LANCASTER UNIVERSITY

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate
held on 4 November 2015

PRESENT: Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair); Professor P. Ashwin; Professor A. Atkinson; Professor A. M. Atherton; Ms J. Bennett; Professor S. Bradley; Professor S. Bushell; Professor K. Cain; Professor A. G. Chetwynd; Dr A. Collins; Professor S. P. Decent; Mr F. Dawes; Professor M. Ehrgott; Professor P. R. Fielden; Mrs R. Fligelstone; Professor A. Gillespie; Dr O. Gomez (for Dr W. Tych); Mr B. Harper; Mr W. Hedley; Professor S. R. A. Hutty; Professor R. Jones; Professor A. Jotischky (for Professor M. Hughes); Professor A. Laing; Dr R. Lauder; Professor A. Lazarev; Professor C. Leitch; Professor C. May-Chahal; Ms M. McDonough; Dr C. Melville; Mr P. Montague; Professor J. F. O’Hanlon; Professor C. Paoloni; Professor I. Paya; Professor M. Piacentini; Ms C. Povah; Professor E. Semino; Professor S. Skogly; Dr B. Smith; Professor M. M. Smyth; Mr J. Thornberry; Mr M. Topps; Dr J. Unger; Professor T. Vurdubakis; Professor M. B. Wright; Dr S. Young.

IN ATTENDANCE: Miss F. M. Aiken; Mr P. Boustead; Mr J. S. W. Dickinson; Mr S. Franklin; Ms C. Geddes; Mr P. M. Graves; Ms N. C. Owen; Mrs S. Randall-Paley; Mr M. Swindlehurst.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Dr P. Bishop; Mr T. Buckley; Professor M. Ehrgott; Mr R. Gould; Professor S. Guy; Professor N. Johnson; Professor K. C. Jones.

MINUTES

S.2015/57 Minutes

Documents: SEC/2015/2/1215; SEC/2015/2/1088

RESOLUTION: the Senate approved the minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2015.
SECTION 1: ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

S.2015/58 Report of the Vice-Chancellor

Ref: 1.2

PROPOSAL (Vice-Chancellor): the Senate was invited to receive for information an oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on items of interest.

The Vice-Chancellor reported on the following items.

(a) The QAA was currently on campus conducting a higher education review, the preliminary results of which would be reported within two weeks of its conclusion.

(b) The University, as with all universities, was now under national Prevent duties that include a legal obligation to show due regard to preventing individuals from being drawn into extremism. Lancaster was implementing a proportionate response within its safeguarding procedures, but was reviewing its policies and practices more broadly to ensure compliance with national requirements. As Lancaster had been identified as low risk, it was not anticipated that any impact on current operation and practice would be significant.

In discussion it was noted that the definition of extremism had been provided at the national level within the Prevent strategy, but would be subject to interpretation within each institution. HEFCE, or a successor body, it was noted, would have responsibility as the accountable body for the HE sector for this area of work.

(c) The project in partnership with Beijing Jiaotong University (BJTU) was proceeding. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International) reported that a senior party had visited BJTU where a memorandum of agreement had been drafted. Subject to legal finalisation, the agreement, along with joint articles of association – also being finalised – would set out terms and conditions sufficient to allow Council at its November 2015 meeting to approve, for Lancaster, a dual application for permission to proceed to Shangdong provincial officials for consideration. The outcome of this application would be known within forty-five days of submission and, if successful, the proposal would then proceed to the Chinese Ministry of Education in Beijing for decision. A final decision was expected in April 2016 and, if positive, foundation year delivery could begin in September 2016.
In discussion it was noted that BJTU was in strong position to advise Lancaster on the application process as the application secretariat was housed within it.

(d) Student enrolment numbers for 2015/16 were reported. Overall numbers were strong, with enrolment up by 110 on 2014/15. However, within these, international recruitment numbers were down and while it was too early to determine if this was a one-off occurrence or the start of a trend, the numbers would continue to be closely monitored.

(e) Lancaster University had risen to the rank of 23rd in terms of Research Council grant funding, with the share of total funding rising from 0.6% to 1.0%. This was a positive result, and, it was noted, more in line with where the University should be.

