



draft:	21 December 2005
confirmed by chair:	6 January 2006
confirmed by committee	24 February 2006
without amendments:	

Senate minutes

date: 16 December 2005
time: 9.30 a.m.
location: Old Library, Chalfont Campus

The Chairman welcomed members and an observer to the meeting. Apologies for absence were received.

05.65 Minutes of Last Meeting – 4 November 2005

The minutes were confirmed as a true record and signed.

05.66 Matters Arising

a) Report from Annual Review & Evaluation Working Party (*Minute 05.51 b)i refers*)

It was reported that this working party had now amalgamated with that set up to consider Validation and Review. Meetings had been held and a consultation paper was being circulated. The prime objective was to streamline processes while still maintaining the necessary rigour.

One result of changes to be suggested would be to allow Senate to be given information regarding headline issues in a much more timely fashion. Thus, it should be possible to break down the process such that standards could be reviewed during the Autumn Term and at the end of the academic year and quality of student opportunity in the Spring Term.

It is intended to work through the proposals with Faculty representatives, taking account of the changes to Validation & Review process which have been put in place for this year. Senate **requested** a paper outlining proposed amendments to the process for consideration at the next meeting.

Action: Deputy Director (Academic)

b) R13 – Credit Accumulation & Transfer Scheme (*Doc No: SEN 05.114*) (*Minute 05.55 c) refers*)

The regulatory document R13 had been considered at the last meeting of Senate, when minor changes had been requested. This was now brought back for ratification. Members now commented further on the document as a whole. It was agreed that the last sentence of 2.2.1 should be amended to read:

'In assessing the specific credits, it is necessary to demonstrate a direct mapping of learning outcomes from previous learning against the learning outcomes of the course/module(s) for which exemption is requested.'

There was also discussion of section 6.3 – Fees. It was felt that there needed to be clarity in respect of how charging would be applied. There was some discussion in respect of this and it was decided that, since R13 is a regulatory document, mention of fees should be removed from this document. Further discussion would be undertaken with each Faculty to ensure a consistent approach.

It was noted that the APCL/APEL application form, included as Appendix 3, referred to module exemptions. In one Faculty this form was used to highlight to the Faculty CATS Committee those students who are considered for advanced standing to level rather than module exemption and the form does not include a relevant section for this. The Chair of AAC noted the need to reinforce the separation between consideration of modules and levels. The appendix noted was not intended for use when considering a student for entry to a course with advanced standing.

With the amendments agreed, the document was **approved** by Senate.

Action: Directorate, Faculties, Academic Registry

c) Degrees Classifications (*Minute 05.53 refers*)

The further analysis of data which had been requested was not yet complete. The Academic Registrar and Deputy Director (Planning) were due to meet with members of the Planning Unit before Christmas to progress this. It was confirmed that the data set used was robust and that further work would be done on this to present a more detailed analysis in the areas identified by Senate.

The Dean of Health Studies noted the additional requirement for monitoring of NHS programmes using the HESA/NHS data set. It would be necessary to include cohort data in our returns which the institution does not currently provide centrally. The Chairman stressed that the central holding and production of information was felt to be most important.

Information requested by Senate to be brought to the next meeting.

Action: Deputy Director (Planning), Academic Registrar, Planning Unit

05.67

External Courses Accredited by BCUC (*Doc No: SEN 05.118*)

Senate had requested a current list of accredited courses, which was now provided. It was noted that 1 further course from the Faculty of Health Studies should be included.

All Deans were asked to submit a return to the Senior Registrar (Quality Assurance) by the end of January 2006 to ensure that every course was captured. A nil return to be submitted where no courses are running. The definitive list to be presented to the next meeting of Senate.

Action: Deans of Faculty, Senior Registrar (Quality Assurance)

05.68

Report on Meetings of Academic Year Working Party – 31 October and 1 December 2005 (Doc No: SEN 05.92)

The Deputy Director (Academic) presented the item noting that the working party had met twice. Notes of the second meeting had been circulated to allow Senate to understand the nature of the debate which had taken place thus far. In addition to specifics regarding the academic year it had become apparent that there were other issues which would need to be considered and which have an impact on the structure of the year.

