

Senate

21/16 A meeting of the Senate was held via teams, on Thursday 24 June 2021 at 2.15 pm.

Present:

The Vice-Chancellor (Chair)

Professor Adrian Bell
Professor Cindy Becker
Dr Rebecca Berkley
Dr Katrina Bicknell
Professor Helen Bilton
Professor Ingo Bojak
Professor Carmel Houston-Price
Professor David Carter
Professor Claire Collins
Dr Yota Dimitriadi
Professor Peter Dorward
Professor Mark Fellowes
Dr David Field
Professor Richard Frazier
Professor Clare Furneaux
Dr Francesca Greco
Professor Becky Green
Professor Andrew Godley
Professor Louise Hague
Professor Chris Harty
Dr Lawrence Hill-Cawthorne
Professor Carmel Houston-Price
Ms Rebecca Jerrome
Professor Rodney Jones
Dr Daniela La Penna
Dr Allan Laville
Dr Tim Lees
Professor Elizabeth McCrum
Professor Gail Marshall
Professor Simon Mortimer
Professor Steve Musson
Professor Julian Park
Dr Karen Poulter

Professor Jane Setter
Dr Mark Shanahan
Professor Simon Sherratt
Professor David Stack
Professor Vesna Stojanovik
Professor Katja Strohfeltd
Dr Maria Vahdati
Professor Sue Walker
Dr Hong Wei
Dr Karin Whiteside
Professor Adrian Williams
Professor Paul Williams
Dr Hong Yang
Professor Parveen Yaqoob
Professor Dominik Zaum

Students:

George Ingram, RUSU Education Officer
Bandy Karki, RUSU Welfare Officer
Rachel Osborne, RUSU President
Alex Rose, RUSU Activities Officer
Rachel Wates, RUSU Diversity Officer
Oscar Minto
Ellie Carter

In attendance:

Ms Louise Sharman (Secretary)
Ms Sam Foley
Dr Richard Messer
Mrs Sally Pellow

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed members to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor paid tribute to the following who had died since the last meeting of the Senate:

Caroline Dyer-Melville who retired from the University in 2019. Caroline joined the University in 2008 as a Receptionist for the Institute of Education (IoE), which at that time was based at Bulmershe campus. When Bulmershe closed in 2011, Caroline moved with the Institute of Education to the London Road campus.

Kathryn 'Kit' Brownlee. Kit joined the University in 1985 and worked for a short period within the Physiology, Biochemistry and Zoology department. Kit then changed roles and joined the Technician team within the Food Sciences department.

Dr Michael Pitt. Michael joined the University in the 1960s and worked as a Lecturer within the History department until his retirement in 1996.

21/17 The Minutes (21/1 – 21/15) of the meeting held on 3 March 2021 were approved.

Items for presentation and discussion

21/18 Update on REF (Item 4)

The Senate received a presentation on the REF submission 2021 from Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Zaum who highlighted a few key points and personal reflections, in particular:

- The submission had been made in March as per the deadline. This was a substantial piece of work which had touched all parts of the University.
- The submission had involved over 200 colleagues from Schools and Functions.
- The pandemic and lockdowns had a significant impact on the preparations for submission.
- The University had made 23 submissions to 22 REF 2021 UOAs.
- The University returned 700.25 FTE, compared to 590.04 FTE in 2014. This increase was not driven by significant growth in research staff at the University, but merely by changes to the REF rules, requiring submission by all eligible staff.
- A total of 1,662 outputs were submitted (1091 in 2014).
- The aim was to achieve an overall institutional GPA of at least 3.30 (3.03 2014) – the final estimate was 3.43.
- Compared to REF 2014 outcomes it was estimate there would be improved performance in all but one UoA.
- A total of 54 staff were considered to be independent researchers.
- A total of 195 staff declared personal circumstances. The Personal Circumstances Group made decisions on the eligibility of these and any relevant output reduction. No appeals against these decisions were received.
- A final equality impact assessment would be undertaken.
- A lessons learnt exercise would be undertaken to understand what had worked well/or not with the process. Feedback would be welcomed from colleagues whilst the process was still fresh in their minds.
- Given the amount of work involved preparation would need to start shortly on the impact case studies for the next REF.
- It was thought that the future research assessment process would give greater focus to

culture and the environment.

