



Minutes Meeting of the Senate

Date: 10 December 2025

Present: The President & Vice-Chancellor in the Chair

Yuliia Artemenko, Professor Thomas Baldwin, Professor Peter Bath, Professor Andrew Beckerman, Professor Adrian Bingham, Professor Briony Birdi, Professor Laurence Brooks, Professor Sarah Brown, Dr Jennifer Burr, Dr Janet Chamberlain, Professor Heidi Christensen, Anna Clements, Dr Charlotte Codina, Professor Joan Cordiner, Professor Lizzy Cross, Professor Kate Dommett, Professor John Flint, Professor Graham Gee, Professor Simon Goodwin, Dr Vanessa Halliday, Professor Russell Hand, Dr Neil Harris, Professor Sue Hartley, Professor Paul Hatton, Dr Francesca Henshaw, Professor Stephen Hincks, Professor Tom Hodgson, Professor Rob Howell, Amy Jeffries, Professor Visakan Kadirkamanathan, Professor Syed Ali Khurram, Professor Janine Kirby, Professor Koen Lamberts, Professor Rebecca Lawthom, Professor Stephen Livingstone, Johanna Marriott, Professor Felicity Matthews, Professor Martin Mayfield, Professor Fraser McLeay, Professor Caoimhe Nic Dháibhéid, Dr Siobhán North, Sam Omondi, Dr Abigail Parrish, Professor Cathy Shrank, Professor Mark Strong, Dr Nicky Stubbs, Rob Sykes, Professor Ashutosh Tiwari, Professor Mary Vincent, Professor Pirashanthie Vivekananda-Schmidt, Emma Wake, Professor Helen Woolley, Dr Karine Zbinden

Secretary: D Swinn

In attendance: Dr A Bath (Items 1-4), E Allan, M Borland, K Clements, S Omondi, Professor M Marshall (Items 1-4), A Priestley, Dr E Smith, K Sullivan, S Taylor.

Apologies: The Senate received apologies from 17 members.

Welcome

The President & Vice-Chancellor (P&VC) welcomed members to the meeting. One new member had joined Senate since the last meeting. It was noted that Eli Thomsson had been appointed as the new Students' Union President; it had been agreed to continue with the current interim SU representation at Senate for the time being to allow for induction arrangements to be organised.

1. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

- 1.1 One potential conflict of interest was declared ahead of the meeting, in relation to a member's role as a member of Sheffield University and College Union (UCU) and questions they had pre-submitted in relation to industrial action. It was noted that this was a general interest and the member had no role with UCU beyond their membership. Ultimately, after

extensive communication with the Interim University Secretary, the pre-submitted questions were not accepted for consideration at Senate, due to being outside of Senate's remit. This was discussed later in the meeting; details of the rationale for this decision, and the member's objections, are reflected in minute 2.4.

1.2 No other conflicts were declared.

1.3 Pre-Submitted Questions

1.3.1 6 questions were submitted in advance of the meeting and were covered under the relevant items. It was noted that it had also been agreed to cover several queries received after the pre-submitted questions deadline 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 Research Excellence Framework (REF): The updated REF guidance had been announced; this was reported on separately later in the meeting (see item 9).

2.1.2 Student Q&A Session: On 1 December, the Vice President for Education and colleagues hosted the most recent student online Q&A event (the previous event was held in May). Just over 100 students attended, the highest number at these events to date. Over 50 questions were submitted in advance of the session and on the day across a range of topics including: industrial action, University finances, course suspensions, exams and assessment, postgraduate learning resources, facilities and reputation. Colleagues were preparing a recording and summary of the event to share in central student communications. Any questions that were not addressed during the live session would be followed up on and answered directly.

2.1.3 External environment: The government had announced plans to push ahead with a levy on international student fees to fund the partial reintroduction of maintenance grants. The Budget documents confirmed the international student levy would now be a flat £925 for 2028-29, exempting the first 220 students, rather than the previously modelled 6% rate. The Government stated that income raised would be 'fully' reinvested into HE and skills. There would be a 3 month long technical consultation, with input from the Russell Group and Universities UK (UUK). While the University, along with the sector, had called for increased financial support for the most disadvantaged students, the impact the levy could have on international recruitment and universities' corresponding ability to cross subsidise education, research and innovation activity had raised significant concern. The University would continue to work to encourage the government to consider HE funding in the round pending the outcome of its own research into the price elasticity of home and international students.