It was the intention that the working party would recommend specific changes. These might be introduced for academic year 2006 – 2007 at the earliest. However, it was noted that Senate might decide that this timing would not be appropriate and that any change should be put off to the following academic year. In light of the complex nature of the inter-related issues, it would not be possible to provide a paper for the next meeting of Senate but this would be brought forward for consideration at the meeting to be held on 7 April 2006.

The Chairman requested that the paper outlines specific proposals on the academic year and highlights other areas for consideration.

Members commented as follows:

- It was felt that some note should be included on the needs of other stakeholders, e.g. employers
- Concern was raised that there might be insufficient discussion prior to any change being made. It was explained that all Faculties were represented within the Working Party and it was important that discussion took place within Faculties which could then be fed back. There had been no dissent within the Working Party thus far on the main thrust of the views being formulated
- The Dean of Buckinghamshire Business School noted that his Faculty felt there were other drivers for some of the current perceived problems which had yet to be considered. Such issues were felt to have an impact and would not be solved by changes made to the semester system. These included:
 - Teaching & Learning
 - Weak transport links
 - Student issues/admissions
- Any changes which may be proposed would have resource implications that need to be taken into account

The Chairman encouraged all Faculties to participate fully in the ongoing discussion to ensure that their views are taken into account. Senate looked forward to seeing the proposal paper at the meeting of 7 April 2006.

Action: Faculties, Academic Year Working Party

05.69

Learning Resources Collection Management Policy and Institutional Repository for Research Outputs (Doc Nos: SEN 05.93 and SEN 05.101)

The Head of Learning & Information Services introduced the two papers, noting the budgetary issues which are implicit within the Learning Resources Collection Management Policy. Section 3 of this document dealt with selection criteria for materials. These are reviewed each year and academic staff are encouraged to provide input into the debate via the Learning Resource Consultative Committee. There is a need to decide what information resources we really need to support the curriculum.

If we wish to encourage students to investigate a wide range of sources then this is most likely to be through having a larger proportion of journals and e-sources available. The current situation is that Faculty expectation is for a large number of books to be purchased and thus there needs to be academic debate on the appropriate allocation of resources. Faculty Librarians are on hand to assist.

The Deputy Director (Academic) agreed that a debate on this issue would be fruitful, however he noted that it would be helpful for Faculties to have more information to hand in respect of the current situation, particularly regarding the pattern of student book purchase, on which to make informed decisions.

It was reported by the Head of Learning & Information Services that while there are a large number of modules currently validated not all these run and books which have been purchased to support them are a wasted resource. Senate was also asked to note that the introduction of year long modules would allow for a more efficient use of the resources available.

Comments were made as follows:

- It was felt that it would not be feasible to rely on a single core text to support a year long module
- The VLE is growing increasingly important rather than the production of a course pack
- Numbers of journals are increasing fast
- Faculties need to undertake informed consideration of the issues at stake particularly if resource is to be FTE driven
- Resource needed to be pumped into new and growing areas of the curriculum
- It was reported that the Planning Unit is currently reviewing issues to do with modules which have only very small numbers of students registered
- There had been some debate as to where resources should best be discussed in relation to Validation and Review. AAC had suggested this might be undertaken by Academic Planning Committee with the necessary input from Faculty Teaching & Learning Committees
- The Dean of Design noted that further migration to more electronic resource would not be appropriate for his Faculty

The Head of Learning & Information Services explained that currently the spend on books is approximately 10% of the information resources spend as a whole. This was felt to be very low by some members. Wide ranging input into the debate on how best resource can be managed is required.

The Chairman requested that a paper should be prepared in respect of the relevant budget and it's distribution for consideration at the next meeting of Planning Board.

A further point was highlighted in respect of the requirement for ongoing staff development. While the use of electronic resources had increased a great deal there were still staff who were less proficient with this than others. Additionally, the student profile was changing and it would therefore be useful to have further information in respect of how students are using the available resources and any trends in this use.

The Chairman agreed to meet with the Head of School of Continuing Professional Education to consider the area of changing needs.