- REF was a hugely demanding and labour-intensive exercise. It was also high risk for some of the smaller units. There would be a need to consider fewer units in the future in order to de-risk and reduce the burden on colleagues. This would be a careful balancing act and would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Professor Zaum agreed to circulate the institutional environment statement.

The Senate recorded its thanks to all colleagues involved in preparing the REF submission.

21/19 Portfolio Review Pathway (Item 5)

The Senate received a presentation on the progress of the projects within the Portfolio Review Pathway from Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor McCrum. The presentation:

- 1) Gave an update on the progress made by each of the Portfolio Review Pathway projects.
- 2) Presented a proposal to restructure the academic year.
- 3) Provided an opportunity for Senators to feed into the work of the Programme Expectations and Blended Learning Projects through break-out groups.

1) Portfolio Review Pathway

The update report provided an overview of the key activities being taken forward by each project, including:

- Programme review (Programme and Module Review Project).
- Revising the Curriculum Framework and proposals for assessment, programme/module timetabling and delivery, including engagement with staff and students (Programme Expectations Project).
- Collating and analysing existing staff and student feedback on their recent experience of online and blended learning, exploring examples of University-wide approaches to blended learning, undertaking a literature review and developing a position paper and definition for blended learning (Blended Learning Project).
- Further exploration of two models for the academic year [the semester system and the three (teaching) term system], including engagement with staff and students (Academic Year Project).

In respect of the Programme Module Review Senators asked whether the review process would take place with Programmes Directors/Module Convenors or whether the process would be top down. It was confirmed that the process would be carried out locally – broad parameters and institutional targets would be set but it was expected that the process would be carried out locally through a consultative process. Any metrics provided would not be a determinant as decisions would need to be made in the local context.

Senators also queried the timescales with the module review and whether there would be the opportunity to speak with students and stakeholders. It was acknowledged that the timescale was being driven by a number of external factors and that was why the timeframe was tight.

2) Academic Year

A series of engagement sessions had been held with the Student Panel as well as engagement with a wide range of stakeholders across the institution and a staff survey to gather feedback on

the proposed options.

The paper assessed the relative merits of the two potential models for re-structuring the academic year at Reading, namely semesters and trimesters:

1. To identify critical feasibility issues that would be raised by the introduction of either model;
2. To assess the potential opportunities for capacity creation offered by either model, through the more efficient use of resources and the estate;
3. To assess the potential opportunities for either model to help improve delivery of teaching and assessment, and to enhance the student experience;
4. To consider the potential implications of each model for the wellbeing of students and staff.

It had been concluded that the balance of evidence was weighted decisively in favour of semesters:

- Semesters better enabled the delivery of teaching in the form of modules with relatively heavy credit weightings (e.g. 20c, 30c or 40c modules);
- Such an approach to teaching delivery provided the most direct means of reducing the overall number of modules taught, and the number of assessments set and marked;
- Semesters maximised the amount of time within the year available for teaching, thus increasing physical teaching capacity without the need to extend the teaching day;
- The longer teaching periods under the semester system allowed for more flexibility in terms of student module changes, and for greater resilience in terms of potential disruption to teaching delivery;
- Semesters, as the globally dominant model within the HE sector, better facilitated the development of international partnerships as well as student and staff exchange programmes;
- Student concerns about wellbeing were most pronounced in relation to the trimester system, which some felt would lead to a more intensive process of cramming for regular assessments;
- A significant majority of respondents to the staff survey had expressed a preference for the semester system.

It was recommended that:

1. The University committed to adopting a semester system from the beginning of the academic year 2023/24.
2. A project implementation team be established with a membership and remit to be agreed by the Portfolio Review Steering Group.

Senators raised a number of questions and comments on the proposal, as follows:

- There was a concern for Schools such as Law as to how the semester system would work well and result in visible efficiencies. The School's UG programme consisted of year long modules with summative assessments partly during the year and partly at the end of the year – it would be difficult to convert these to long/thin modules to short/fat modules. There were also similar issues in the Languages.

Professor McCrum responded that this was an issue that would definitely be picked up further in the implementation phase. The bunching of assessments was a real problem for students and staff. It was recognised that there were a number of disciplinary arguments around this issue that would need to be explored further.