Longer term, the government had also committed to legislate to automatically increase undergraduate fee levels in line with inflation. It had now been confirmed that the higher

rate for tuition fee loan caps would increase to £9,750 in 2026/27 and to £10,010 for 2027/28. Beyond that, primary legislation would be needed to allow further fee increases and the University was pushing for this.

- 2.1.4 Research budget: UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) had recently announced its budget allocation to 2029/30, which represented a real-term increase over the next four years and was a positive outcome for research in the current fiscal climate. Higher education research is, however, a loss making activity, cross-subsidised primarily by international student tuition fees. The introduction of an international fee levy, as outlined above, poses a threat to this activity and the potential to generate economic growth through research. Colleagues were working through what this meant for the University.
- 2.2 A pre-submitted question sought clarity on the offer made by the University to end the strike action (referenced in the P&VC's report), which included a requirement that UCU would take no further strike action on the matter before 31 October 2026. The member felt that this factor would have been significant in UCU's decision not to accept the offer. Attention was drawn to the University having published all of the offers it had made in full on its webpages for transparency. It was noted that the fourth offer to UCU on 20 November included a commitment that UCU would not take industrial action over the local dispute before 31 October 2026. The University achieved an agreement in the previous local dispute in May of this year and made a commitment to no compulsory redundancies before 31 December 2025. UCU had subsequently sought a new mandate and scheduled 16 days of strike action before that commitment was due to expire. For this reason the University was seeking a longer safeguard against industrial action.
- 2.3 A further pre-submitted question highlighted that the University received an offer from UCU to call off the final two weeks of the strike action (but not the Action Short of a Strike, nor the right to strike in the Spring) in exchange for the contracts of staff facing redundancy on 1 January 2026 being extended until 30 March 2026. The member sought clarification on why this had been rejected by the University and why it had required that the UCU stand down their industrial action mandate entirely. It was clarified that UCU had offered to call off 8 days of strike action in return for a commitment to no compulsory redundancies before the end of the current mandate on 30 March 2026. Given that the UCU had already announced an intention to take further action before the end of the mandate and to continue with action short of strike, the University could not agree to those terms, but it had indicated that it would do so if there was a commitment to no industrial action for the remainder of the mandate.
- 2.4 The University Secretary's Office also received a large number of questions from Dr Nicky Stubbs in relation to the industrial action in advance of the meeting. Many of the issues raised in those questions were adjudged by the Chair on the advice of the Interim University Secretary as being outside the scope of Senate business and related to matters that sat with Council and/or with UEB or members of UEB.
- 2.4.1 Following correspondence with the Interim University Secretary to attempt to revise the questions into a form that was within the remit of Senate, a shorter updated list of questions was submitted. That list included some elements that more accurately reflected the role of Senate but there were still some significant elements that were out of scope and

it was not possible to disaggregate them into a meaningful set of questions appropriate to Senate's remit.

2.4.2 It was noted that those matters that were deemed out of scope for Senate had been directed to the appropriate person or teams in the University to respond to. Recognising Senate's role in terms of the impact of industrial action on matters within Senate's remit (learning and teaching), the Interim University Secretary had facilitated the sharing of further information about the industrial action with reference to Senate's remit. Senate received an update on the daily participation rates in the strike action (based on the most recent available data) as follows:

- Since strike action began on Monday 17 November, the highest number of staff taking part was 473. Of those, 281 colleagues were in roles with teaching responsibilities.
- Over the period of the action the numbers of participants had been reducing, in both total numbers and the proportion of colleagues in teaching roles.
- The percentage of participants in teaching roles on a given day of strike action had reduced from just under 60% at the start of action to around 50% at the end of last week.
- On Thursday and Friday of the previous week, the last two days for which data was available at the time of reporting, there were 82 teaching participants out of a total of 163 on the Thursday and 70 teaching participants out of a total of 145 on the Friday.
- Over the three weeks for which data was available, the highest daily numbers of teaching participants were:
 - Week 1: 281 (Tuesday)
 - Week 2: 232 (Tuesday)
 - Week 3: 162 (also Tuesday)

2.4.3 Senate was also updated on the impact of strike action on delivery of modules/sessions; as of 9 December 2026, on strike days, timetabling data showed that 1,334 modules had a total of 11,602 sessions scheduled. Of those, 396 modules had been affected by industrial action, covering 1,801 sessions. Six schools accounted for 84.8% of the sessions that had been recorded as affected, so the impact had so far been very concentrated.