Institutional Repositories

The Head of Learning & Information Services then highlighted the main points contained within the paper in respect of Institutional Repositories and their Relevance to BCUC. It was explained that within research led institutions there was a tendency to deposit outputs within a Repository. This was an area where project work has been funded by JISC. The result of using such a system was that material became more easily available to searchers and could include preprint (before refereeing) and postprint (after refereeing but before publication). Citations increase for papers which are held in repositories. Publishers attitudes to repositories differ somewhat but information in respect of this is available.

It was reported that Research Degrees Committee agree that theses should be held within a repository. This could, in addition, be used for learning objects.

Senate welcomed the paper and it was agreed that further development and awareness raising would be required. The Heads of Learning & Information Services and School of Continuing Professional Education to liaise on this.

Action: Chairman, Heads of Learning Information Services and School of Professional Continuing Education

05.70

University College Response to QAA Operational Description for the Revised Institutional Audit Process (Doc No: SEN 05.91)

The Deputy Director introduced a paper brought to Senate to note changes to methodology of the audit process. This was presented for Senate comment and for any necessary amendment to the commentary and endorsement. He had spoken to the Students' Union who were unhappy in respect of some of the content of the paper and he wished to stress that this was not a reflection on BCSU but an overall response iterating a view which was shared by other members within the Quality Strategy Network.

The President of the Students' Union was invited to comment upon the issues on which the Union had expressed concern. These related to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the section dealing with Student Involvement and the Student Written Submission. The Students' Union agreed that there needed to be a more defined process to follow but felt that what was included within this section was not a fair nor true reflection of the Student Written Submission produced by BCSU. It was noted that the National Student Survey had been put forward as a possible alternative to the Student Written Submission but this was a proposal which had been much criticised. The Union had been delighted with the result of our recent Audit and felt that this success was in no small part due to the student centred approach of the University College. The close relationship between the University College and Students' Union needed to be fostered but there was concern from the Union that this would be damaged should the current response be submitted to QAA.

It was noted that there had been discussion at the QAA Solstice meeting in respect of how it would be possible to ensure appropriate input from Students' Union representatives when those who had prepared the Student Written Submission might no longer be in post. The QAA view had assumed that the same students who produced the Written Submission would also present to auditors. Regardless of this, it was felt by members that the independent Student Written Submission was of great importance.

The Dean of Design noted that there appeared to be some conflation of a number of issues. Audit in the future would be more remote. The National Student Survey suffered from some problems in respect of data gathering and the issue regarding whether the same students who had produced the Written Submission were still in post would have to be addressed.

The Deputy Director (Academic) apologised for any distress which the draft document had caused. This had been written as a direct response to the QAA operational descriptor and needed to be considered in this context. It is not and was not intended as a response to anything involving BCSU. Because of a potential for polarisation in the future and the move of focus away from the holistic it was deemed that some sort of response should be made as a sector wide comment but this did not reflect upon BCSU at all. It was accepted that the Students' Union had interpreted some comments as directed towards them, but the Deputy Director (Academic) reiterated that this was not the intention.

The President of the Students' Union noted that the author of BCSU Student Written Submission had been in post for two years, as he himself would be. It was pointed out however that it could not be guaranteed that this would always be the case nor that the authors of the Student Written Submission would be available during any future Audit visit.

The Chairman emphasised that there was no intention to deviate from the University College's strongly student centred approach. Further discussion would be needed with the Students' Union in respect of the issues raised. Additionally, since other aspects of the paper had not been considered thus far and a response needed to be sent to QAA by 13 January 2006, it was agreed that comments on all sections should be sent directly to the Deputy Director (Academic) before Christmas. In view of the short time scale involved, it would not be possible for Senate to consider the paper further before it was submitted. Senate **agreed** that a response should be sent from the University College and therefore the paper should be amended, as appropriate, following further discussion with the Students' Union and taking into account members' views.

Action: Deputy Director (Academic), Students' Union, Members

05.71

Report on the Meetings of Academic Audit Committee – 7 December 2005 and 14 December 2005 – verbal

The Chair of Academic Audit Committee gave a verbal report on the recent meetings of the Committee since it had not been possible to produce minutes in time for the Senate meeting.

