 8.8.2 from the June 2025 meeting: It had been agreed to review the way in which Senate received information and assurance on student discipline and appeals cases, with a view to ensuring sufficient oversight of how the relevant Regulations were being applied in practice. It was noted that colleagues were considering what reporting could be provided to best meet Senate's needs and work would be done to find the best way to report cases in the future. **[Action by: MV]**

10.5.2 Minute 8.9.2 from the June 2025 meeting: The minute, which related to programme simplification and the operation of the framework, was read out in full. In June, a query had been raised about an exception being made to the framework in relation to the BSc programmes in Biological Sciences and Biomedical Science and concern had been raised by a member that Senate may have been misled about the way in which exceptions were being applied. It was reported that this matter had been investigated by the Interim University Secretary, in liaison with the Chair of SEC and the SEC Secretary, and followed up in detailed email correspondence with the member who had raised the question. Senate noted that the conclusion of this process had been that this was not a case of anyone misleading Senate, knowingly or otherwise, and neither was it an issue with the record per se. Rather, it had been unclear to Senate, in June, why these programmes were permissible under the Framework, which Senate had previously approved. The response given to the query at Senate in June set out to explain why this was the case and how it had been accepted and agreed. After further checking, a more detailed rationale had been provided to the member in email correspondence; this was read out in full at the meeting. Colleagues recognised that the information shared with Senate could have been made clearer at the time. The Secretary to SEC and the Interim University Secretary had discussed how to ensure that these kinds of cases were clearer for members of Senate in future SEC reports and, more broadly, work was underway to consider how best to facilitate greater assurance for members of Senate over the work of its committees, beyond simply the reports and appendices which included in the formal Senate papers.

11.   Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Committee
11.1   Senate received and noted an update from the Chair of the Research and Innovation Committee (SRIC), noting that a meeting of SRIC had not taken place since the last meeting of Senate.

11.2   The following was highlighted:

11.2.1 Post Graduate Researcher (PGR) Voice Survey: The PGR Survey, run in conjunction with the University of Manchester, was the primary source for capturing the experience of PGRs. It was a biannual survey and was conducted for the first time in 2023. Overall the results had been positive, with all questions except one reporting the same or better results than in 2023. The majority of PGRs continued to rate the overall experience as excellent, good or satisfactory. The strongest result related to supervision with 87.7% rating their supervision as excellent. Disabled students had been identified as a priority in 2023 and significant work had been undertaken in this area; overall the results for disabled PGRs had improved but there remained a gap between the experience of PGRs with disabilities and those without disabilities; work would continue in this area. It was noted that topical questions in this survey included GenerativeAI (GenAI); just over half of PGRs had used AI during their programme, mostly for support with coding and writing; comments revealed this was a complex issue with many students concerned about AI use and impact.

11.2.2 Research Excellence Framework (REF): On 4 September, the Minister of State for Science, Research and Innovation announced what was described as a three month pause to the REF. It was noted that this was only a pause in the release of further guidance (expected later in the calendar year); there had been no extension to the REF timetable and work at the University continued as normal. The reasons for this pause were understood to be strong feedback from the sector about the burden and complexity of the process. The membership of the REF 2029 panels had been released. Senate was pleased to note that 16 colleagues had been appointed to serve in various roles.

12.   **Report of the Senate University Research Ethics Committee**
       (Meeting held on 17 September 2025)

12.1   Senate received and noted the Report of the Senate University Research Ethics Committee (SUREC), noting that a correction would be made to a typographical error (section 6, paragraph 2) relating to the outcome of an internal appeal.

12.2   Senate approved of the revised 2025-26 Senate University Research Ethics Committee Terms of Reference and Membership, noting that the membership had been reviewed to include an early career researcher, to widen the membership and bring new perspectives.

12.2.1 In response to a query about how 'early career researcher' was defined for the purposes of the membership, it was agreed to clarify this with the member outside of the meeting.

OTHER MATTERS

13.   **Provisional Business Schedule 2025-26**
13.1   Senate received and noted the Senate provisional business schedule for 2025-26.

14.   **Returning Officer's Report**

14.1 Senate received and noted a report on the outcome of elections to Senate and of Senate Members to Council. It was highlighted that further to the report, the Interim University Secretary had received a request for a motion on today's agenda in relation to colleagues' eligibility to stand in elections. It was noted that this was ultimately refused and the rationale for this decision had been shared directly with the member.

14.2 Senate received and noted the report, which provided details of 3 instances where the Chair had taken action on behalf of Senate since the last meeting.

15. Report on Action Taken
15.1 Senate noted the report, which provided a summary of three actions taken by the President and Vice-Chancellor on Senate's behalf since the previous Senate meeting.

16. Major Research Grants and Contracts
16.1 A report listing major research grants and contracts awarded since the last meeting of the Senate was received and noted.

17. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
(Meeting held on 25 June 2025)
17.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2025 were approved.

18. Matters Arising on the Minutes
18.1 It was noted that all the matters arising in the minutes had been covered under relevant items on the agenda.