2.4.4 For transparency, Dr N Stubbs requested that both lists of their written questions be appended to the official record, along with the rationale for determining that they were out of Senate's remit. The Interim University Secretary clarified that this would have the effect of placing the questions before Senate despite their having been ruled out of order and, therefore, would be inappropriate.

2.4.5.i During further discussion, Dr N Stubbs sought to highlight a key concern raised in their original questions relating to the delegation of certain responsibilities within Schools and a corresponding perceived risk of damaging collegial relations and impact on academic provision, which the member felt did fall within the remit of Senate. Following discussion, Senate was reminded that the question of management responsibilities and accountabilities rested with UEB as delegated by Council itself. Further clarification was provided that because the original question(s) on these points had been referred to appropriate colleagues in the University, further discussion at Senate would be

inappropriate by having the effect of putting before Senate a matter that had been previously been ruled out of order.

2.4.5.ii *Post meeting note: In follow-up correspondence with the Interim University Secretary to the meeting Dr N Stubbs exercised their right under the Standing Orders and requested that their opposition to the ruling to not put their questions before Senate be formally recorded in the minutes. , along with their view that:*

- *Not tabling the questions amounted to an evasion of accountability regarding a policy that is legally questionable and risks potentially serious damage to the reputation of the University.*
- *The ruling had the effect of suppressing legitimate governance scrutiny regarding the impact of this policy on School cohesion, which is a core academic responsibility of Senate.*

The Interim University Secretary accepted the request and clarified that all the questions submitted by the member had been referred to appropriate colleagues in the University. The reason the questions were not tabled at Senate was because they related directly to Council and/or UEB responsibilities, specifically staffing issues, the role descriptions and responsibilities of HoSs and DoEs as well as questions around legality and liability, all of which sat outside of Senate's remit. These were all matters for UEB and Council holds UEB to account. The ruling was not an avoidance of accountability, rather it aimed to ensure that Senate and Council acted / considered matters within their powers and the in line with the University Constitution.

2.4.6.i Students' Union (SU) representatives drew attention to feedback from students relating to the impact of industrial action including:

- Confusion amongst students about how lost learning (arising from strike action) would be replaced.
- Risk of potential impact on student supervision and support during the period when staff would be required to replace lost learning and the need for assurance / clarity about mitigations planned to address this risk.
- Concern amongst students that staff would be expected to undertake work for which they would not be paid.

2.4.6.ii During discussion the following key points were noted:

- Colleagues recognised that there may have been some confusion due to various local communications to students about cancelled learning and that this may have been challenging to navigate while the Industrial Action had been taking place. It was clarified that separate central communications would be shared with students later the same week; the SU was invited to highlight these communications to students and support this messaging.
- Supervision and support for students was being managed at the local (Faculty / School) level. This was a high priority for all Schools and additional study sessions were already running. Senate received assurance that the University was committed to ensuring that no student was disadvantaged as a result of industrial action. Examples of support already in place, plans for replacing lost learning, how lost learning was being captured and how future support was being planned was shared

by colleagues from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and the Faculty of Engineering. It was also highlighted that any rescheduling of exams would still be in the exam window.

- The premise that staff would be expected to work longer hours or undertake overtime for free was incorrect. The University had specific legal and regulatory responsibilities in these circumstances, specifically the requirement to deliver all lost learning for students. Therefore, it followed that staff would be asked to prioritise and develop plans to achieve this. Pay would only be deducted if staff (who had participated in strike action / ASOS) failed to deliver the lost learning to their students, reflecting the University longstanding position. The member highlighted the SU's view that this reinforced the need for clearer communication with students.

2.4.6iii With respect to the latter, Dr N Stubbs sought to challenge the accuracy of statements that the University's approach reflected its longstanding position regarding partial performance and questioned the statement of the Chair that the legal position was clear. These challenges were ruled out of order on the basis that they could have the effect of putting the same questions to Senate as had previously been ruled out of order.

Post Meeting Note: The University's position reflects legal advice it has received, including in respect of employment law. In May 2025 the University entered into a one-off agreement with UCU regarding pay deductions, as part of a wider settlement.

3. Matters Requiring Approval

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

4. TEF and Student Survey

A Bath and M Marshall were in attendance for this item

4.1 Senate received and noted a detailed presentation on the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and Performance against the Office for Students (OfS) B3 Conditions, which related to Student outcomes (the presentation slides were shared with members after the meeting).