In respect of the meeting of 7 December 2005 Senate was made aware of difficulties which had become apparent in respect of Annual Review & Evaluation in one area of University College provision. There had been discussion with Academic Registry and Directorate to review the process problems and how these might be resolved. Because of exceptional staff pressures and the visit of the British Psychological Society the AR&E Reports for Human Sciences had not been completed to the required schedule. An amended schedule had been agreed under which all necessary consideration would be completed by 24 February 2006. The Faculty Action Plan was due to be completed by 16 December 2005 and the Departmental Report by 11 January 2006. This latter date would allow for auditor's comment to be available to the next Faculty Board and thus the completion of the cycle in time for the next meeting of Academic Audit Committee.

This proposal was put to Senate and, in view of the fact that it resulted in a slight deferral of process but that all necessary consideration would have taken place by the next meeting of the Committee, it was **agreed**.

Matters to be brought forward from the meeting of 7 December to the next meeting of Senate included:

- Appeals
- Mitigating circumstances

The meeting of 14 December 2005 dealt with Annual Review & Evaluation. This included an overview of all Faculties and a selective view of Departments. The Chair of Academic Audit Committee confirmed proper process and overall confidence in the review process and delivery. Committee members were to be complimented on the work undertaken.

Minutes of both these meetings would be available for consideration at the next meeting of Senate.

a) Validation and Review (Doc No: SEN 05.104)

A Validation Event Report was presented to the meeting for consideration.

As shown from the papers, the Chair of the Panel had confirmed the completion of required conditions/recommendations. Senate therefore **approved** the following courses for delivery:

- FDA Dance Teaching
- FDA Dance Teaching with Certificate of Higher Education in Work Based Learning

b) External Examiner Nominations (Doc No:SEN 05.113)

A number of external examiners had been considered by AAC and were brought forward for approval.

- i) Laurence Solkin – City University
PGDip/MA Leadership and Management in FE and HE
New Nomination

Senate **approved** the nomination for a period of four years from 1 February 2005 to 31 January 2009.

- ii) Paul Smith – University of Hertfordshire
CIPD Personal Management & Development
Extension to Term

Senate **approved** the extension to term of office for a period of one year to 30 September 2006.

- iii) Andrew Collins – Anglia Ruskin University
CIPD PDS – Management Reports
Integrated Management Programme

Senate **approved** the extension to term of office for a period of one year to 30 September 2007.

-
- iv) Christiana Jacklin – London Metropolitan University
FD Sports Coaching and Performance
New Appointment

Senate **approved** the nomination for a period of four years to 30 September 2009.

- v) John Gould – Cumbernauld College
Music Industry Management
Degree and HND Programmes
New Appointment

Senate **approved** the nomination for a period of four years to 30 September 2009.

- vi) Alan Summers – North Wales School of Art and Design
BA(Hons) Design for Digital Media
New Appointment

It was noted that this nomination had been progressed by Chair's Action from AAC. Senate **approved** the nomination for a period of four years to 30 September 2009.

- vii) Marc Lavelle – Luton University
Field of Video Production – Selected Modules
New Appointment

Senate **approved** the nomination for a period of four years to 30 September 2009.

- viii) Rosie Gunn – University College for the Creative Arts, Farnham
Field of Video Production – Selected Modules
New Appointment

Senate **approved** the nomination for a period of four years to 30 September 2009.

- ix) Lorna O'Reilly – Homerton School of Health Studies
Critical Care and Clinical Courses
New Appointment

Senate **approved** the nomination for a period of four years to 30 September 2009.

- x) Carol Clark – University of the West of England
BSc(Hons) Nursing/DipHE Nursing Flexible Conversion (Child Pathway)
Return to Practice (Child Pathway)
Extension to Remit

Senate **approved** the extension to remit to the end of the term of office at 30 September 2008.

Report on the Meeting of Research Degrees Committee – 30 November 2005
(Doc No: SEN 05.107)

a) **Terms of Reference and Membership of Faculty Research Committees** (Doc No: SEN.05.106)

The Terms of Reference and Membership had now been amended to reflect the discussions at the previous meeting of Senate. Within the Terms of Reference there was now provision for the Committees to:

- Monitor grant applications
- Monitor and review an up-to-date record of research and scholarly outputs in the Faculty

It was suggested that there should be inclusion in the Terms of Reference of the ability of these Committees to set up Sub-Committees. This was agreed and the Terms of Reference and Membership were **approved**, subject to this change.