(f) The University Secretary, Fiona Aiken, would be retiring on 31 March 2016. This, it was reported, had provided an opportunity for reflection on the organisational structure for quality and governance within Professional Services. The role of the University Secretary, it was reported, had been discussed at Council where it had been agreed that the key institutional responsibilities would be subsumed into the role of the Chief Administrative Officer.

(g) The Green Paper on the future of higher education was expected to be published imminently, as was the Nurse Review of the Research Councils.

**RESOLUTION:** the Senate agreed to note the report.

S.2015/59 **Summary of UMAG Business Relevant to Senate**

*Ref: 1.3; document: SEC/2015/2/1209*

**RESOLUTION:** the Senate agreed to note the report.

S.2015/60 **Forward Schedule of Senate Business**

*Ref: 1.4; document: SEC/2015/2/1216*

Senate received the forward schedule of business. It was noted that the review of the Head of Department role would come to a future meeting.
A necessary change of date for the next meeting was also noted.

**RESOLUTION:** the Senate agreed to note the schedule of currently expected Senate business for 2015/16.

**SECTION 2: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION REQUIRING DECISION**

S.2015/61 Proposal to Establish a Lancaster Education Committee

*Ref: 2.5; document: SEC/2015/2/1200*

**PROPOSAL** (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)): the Senate was invited to consider this proposal and to:

(i) approve the establishment of an Education Committee as a standing committee of Senate with the terms of reference and membership as set out in Appendix 1;

(ii) make the Academic Standards and Quality Committee a sub-committee of the Education Committee; and

(iii) approve the consequent amendments to the terms of reference of the committees and the Senate Schedule of Delegations as set out in Appendices 2-4.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) introduced a proposal to establish an Education Committee as a standing committee of the Senate. She noted that the University currently lacked a central forum for education and that the establishment of the committee clearly signalled its importance within the University strategy.

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) would become a sub-committee of the Education Committee with revised terms of reference. Revisions would also be required of other education-related committees such as Collaborative Provision and Oversight Committee. Finally, a new schedule of delegations had been developed to reflect the powers of each committee and the interaction between them. Thus, it was noted in discussion, Senate would retain responsibility for strategy and principles, while appropriately delegating policy and implementation to the Education Committee and its subcommittees.

**RESOLUTION:** Senate agreed to establish a new standing Education Committee, with Academic Standards and Quality as a subcommittee, and other changes as set out in the proposal.

**ACTION:** SRAH
Proposal for a New Award: Doctor of Management (D.Mgt)

Ref: 2.6; documents: SEC/2015/2/1218; SEC/2015/2/1217

PROPOSAL (Dean, Management School): the Senate was invited to approve the new award of Doctor of Management (D.Mgt).

The Dean of the Management School, Professor Laing, introduced a proposal to establish a new award, the Doctor of Management (D.Mgt). The D.Mgt would be an academically rigorous and practice-based doctorate, designed to develop critical professionals rather than more traditional academics. Much of the doctorate would be work-based, using students’ own organisations as case studies; subject to the same ethical standards as any doctoral work.

It was noted that the award had been considered by ASQC, and that while specific aspects of it would return to that body for further refinement, the committee was recommending approval of the award to the Senate.

RESOLUTION: Senate approved the new award of Doctor of Management (D.Mgt) with immediate effect.

New Accreditation Arrangement: European Masters in Management

Ref: 2.7; document: SEC/2015/2/1219

PROPOSAL (Director of Quality Assurance and Enhancement): the Senate was invited to approve in principle a new triple accreditation arrangement to be used, subject to approval, for the European Masters in Management (EMM) Programme.

The Director of Quality Assurance and Enhancement introduced the proposal. He noted that the arrangement carried a sufficient number of innovative aspects to warrant consideration in principle by the Senate. These included: multiple accreditation such that successful students would receive recognition from three degree awarding bodies; a twenty-one rather than twelve month duration; and an overall credit rating of 240 rather than 180 credits. None of these were, of themselves, entirely novel to Lancaster, but this was the first time when they would be brought together within a single award.

Senate acknowledged the clear coherence of the award as well as its well-articulated academic objectives.
RESOLUTION: Senate agreed to approve the arrangements, subject to further approval of matters of detail by ASQC, for the triple accredited European Masters in Management (EMM) Programme.