4.2 The presentation provided an update on the current TEF framework, proposed changes for the next TEF, implications for the University, actions being taken to drive improvement, key areas of focus and priorities for the University, how the OfS monitored progress against our student outcomes (continuation, completion, progression), an overview of the University's performance/benchmarking data for continuation, completion and progression rates (from 2019-20 to 2022-23) and next steps.

4.3 The following was highlighted:

- Participation in the TEF is an ongoing condition of OfS Registration, judged on a combination of a 25 page written submission and TEF dataset. Based on this, the University is awarded an overall rating (Bronze, Silver, Gold or Requires Improvement), plus ratings for student experience and student outcomes.
- The proposed changes to the TEF would mean that the University's rating would be determined by performance in relation to its institutional benchmark, not absolute

values, and these benchmarks were high. In order to achieve a rating of Gold, the University would need to perform consistently and materially above benchmarks.

- Key challenges for the University were inconsistency and pockets of underperformance in data for Student Outcomes.
- The TEF provided access to a wealth of data that could help the University understand areas of challenge and where it needed to focus.
- Institution wide action was being taken to support improvement and colleagues were called on to focus on delivering a consistent high quality student experience and implement agreed changes to improve consistency.
- A key priority was to better understand which factors may affect success for students on Integrated Masters routes.

5. Research and Innovation: Government and Regional Priorities

5.1 Senate received and noted a detailed presentation on the Government's Industrial Strategy, including growth driving sectors and Government Missions Statements, The Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT) spending allocations for 2025-2026, UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) mission and priorities, new approaches to research funding, local and regional opportunities, Innovate UK's agenda, work the University was already doing and how it was responding to change. The presentation was shared with members after the meeting.

5.2 Senate welcomed the update and during discussion the following was highlighted:

- The Research and Innovation landscape was change rich and fast moving. The Government's Industrial Strategy focussed on eight growth driving sectors which offered the highest growth opportunities for the economy and business and would require harnessing a lot of different types of expertise.
- There had been a small increase in overall R&D spending to £20.4bn. UKRI's mission and priorities included supporting the delivery of Government priorities and providing targeted innovation, commercialisations and scale-up to drive growth.
- New approaches to research funding would see greater strategic distribution of research activity across the sector and funding increasingly directed where research was nationally and internationally leading.
- The Government wanted to see research funding better costed and for the sector to operate more efficiently and innovatively.
- There was £30m UKRI funding available to develop and scale innovation clusters in South Yorkshire, guided by the Local Growth Plan which focussed on defence, advanced manufacturing, clean energy and health.
- There was good alignment between the University's strengths and the areas the Government wanted South Yorkshire to focus on.
- The University needed to continue to focus and what it did well and be open to honest conversations about where its real strengths were. There would need to be increased sharing of facilities, equipment and procurement and greater focus on collaboration within and between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).
- There would need to be more oversight of the type of research the University focussed on and it would be important to communicate with and support colleagues in understanding and driving priority areas.

- The University had a growing start-up culture and it was important to focus on and support people with this through academic line management and the School Director of Research & Innovation (SDRI) network.

REPORTS FROM STATUTORY BODIES

6. Report on the Proceedings of the Council

(Meetings held on 6 October 2025)

- 6.1 Senate received and noted the Report on the Proceedings of the Council.
- 6.2 In response to a pre-submitted question seeking clarity on the status of Students' Union (SU) representation on Council and its sub-committees, following the election of a new SU President in a recent by-election, it was clarified that the SU President was an ex-officio member of the Council under the Statutes, so would automatically become a Council member upon taking office. During the period in which there was no SU President in post, the University and the SU had agreed for an additional SU Officer to attend Council. The Interim University Secretary was working with the SU team on the usual induction and introductory activities for the new SU President.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

7. Report of the Senate Academic Assurance Committee

(Meeting held on 11 November 2025)