It was noted that within the Faculty of Design the relevant Committee is designated the Faculty Research & Scholarship Committee. Reconsideration of the University College approach to this may be necessary in future.

The Chair of Research Degrees Committee reported that the changes were welcomed by the Committee. However, a question had been raised as to how the Faculty Research Committees should be dealing with issues which are identified as a result of these. Some further input in respect of this was requested from Senate.

Action: Chair of Research Degrees Committee

b) **QAA Special Review – Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes** (Doc No: SEN05.108)

A questionnaire had been circulated to Research Degree Committee members for comment and the document approved in principle. As a result of an error in reproduction of the paper for Senate consideration this was not complete. It was agreed that a correct version would be circulated to all members for comment by the end of the first week in January. Following this any necessary amendment would be made to the document and **Chair's Action** taken to **approve**. To be reported back as a Matter Arising at the next meeting.

A question was raised in respect of the University College response and whether, since our research degrees are validated by Brunel University, this should be fed back through them. It was confirmed that advice had been sought regarding this and QAA confirmed that the requirement was for a University College response. It was also noted that our processes involved an enhancement of the Brunel University regulations.

Action: Chairman, Senate Secretary, Senate members

c) **Modifications to R3 and Q28** (Doc No: SEN 05.117)

A paper was presented highlighting minor amendments to the documents.

Senate **approved** these.

d) Other Matters

The Chair of the Committee drew attention to the executive summary. Problems had been raised in respect of research student living accommodation. This was being taken forward with the Head of Campus Services due to attend the next meeting.

Some rewording of the outcomes from Annual Review had been considered and agreed.

It was reported that there had been some revisions made to Brunel University regulations. Necessary changes would be made to University College regulations and guidelines to incorporate these.

05.73 Report on the Meeting of Teaching & Learning Committee – 29 November 2005 (Doc No: SEN 05.109)

The chair reported on a long meeting of the Committee.

a) Assessment Results

There had been consideration of assessment results for 2004-2005. A number of members had raised queries in respect of the nature of data presented but there was disappointment expressed by all in what appeared to be the worsening situation shown.

It was agreed that there should be a detailed review undertaken in each Faculty to ask:

- Is the situation deteriorating?
- If so what are the contributory factors?

The Faculty representatives will now initiate debate within the Faculties at Faculty Boards/Faculty Teaching & Learning Committees and this will then feed back to the Teaching & Learning Committee. It is then intended to initiate discussion across the University College and consider strategy for the future.

b) Student Retention/Attrition: A Brief Summary of the Literature (Doc No: SEN 05.109)

The Committee had reviewed activities and initiatives in respect of the Retention Strategy. Student Personal Development Planning is now a requirement and a detailed review/timeline has been put in place. A working group had gathered information from Faculties, Departments and the Students' Union. One of the actions required post our Institutional Audit was for a clearer/more consistent approach to Personal Development Planning.

The summary paper considered identified key factors linked with student retention/ achievement. The theme of engagement of students academically and socially as early as possible in their University life was brought out as was that of attendance support.

Faculties have been asked to provide updates on their attendance support and at the next meeting of the Committee there would be a review of the electronic system piloted by Leisure & Tourism and consideration of patterns of attendance across the Faculties.

It is felt that there should now be a fundamental review of the work of Academic Tutors and initial information gathering is currently taking place. As part of research undertaken with students who had withdrawn during their first year of study it became apparent that there was a lack of knowledge within this group of the Academic Tutor system.

It seems that a great many initiatives have been incorporated into the Academic Tutor system including, skills development, attendance support and provision of information to students and this may have diluted the original intention of the promotion of engagement with students to ensure that they settle quickly.

The Committee also intended to review the implementation of a revised Assessment Strategy in the New Year. Therefore, there are four main areas of work now to be taken forward:

- Personal Development Planning
- Attendance Support
- Academic Tutoring
- Assessment Strategy

A progress report would be presented to each meeting of Senate and proposals brought forward for changes which might be implemented for next academic year.