- There needed to be recognition that some Schools offered programmes that did not fit the standard mould, for e.g. the Physician's Associate Programme. Consideration would need to be given as to how to deal with programmes that did not easily fit the semester system and how they would be supported to ensure they were on par with standard programmes.

Professor Miskell acknowledged that the University ran a number of programmes that would not align with the academic year however it was structured and that these programmes would have to run as now. It was reported that many Schools and Departments were looking to find innovative solutions and be creative; it was felt that the semester system would provide a structure that would be of most help.

- Did the Student Panel include a broad representation of students?

Professor McCrum confirmed that the panel was proportionately represented across mode and level of study.

- Some Schools had long/fat modules that could not be split across two semesters; this would need to be addressed further.
- The requirement to do away with 10 credit modules might cause issues – it would not make sense to expand into 20 credit modules or make an alliance by merging two 10 credit modules.
- There was a need to be cautious about making assessment piecemeal and missing out on the sound pedagogic principles of assessing broad knowledge and application of that knowledge.
- University level structures needed to be designed in a way that allowed maximum flexibility.

The Senate were asked to approve the recommendation that the University commits to adopting a semester system from the beginning of academic year 2023/24, for onward submission to the Council at its meeting on 5 July 2021.

Whilst there was broad support for the principle of semesterisation, a number of Senators expressed reservations about approving a general policy without more detail or a clear commitment as to whether there would be any flexibility at the local level.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that there would be ways to accommodate subject specific needs especially where linked to professional accreditation by professional and statutory bodies. He noted that many other institutions operated semesters and were still able to teach subjects such as the Modern Languages and Law, and that they benefited from a simpler and more effective system. If there were genuine reasons as to why programmes would not fit with the semester model then the University would try to be flexible where it could.

Professor McCrum agreed that the University would do what it could to help with the move to a semester system but it could not commit to full flexibility for Schools. It would, however, commit to understanding the key issues for certain disciplines and look to make accommodations where possible whilst recognising the overall need to achieve the benefits

from this piece of work.

The Senate agreed to approve the proposal to adopt a semester system, with a commitment to adopt reasonable disciplinary flexibility where this did not dilute the benefits of semesterisation. Professor Frazier as the Senate representative on Council was asked to convey the view of Senate to Council.

3) Revised Curriculum Framework

The first activity of the Programme Expectations Project (PEP) was to: Establish a set of programme principles that were linked to programme and learning outcomes, and that clearly articulated an approach to student blended learning and assessment, embedding the principles of our University strategy and the Curriculum Framework.

The Curriculum Framework (CF) was a logical starting point for this activity as it:

- remained central to achieving our education and student experience priorities; and
- already sets out academic and pedagogic principles that underpin programme design.

Given this alignment the planned review and refresh of the CF itself was subsumed within the PEP. The purpose of the CF Refresh was to:

- Revisit CF principles to ensure they were current, relevant to our teaching & learning context and reflective of the new University Strategy.
- Streamline CF through prioritising those aspects which are fundamental to programme design, providing colleagues with a clear and accessible set of baseline expectations to guide practice.

The outcomes of the process (Revised CF) formed the basis of the PEP programme principles and ensured a 'pedagogy-first approach' to the implementation of other PEP activities, such as rationalising assessment and achieving a more efficient and sustainable timetable.

The revised CF outlined the University's Graduate Attributes and four overarching Principles of Programme Design, Coherent, Connected, Student-centred & inclusive and Sustainable, indicating how each of these principles could be achieved. Each of the revised CF programme principles also integrated the long-term vision for a University-wide approach to blended learning following consultation with BL project group.

The Revised CF would be referred to UBTLS for formal approval in July. The dissemination and implementation of the revised CF will be considered alongside the development of the PEP Project Initiation Document in consultation with the Strategic Lead for the Curriculum Framework Project.

Senators were invited to comment further on the proposals in break out groups. Feedback from those groups would be fed back to the project team.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked all those colleagues involved in the Portfolio Review Pathway and Senators for their comments.