- 7.1 Senate received and noted the Report of the Senate Academic Assurance Committee (SAAC) and approved the updated SAAC Business Plan for 2025-2026.
- 7.2 Disabled Student Experience: SAAC had undertaken a deep dive on the disabled student experience at both taught and postgraduate research (PGR) levels. The scope of the deep dive and particular areas investigated were consistent with the assurance questions detailed in SAAC's Business Plan. Based on the material reviewed and the discussion with the relevant stakeholders, SAAC made several assurance determinations (detailed in the report). It was highlighted that for undergraduate students (UGs), SAAC was assured that there were comprehensive systems in place, both internal and external, to facilitate the tracking of data trends, benchmarking the University against sector peers, and identification of issues in need of investigation or remediation. It was likewise assured that this data was robust. SAAC was also assured that progress to date by the Inclusive Curriculum Steering Group in overseeing and setting the direction of the University's activities in support of disabled students at the taught level had been good, laying clear and strong foundations for consistent and effective course design and implementation. SAAC was less well assured in other areas, including in relation to the consistent implementation of Learning Support Plans (LSPs) and in relation to Post Graduate Taught (PGT) disabled students; SAAC would undertake a deep dive of this at its next meeting.
- 7.3.1 A pre-submitted question was raised about the deep-dive into the Disabled Student Experience. This drew attention to SAAC's findings in relation to inclusive learning practices, how well LSPs are implemented and the risk of Inclusive Education principles failing to gain traction. Specifically a query was raised about the framework proposed for mitigating these issues, which appeared to rely on top-down enforcement through power structures, and

SAAC was asked whether it had discussed other mitigations, including those which would create buy-in from staff.

- 7.3.2 Clarification was provided that SAAC's focus was institution-wide, and when considering risks and mitigations, the Committee naturally examined the structures in place to support education across the University. The 'golden thread' through education governance, connecting schools to Senate via School and Faculty Education Committees, was not about top-down enforcement. Instead, it was about ensuring reliable channels for communication, support, and accountability. Governance spaces could also be generative, including by being spaces where colleagues develop new understandings. One of the main motivations for creating this structure was to provide a basis for consistent approaches and to support the embedding of important institutional initiatives such as Inclusive Education.
- 7.3.3 The importance of the point about staff buy-in was acknowledged. SAAC had heard evidence about several initiatives designed to build engagement and ownership at the local level, including the work of Student Inclusion Officers in schools, the incorporation of inclusive supervision principles into PGR Supervisor Continuing Professional Development (CPD), and joined-up working between the Disability and Dyslexia Support Service and schools. The Inclusive Curriculum Steering Group, which had representation from across the University, was also working to socialise the expected standards and support implementation rather than simply mandate compliance.
- 7.3.4 SAAC recognised that structural governance alone would not embed inclusive practices and effect genuine cultural change. This would come about as colleagues better understood the organisation's legal obligation to provide recommended adjustments, as well as the broader pedagogical value and practical benefits of embedding inclusivity from the outset of programme design and delivery, rather than seeking to adjust retrospectively. This was why SAAC had signalled its intention to return to this area once the principles were better embedded, to assess not just whether they were being applied, but whether they were gaining meaningful traction.

8. Report of the Senate Education Committee

(Meeting held on 6 November 2025)

- 8.1 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:
- 8.2 Attention was drawn to the update at Section 4 and Appendix 3 of the report relating to the use of Special Regulations in 2024-25. See minute 8.6 for a pre-submitted question on this item.
- 8.3 Policy on Remote Teaching: During discussion about the new policy it was noted that this had been developed partly in response to the UK Visas and Immigration (UKVI) revised position. While the SEC recognised that this was in conflict with the Students' Union's (SU) long standing position to encourage the university to offer more hybrid learning opportunities to support students with a range of needs, members had reaffirmed the

position that University provides a campus-based learning experience and that digital tools and technology are used to enhance the on-campus experience, not to replace in-person teaching. During discussion about exceptions, for example severe weather conditions or other events that may prevent attendance on campus, it was clarified any temporary exceptions would require formal approval. Provisions would be made for those circumstances, with clear communications as and when they arose.

8.4 Senate approved the following:

- i. The new, significantly amended, resumed and closed programmes and title changes approved by Faculties between 9 September and 5 November 2025.
- ii. The new and resumed programmes, approved by Faculties, which had been approved under SEC Chair's action.
- iii. The new Policy on Remote Delivery of Teaching.

8.5 It was noted that on 20 November 2025, Council had approved the changes to Regulation III and IX relating to the delegation of Senate's revised powers, which Senate had discussed and recommended following its previous meeting in October 2025. This included the delegation of authority for the approval of new programmes of study, major amendments, and closed taught programmes of study and the associated programme regulations to the Senate Education Committee.

8.6.1 A pre-submitted question asked how Special Regulations were catered for in the University's governance framework. It was highlighted that the report referenced Regulations IX and X, but that there was no specific mention of Special Regulations in this part of the Regulations or anywhere in the University Calendar. While there seemed to be established practice in terms of how the University managed and approved exceptions to the regulations, it was unclear in the governing documents who explicitly had the power to do this. It was noted that the introduction of more regular and more detailed reporting of the use of Special Regulations through SEC to Senate offers greater transparency and is to be welcomed.