The Chairman of Senate noted that there would also be review in respect of other issues which impact upon students, e.g. accommodation and transport, and these are currently being considered elsewhere.

Members were asked for comments in respect of the inter-related issues raised under a) and b).

- It was agreed that the minutes would be amended to read FD rather than FDA to accommodate the fact that we also offer FDSc
- It was noted that Senate members had yet to have the opportunity to review the paper on assessment results. This was to be circulated within the Faculties for consideration
- A question was raised as to whether the worsening of results could be attributed to changes already made to the academic year. It was reported that a number of potential explanations had been raised but that as yet there was insufficient evidence to come to any firm conclusion
- There was some concern raised regarding the number of descriptors currently in use. It was agreed that the Glossary definitions should be used at all times but there was a potential for more work to be undertaken by Teaching & Learning Committee. Senate **requested** that the Committee take this forward
- In respect of the Literature Review, thanks were extended by Senate for the work undertaken. However, in some respects this related to a situation somewhat different from that in which the University College finds itself and did not reflect our current student intake

The Chairman confirmed that arrangement would be made to ensure that when proposals are brought forward from the Committee these would be financially supported for next year.

Action: Teaching & Learning Committee

05.74

Report on Meeting of Planning Board – 31 October 2005 (Doc No:SEN05.103)

Minutes of the meeting were presented for information.

The President of the Students' Union requested that some consideration should be given to the inclusion of Students' Union representation in the membership of the Board.

05.75

Report on the Meetings of Faculty Boards of Studies

a) Applied Social Sciences & Humanities – 19 October 2005 and 23 November 2005 (Doc No: SEN 05.100)

The Dean reported on items from the meeting of 19 October 2005. There had been a number of problems encountered in enrolment for students in the Faculty. These were now being taken forward via co-operation between the Faculty and central services.

Proposals for new courses were considered, including the first Foundation Degree within the Faculty.

Senate was informed that the British Psychological Society had made a re-accreditation visit reviewing the BSc(Hons) and Graduate Diploma in Psychology. Initial feedback from the visit had been positive and it was firmly expected that re-accreditation will be recommended in January. The pro-active approach taken by the team was noted by the visitors. Senate looked forward to the result of the visit being received.

Minutes of the meeting of 23 November 2005 were not available and would therefore be considered at the next meeting.

b) Buckinghamshire Business School – 14 October 2005 and 25 November 2005 (Doc Nos: SEN 05.90 and 05.112)

The Dean of Faculty introduced the minutes of the 2 meetings which had both dealt with issues relating to Annual Review & Evaluation. There had also been discussion at both in respect of the condition of the estate at Chalfont and problems related to this.

The meeting of 25 November 2005 had agreed to request a presentation from the Head of Marketing in order to gain an informed understanding of the current strategy for promotion of the University College. It was felt that this was something which should be arranged for all Faculties.

Action: Head of Marketing

c) Design – 23 November 2005

Minutes of the meeting were not available, however the Dean noted that it had been taken up by consideration of Annual Review & Evaluation. To be brought forward to the next meeting of Senate.

d) Health Studies – 14 November 2005 (Doc No: SEN 05.105)

The Dean drew attention to a number of points on the Executive Summary. Problems regarding the National Bursary were ongoing and a member of the Student Money Advice Centre had attended to report on the current situation. Representation had been made at a national level and it was hoped that problems would ease. The Faculty thanked the Student Money Advice Centre for their help and support at this difficult time.

A highly complimentary report on Major Review and OQME had been received and the draft written report is expected on 6 January 2006. Full confidence was confirmed in the standards set for and attained by Health Visiting and Nursing students. Outcomes were reported as follows:

- Learning & Teaching – Commended
- Student Progression – Commended
- Learning Resources and their Effective Use – Commended
- Management and Enhancement of Standards and Quality – Full Confidence

The Faculty will be expected to formulate an action plan by 26 March 2006 and following this there will be a requirement for quarterly data sets and monthly monitoring.