The Senate received the Vice-Chancellor's address to the Senate, noting in particular:

- a) Surge testing - Reading Borough Council (RBC) and Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) had announced that they were working with Public Health England (PHE) to launch a period of extra testing for the local community from Monday 7 June as cases in the region had been increasing. The University had also seen an increase in cases, as reported on the Dashboard, and had been working with PHE to undertake targeted on-site testing for the Halls affected. Contact tracing to date suggested that infection had been contained and PHE had also confirmed they were happy with the control measures in place.
- b) Roadmap implications - The Government announcement on 14 June meant there would be delay of at least four weeks before the further COVID-19 restrictions would be eased. It had been confirmed that the current guidance to work from home where possible continued to apply.
- c) Lateral Flow Testing – The University was operating a home-testing model for lateral flow testing for staff and students who were coming onto campus. Members of our community could pick up lateral flow tests from campus and all those studying, living or working on campus were strongly encouraged to test themselves twice a week.
- d) Autumn term planning - The Major Recovery Team (MRT) continued to plan for the start of the next academic year. From September no social distance measures would be required for teaching.
- e) Impact on research - Research leave had been awarded to 50 colleagues for next year to enable them to focus on their research. It was widely documented that the impact had been disproportionate on women; two thirds of those who had been awarded research leave were female.
- f) Staff pulse survey: Last month's survey would help to understand how colleagues felt on the measures in place to keep our campuses safe and secure for those returning to work on campus, as well as those who had continued to do so throughout the pandemic. The responses would also help plan for the coming months.
- g) Phase 1 Review with UCU and Staff Forum - At the end of May, the Vice-Chancellor met with members of the Staff Forum and the UCU as part of the agreed three-monthly review of the phase 1 agreement. The projected shortfall because of the Covid-19 pandemic remained c£80m and so no further measures were proposed at this time. The next major milestone would be January 2022 when an assessment of the financial implications of the summer recruitment would be made.
- h) OfS – the Vice-Chancellor had attended a meeting of Universities UK where Lord Wharton, the new chair of the Office for Students (OfS) gave his inaugural speech. Whilst there were no new policy announcements, the importance of 'high-quality' courses, and universities' central role in levelling-up access to higher education for students from all backgrounds were central themes.
- i) Ethical investment – the University, like many other universities, had received correspondence from students regarding the crisis in the Middle East and the extent to which it had investments in companies operating in or benefiting from activities in occupied Palestinian territories. In response, we were able to outline our ethical investment policy – which already precluded investment in companies listed by the UN as benefiting from operations within these areas – and the involvement that RUSU had played in developing this policy.
- j) Flexible use of apprenticeship levy – the Vice-Chancellor had received a response from the Chief Secretary to the Treasury, in response to the joint letter sent on behalf of

universities, students' unions and businesses on the flexible use of the apprenticeship levy, over a month ago. Whilst the Government had noted the concerns, and restated recent announcements on plans for changes to the apprenticeship scheme, the specific offer to work on a revised scheme that would allow businesses to use levy funds on key skills and jobs for a limited period was not taken up.

- k) USS Pension – in May an all-staff talk was held on the USS pension scheme where support for the UUK alternative proposal was outlined.
- l) Wokingham development plans – the University had been approached by Wokingham Borough Council to discuss options for future development. As part of a review of potential areas for new development through the Wokingham Local Plan process.
- m) Freedom of Speech -The Government had launched a new policy over freedom of speech in universities. The new detailed guidance included a new free speech condition placed on higher education providers in order to be registered in England and access public funding. The regulator, the Office for Students, will have the power to impose sanctions, including financial penalties, for breaches of the condition.
- n) Strategic Foundation Programme - Progress was being made on this important programme. To aid communication and engagement, staff portal pages had been published with information on the programme and individual pathways. On ways of working, a series of five workshops were held with 50 colleagues from across the University. A draft framework had been developed to enable more flexible ways of working and was being considered by the steering group.
- o) Race equality – Senators might have seen the positive new coverage concerning our race equality review with the report published last week.
- p) Gender equality - Two Schools had been awarded Athena SWAN awards. The School of Psychology and Clinical Language Sciences has been awarded an Athena SWAN silver and the School of Politics, Economics, and International Relations (SPEIR) an Athena SWAN Bronze award.