Although it is right that Special Regulations are not specifically mentioned, it is also right that the approach used follows longstanding and recognised practice and that the authorities exercised under that practice is at least implied in the regulations.

8.6.2 It was noted that the approach to special regulations aligned with the way in which the provisions in Regulations IX and X were written, albeit less clearly than they might be. The approach was also aligned with the delegation of Senate's powers (specifically 1.1.6) in the updated Scheme of Delegation, under which the power to oversee and regulate the recruitment, selection, admission, teaching, supervision and assessment of the students of the University; to decide on the award of degrees or other academic awards or distinctions and to regulate the conduct, discipline and academic progress of the students was delegated to the Senate Education Committee (SEC), the Senate Research and Innovation Committee (SRIC) and the President and Vice-Chancellor (P&VC) or an non-Faculty Vice-President (VP) and also allowed for the use of Chair's action.

8.6.3 Special Regulations invariably related to individual students and also required a relatively quick decision in order not to disadvantage students, which was why they were not approved in formal committee, but through the established system of delegation with

oversight and support through SEC and Faculties/Professional Services departments. It was crucial that there was an approved route and authority to approve/reject cases where a variation was needed; pragmatically, situations did arise where the University needed to consider whether a variation was appropriate and fair for an individual student.

- 8.6.3 It was acknowledged that the terminology "Special Regulations" may not be entirely helpful. These were individual cases for an exception and covered a range of scenarios, some of which could be fairly minor, e.g. taking an equivalent replacement module for example. Noting that the University had recently updated the Scheme of Delegation to reflect Senate's new powers and having just appointed external support for the wider review of the Scheme of Delegation, the question of how to reflect practice around Special Regulations more clearly in the governing instruments (and the terminology and classifications) would be fed into that review in liaison with SEC and other relevant colleagues.

9. Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Committee

(Meeting held on 29 October 2025)

- 9.1 Senate received and noted the report of the Research and Innovation Committee (SRIC).
- 9.2 Research Excellence Framework (REF): It was reported that the three month pause on the release of further REF guidance had ended and new guidance had been released that morning. Senate received a brief overview on the key headlines / changes. It was noted that the timetable for 2029 was unchanged with submission due in the Autumn of 2028. More details / communications would follow.
- 9.3 Good Research and Innovation Practices (GRIP) - matter arising from October 2025: Following a brief discussion at the October 2025 meeting about linking statements on defence research to sustainability, it was noted that this issue was to be considered through the relevant SRIC sub-committees and Professional Services in the first instance.
- 9.4 A pre-submitted question regarding the update on Runway Park (on page 85 of the SRIC Report) queried whether there was anything positive to report on uptake or interest from industrial partners since the launch. It was reported that since the launch of the Runway Park vision at the UK's Real Estate Investment and Infrastructure Forum (UKREiiF), the University had been approached by a number of industrial third parties interested in taking space at the park. The project team were developing the site-wide masterplan beyond the initial vision, with a specific focus on the first phase of delivery. This work included assessing any viability gaps and potential financial and funding structures. Once finalised (expected by February 2026), the University would advance discussions with its industrial partners, including the specific lease and agreement structures the University would be willing to enter into.
- 9.5 Senate **approved** the revised 2025-26 Senate University Research Ethics Committee Terms of Reference and Membership.

10. Report of the Senate University Research Ethics Committee

(Meeting held on 12 November 2025)

- 10.1 Senate received and noted the Report of the Senate University Research Ethics Committee (SUREC) meeting, which had taken place on 12 November 2025.
- 10.2 Senate **approved** the revised 2025-26 Senate University Research Ethics Committee Terms of Reference and Membership; there had been several changes to the membership of the Committee to strengthen links to research data management, an area with considerable cross-over with research ethics.

OTHER MATTERS

11. Report on Action Taken

11.1 No actions had been taken by the President and Vice-Chancellor on Senate's behalf since the previous Senate meeting.

12. Major Research Grants and Contracts

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

13. Students' Union Annual Report: Complaints and Discipline 2024-25

13.1 Senate noted the report, which provided a summary of reporting trends for complaints and discipline cases dealt with under the Students' Union complaints procedure, for the reporting period 1 August 2024 to 31 July 2025.

14. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(Meeting held on 15 October 2025)

14.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2025 were approved.

15. Matters Arising on the Minutes

15.1 It was noted that all matters arising in the minutes had been covered under relevant items on the agenda.