The Chairman of Senate congratulated the Faculty on the great success of the visit and thanked all staff involved for their hard work.

e) Leisure & Tourism – 23 November 2005

Minutes of the meeting were not available and would therefore be considered at the next meeting.

f) Technology – 23 November 2005 (Doc No: SEN 05.102)

A number of points from the Executive Summary were highlighted by the Dean. The meeting had undertaken work relating to Annual Review & Evaluation.

Module and course amendments were considered in addition to proposals for new courses and title changes for some other courses.

The Faculty Staff Development Annual Report was received and endorsed.

The Faculty Operating Statement for 2004 – 2005 was reviewed.

g) Board of Professional and Continuing Education – 14 November 2005 (Doc No: SEN 05.116)

The Head of School of Continuing Professional Education introduced the minutes noting that the second cohort of students on the MA in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education was about to commence work. The Chairman noted the importance of promotion of development for colleagues and encouraged all Faculties to consider staff for inclusion within the programme.

An Ofsted inspection was currently part way through for the PGCE. Thus far there had been no problems encountered with this and it was reported that the inspection team found the teaching and management at Amersham & Wycombe College and East Berkshire College to be of a high standard. There would need to be further development undertaken, but this would be within areas which were deemed to be difficult nationally. The inspectors would be returning for a further visit in May 2006.

Action: Deans of Faculty

05.76 Report on the Meeting of Council – 21 November 2005 (Doc No: SEN 05.115)

Minutes of the meeting were presented to Senate for note.

The Chairman drew attention to the minute dealing with University Title. It was reported that work was currently being undertaken by the University Title Oversight Group to prepare a submission document in order that it would be possible to submit at a time of our choosing to be agreed post-Easter. Work was ongoing to update the academic staff database and it was noted that the return date for information had now been reached.

As the work continued, papers would be brought forward for consideration by Senate and Council.

05.77

Academic Planning Committee – Terms of Reference

Amendments to Membership and Terms of Reference were presented for consideration. It was noted that under 5. of the Terms of Reference the Academic Planning Committee would consider market research. A question was raised as to how this would occur.

The Chair of the Committee explained that there would be a group looking at initial/outline proposals and there would need to be significant input from the Planning Unit.

The Chair of Academic Audit Committee felt that it would be useful to have some cross reference to that Committee included to make certain there would be no potential for omission between academic and planning approval. It was agreed that the Chairs of the Committees should meet to discuss this and agree appropriate wording.

The President of the Students' Union highlighted the omission of any student representation on the Committee. It was agreed that the Committee should consider whether this would be of use to the development of the curriculum. If so, a student representative should be included and if not then the reason for this should be explained.

There was some discussion in respect of other membership of the Committee and it was noted that Deans were not specifically included though since there was a Deans nominee they were at liberty to nominate themselves. Additionally, members could be co-opted for specific items if it was felt that this was appropriate.

It was felt that, since there may be restructuring within Faculties in the future, the current Terms of Reference might not be radical enough. While it was accepted that there may be change in future, the current emphasis was to ensure that Academic Planning Committee had a clear role in respect of issues which are being brought forward.

It was agreed that the Membership and Terms of Reference should be **approved**, subject to inclusion of mention of Academic Audit Committee and a representative of the Students' Union, should this be deemed appropriate.

The Chairman noted that there would be a review of portfolio and structure which would result in proposals being put forward by the Directorate in due course. These would be considered by Planning Board and Senate before being presented to Council.

Action: Chairs AAC and APC, APC, Secretary - APC

05.78 **Report from Academic Appeals Committee – 18 November 2005** (*Doc No: SEN 05.89*)

Anonymised details of the decisions made by the Committee were presented for note.

05.79 **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of Senate would be held on 24 February 2006 in the Board Room, High Wycombe Campus.

The Chairman noted that this was the last meeting for the Dean of Applied Social Sciences and Humanities prior to his departure. Best wishes were extended for his career in the future. His successor was welcomed to her new post.

The best wishes of Senate were also extended to the Chairman on his last attendance prior to his retirement.

Signed _____
(Chairman)

Date _____

prepared by: Senior Registrar (Timetabling, Assessments & Awards)
file location: K:\Committees\Senate (RA)\Senate - Minutes\2005 - 2006\Senate minutes 16 December 2005.doc