21/21 Update on ECMWF (Item 7)

The Senate received an updated from Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Zaum on ECMWF. It was noted that:

- The UK had reiterated its offer to build a new HQ to host ECMWF's core science on the University Campus. Since January, the UK government, through BEIS and the Government Property Agency (GPA), had been working with ECMWF to agree the requirements for the new HQ. These discussions were ongoing and progressing. BEIS and GPA would bring an update on the proposal and state of discussions to the June 2021 ECMWF Council for approval in principle, to be followed by a full and detailed final proposal for the December 2021 Council. If approved, work on the building should start soon after.
- In the wake of the unsuccessful Copernicus bid, the University had the opportunity to see key elements of the more successful proposals. Two issues stood out. First, they were financially more generous. Second, they offered to invest into supporting the development of research synergies with relevant institutions in the wider area. This included a number of research posts, visiting fellowships etc. This was an aspect of the successful bids that the University could meaningfully contribute to.
- Even without Copernicus, there was a strong case that moving ECMWF and its core weather-forecasting operation to the campus would create transformative opportunities and synergies for climate and weather science, and the reputation of the University in this area.

- The potential scientific, reputational, and commercial benefits supported a case for a significant University effort that both maximised our ability to benefit from the co-location and supported the UK proposal. The lesson from the Copernicus bid was that the best way for the University to do so was to investment into research synergies, such as dedicated teams of early career researchers in priority areas for ECMWF and the University, that supported both ECMWF’s modelling and forecasting work, and the University’s research and global reputation.
- An initial proposal of what such an investment could look like has been developed. The total proposed investment would be £30m over 15 years, or an average of £2m per year, from 2022/23. Strategy and Finance Committee had in principle approved such an investment, conditional on a positive outcome of the proposal to move ECMWF HQ and its core weather forecasting operation onto the campus.

Items for report and approval

21/22 Report of the University Executive Board (Item 8)

There was no report on this occasion.

21/23 Report of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (Item 9)

The Senate received the Report of the meetings of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (UBTLSE) held on 16 March, 20 April, 11 May and 8 June 2021.

The Senate noted updates on:

- Portfolio Review Pathway (including Academic Year Project)
- Terms and Conditions and Student Fees Policy 2022/23
- International Foundation Programme Student Contract bundle 2022/23
- Examinations and assessment in 2020/21
- Teaching & Learning Framework 2021/22
- New Policy and Procedures for Exceptional Circumstances
- Student Academic Transitions
- Student Attendance & Engagement Project
- Student Voice & Partnership
- Quality Assurance Review
- Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) at the University of Reading
- Changes to the Academic Practice Programme from 2021/22

21/24 Report of the University Board for Research and Innovation (Item 10)

The Senate received the report of the University Board for Research and Innovation.

In particular, the Senate noted the following key points from the Board:

- The Board had received an update on the individual expectations workstream, the first stage

of the Strategic Foundations Programme Expectations and Workload Pathway.

- The Board had received an update on recent research-related performance data, including the Knowledge Exchange Framework, QS World and THE Impact rankings, and research grants data.
- The Board discussed the SUMS review of the Building Outstanding Impact Support Programme (BOISP)
- The Board received a summary of the University's REF 2021 submission
- The Board received an update on the potential relocation of the ECMWF HQ to campus
- The Board approved the annual statement of compliance with the Concordat to support Research Integrity for onward transmission to Senate and Council.

The Senate approved the annual statement of compliance with the Concordat to support Research Integrity for submission to the Council.

21/25 Report of the Global Engagement Strategy Board (Item 11)

The Senate noted that there was no report on this occasion. Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Paul Inman) had indicated that he wished to give a presentation to a future meeting.

21/26 Student Recruitment and Admissions Update (Item 12)

Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Fellowes highlighted to the Senate that this year's recruitment round would be challenging. There were issues around: grade inflation; competitor behaviour; changes to visa rules; vaccinations; travel restrictions; and quarantine hotel costs. All of these factors were creating a great deal of uncertainty.

Undergraduate Home applications were looking positive, however International undergraduate applications were down and as were PGT.

21/27 Report from RUSU (Item 13)

The Senate received reports from the outgoing RUSU Officers highlighting their achievements over the last year. Members of Senate thanked the Officers for all their work.

The Senate also welcomed the incoming RUSU Officers and noted their plans for the coming year.