ACTION: MBW

S.2015/64  Research Institutes

Ref: 2.8; document: SEC/2015/2/1211

PROPOSAL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)): following endorsement previously provided, the Senate was invited to receive an update on the continuing development of the three Research Institutes, and to formally approve their establishment.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) introduced a paper providing Senate with an update on the Research Institutes and seeking formal approval of their establishment. He reported that since receiving endorsement in principle, work within the Institutes had continued. Key milestones already reached included: over £1M in research grant applications had been submitted; internal university events had taken place and others were in planning; websites were being populated; and a Futures journal was being established. More academics were becoming involved in the Institutes and formal processes, such as Planning, now included the Institutes as recognised constituencies of the University. However, having been endorsed in principle, and in accordance with principles of good governance, formal approval was being sought from the Senate for the establishment of each of the three.

RESOLUTION: Senate agreed to approve the establishment of the following research institutes, with immediate effect: the Data Science Institute, the Institute for Social Futures, and the Materials Science Institute.

ACTION: JSWD

S.2015/65  Review of Statutes and Ordinances

Ref: 2.9; document: SEC/2015/2/1190

PROPOSAL (University Secretary): the Senate was invited to:

(i) consider and comment on the proposals to amend Statutes and Ordinances as set out in this paper and the detail in Appendices A and B; and

(ii) concur with the proposals.
The University Secretary introduced a series of proposals to amend the University’s Statutes and Ordinances. These had been previously considered by the Council and had come to Senate for consideration and concurrence.

Some amendments were simple updates to reflect changes in University structures and personnel as well as changes to national legislation. However, there were more substantial changes which were, in part, driven by the objective to modernise the governance procedures by moving aspects of the Statutes into Ordinances so as to allow the University to take full autonomy in the governance of its internal structures and procedures. Change to Statutes, it was explained, required Privy Council approval, while changes to Ordinances were subject solely to internal procedures. By moving Statute clauses to Ordinances, the University was taking greater control of its own affairs, thus giving it greater flexibility in its operation, and allowing for a greater dynamism that would enable adaptation to external change. It was noted that this work was being encouraged by government, and that they wanted chartered universities, such as Lancaster, to remove the more operational aspects from the Statutes so as to lighten the burden on the Privy Council. It was noted that Lancaster had been modest in its amendments compared with many of its peers.

Objections to the proposal were raised by a Senator. He noted that the overall effect of the change would be to strengthen the central management of the University. The University constitution (the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances) had been designed to afford certain protections, and the current high bar necessary for amendment had served as a means to ensure all changes were subject to full and rigorous scrutiny and consultation. He further objected that the constituent parts of the University which were being removed from the Statutes – the College Syndicates, the Faculties and the Students’ Union – were not, as the paper described them “aspects of internal organisation”, but were the defining attributes of the University. To move them to the Ordinances would be to reduce the safeguards currently in place as provided through the external checks and balances system of the Privy Council.

In discussion the following points were noted.

- Sufficient safeguards were provided through the internal processes of Council and Senate.
- As the Privy Council did not, when consulted, exercise its authority to reject any proposed changes it had, in practical terms, already ceded these matters to the individual institutions.
• Demonstration of reasonable process to date was not a guarantee against future decision-making, and maintaining safeguards was important.

• Amendments to Ordinance 13 (The Court), it was noted, had been subject to consideration by a working group, and that while some categories of membership had been reduced, overall numbers remained broadly the same.

• Some of the language, for example, the definition of ‘good cause’, while not being proposed for change, might be considered for future updating.

• It was agreed that any minor changes of wording should be sent direct to the University Secretary.

RESOLUTION: by a show of hands, the Senate agreed to register its concurrence with the amendments to the Statutes and Ordinances to the Council.

ACTION: FMA

SECTION 3: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION NOT REQUIRING DECISION


Ref: 3.10; document: SEC/2015/2/1212

PROPOSAL (Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences): the Senate was invited to comment on the interim report.

Professor O’Hanlon, on behalf of the Dean of Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, introduced an interim report on the transparent allocation model. The model, developed at the Vice-Chancellor's request, represented an aspect of the next stage in the evolving planning process and proposed a move to an internal financial reporting model which recognised allocation of costs. Departmental direct costs would be shown as elements of expenditure, however, alongside these, space and central costs would also be allocated, using a number of agreed drivers. The intention of the exercise was to provide additional financial information to the planning process and to better inform decision-making.

In discussion the following points were noted.

• The model could lead to greater comparator analysis against competitors at departmental level which, in turn, could affect how departments are viewed internally.
The model was rightly premised on the recognition that there were different norms in different disciplines.

With the inclusion of space costs, the outcome could potentially have an impact on space management.

In addition, departmental expectations about their access to Professional Services might change and should be clarified.

It was noted that for the current cycle the model would be used in parallel with existing arrangements so as to be able to determine its effectiveness. Following this the model would be reviewed and refined.

As the working group continued its work, Senate identified two specific items for consideration.

1. Consideration of how the additional information and insight that the model would impart would translate to reduction in inequities between departments where these were identified.

2. Review of the external comparative data to ensure that what it revealed was consistent and capable of being analysed on a like for like basis with Lancaster.

It was noted that a key benefit to the new model would be the additional transparency it provided for decision-making.

Resolution: Senate agreed to note the interim report.

Action: SG

SECTION 4: ITEMS FOR DECISION UNLIKELY TO REQUIRE DISCUSSION

S.2015/67 College Constitution: The County College

Ref: 4.11; document: SEC/2015/2/1227

Proposal (Principal, The County College): the Senate was invited to approve the revised college constitution for The County College, which had been brought into line with the constitution template that Senate approved in July 2015.

Resolution: Senate agreed to approve the revised constitution for County College with immediate effect.
SECTION 5: ITEMS FOR REPORT

S.2015/68  New Full-Time Taught Registrations

Ref: 5.12; document: PSU/2015/0111

PROPOSAL (Director of Planning Support): the Senate was invited to receive a report on new full-time taught registrations (UG and PGT) for 2015/16 as at 21 October 2015.

RESOLUTION: Senate agreed to note the report

S.2015/69  Academic Dress Regulations (from 1 October 2015)

Ref: 5.13

Document: SEC/2015/2/1223

PROPOSAL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)): the Senate was invited to receive a report of changes to the Academic Dress Regulations approved via delegated authority in September 2015.

RESOLUTION: Senate agreed to receive the report.

S.2015/70  Report on 2015/16 Periodic Quality Reviews

Ref: 5.14; document: SEC/2015/3/0841

PROPOSAL (Director of Quality Assurance and Enhancement): the Senate was invited to note the departmental Periodic Quality Reviews carried out in the last academic year and their outcomes.

RESOLUTION: Senate agreed to note the reviews and their outcomes.

S.2015/71  Written Reports of Meetings

Ref: 5.15

The Senate received the following written reports of meetings and, where appropriate, confirmed the actions taken:

(i) Academic Standards and Quality Committee, meetings of 7 May 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1113) and 13 July 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1127)
(ii) Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee, meeting of 14 September 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1114)
(iii) Colleges and Student Experience Committee, meeting of 20 May 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1240)
(iv) Council, Awayday meeting of 22 May 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1228), and meeting of ordinary meeting held on 10 July 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1230)
(v) Equality and Diversity Committee, meeting of 6 May 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1023)
(vi) Public Arts Strategy Committee, meeting of 30 April 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1229)
(vii) Research Committee, meeting of 19 June 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1241)
(viii) College Syndicate reports:
   (a) Bowland College Syndicate, meeting of 20 April 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1234)
   (b) Cartmel College Syndicate, meeting of 6 May 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1235)
   (c) The County College Syndicate, meeting of 27 May 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1236)
   (d) Fylde College Syndicate, meeting of 16 June 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1231), and extraordinary meeting of 24 June 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1232)
   (e) Furness College Syndicate, meeting of 16 June 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1237)
   (f) Graduate College Syndicate, meeting of 15 June 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1233)
   (g) Grizedale College Syndicate, meeting of 28 January 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1238)
   (h) Lonsdale College Syndicate, meeting of 24 February 2915 (SEC/2015/2/1239)

S.2015/72  New and Revised Courses

Ref: 5.16; document: SEC/2015/3/0829

RESOLUTION: Senate noted the reports on new and revised programmes, approved in accordance with the schedule of delegations.