Items for note

21/28 Review of the Senate (Item 14)

The Senate noted that there would be review of the Senate during 2021/22. This would be taken forward by the Senate Agenda Group, members of the Senate were encouraged to be involved.

21/29 Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Examination Results (Item 15)

The Senate received and noted a report from the Senate Standing Committee on Examination Results summarising cases since the last Senate.

21/30 Report of the Student Appeals Committee (Item 16)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Student Appeals Committee held since the last meeting and noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

21/31 Report of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct (item 17)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct held since the last meeting and noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

21/32 Report of the Standing Committee on Academic Engagement and Fitness to Study (Item 18)

There was no report on this occasion.

21/33 Report of the Standing Committee on Fitness to Practise (Item 19)

The Senate received and noted the Report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Fitness to Practise.

21/34 Report of the Standing Disciplinary Committee (Item 20)

The Senate received and noted the Report of the Standing Disciplinary Committee on disciplinary sanctions including those imposed in the Halls of Residence.

21/35 Items approved by Chair's Action (Item 21 a)

The Senate noted the following items had been approved by Chair's Action:

- Appointment of Professor Osborn, Professor Brauner, Dr McSorley and Mr Savania to the Student Appeals Committee for the period to 31 July 2024.
- That Heads of School membership would rotate in future to ensure that all had the opportunity to serve on Senate during their tenure as Head of School.
- Minor amendments (deletions) to the Ordinances 2021/22

21/36 Appointments to Committees and other bodies (Item 21 b)

In respect of appointments, the Senate:-

- Noted that two vacancies remained on the Senate Agenda Group
- Two vacancies remained for Senate representatives to serve on Honorary Degrees Committee to 31 July 2024
- One vacancy remained on the Arts Committee until 31 July 2024
- One vacancy remained on the Research Ethics Committee

The Senate made the following appointments/reappointments:

- Professor John Board to the Honorary Degrees Committee to 31 July 2023
- Professor Lorraine Farrelly to the Honorary Degrees Committee to 31 July 2023
- Dr Karen Poulter to the Personal Titles Committee to 31 July 2024
- Professor Simon Sherratt to the Student Appeals Committee to 31 July 2024.
- Professor Green to the Student Appeals Committee to 31 July 2024.
- Dr Andrew Bicknell to the Student Appeals Committee to 31 July 2024.
- Dr Carol Padgett to the Student Appeals Committee to 31 July 2024
- Dr Matthew Lickiss to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Ms Daniela Standen to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Ms Sharon Sinclair-Graham to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Professor Jane Setter to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Dr Paul Jenkins to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Professor Rebecca Harris to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Dr Carol Padgett to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Dr Smith to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Ms Amanda Millmore to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Dr Joseph to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Professor Glaister to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024
- Ms M Jay to the Standing Committee on Examination Results to 31 July 2024.
- Professor Lovegrove to the Research Ethics Committee to 31 July 2024.
- Dr Christakou to the Research Ethics Committee to 31 July 2024.
- Dr Lim to the Research Ethics Committee to 31 July 2024.

21/37 Retirement of Professors (Item 21 c)

The Senate approved that under the provisions of Ordinance B7 the title of Emeritus/ta Professor be conferred with effect from the date indicated on:

Professor Rhona Stainthorp (31.1.21)
 Professor Geoffrey Wadge (13.6.21)
 Professor Claire Collins (31.7.21)
 Professor Michael Ball (31.7.21)
 Professor Abby Ghobadian (31.7.21)
 Professor Christopher Newdick (31.7.21)
 Professor Roger Gibbard (31.7.21)
 Professor Anna Horwood (31.7.21)
 Professor Laurence Harwood (31.7.21)

Professor Grace Ioppolo (31.7.21)
Professor Rachel McCrindle (31.7.21)
Professor Dianne Berry (30.9.21)

21/38 Other Retirements (Item 21 d)

The Senate approved that that the following be accorded the title of Honorary Fellow for a period of five years with effect from the date indicated:

Nick Roberts (8.6.20)
Julie Pendleton (30.11.20)
Dr Simon Burke (31.12.20)
Shane Benson (31.12.20)
Christina Harrison (28.1.21)
Camilla Evans- Hensey (31.3.21)
Dr Christopher Turner (31.3.21)
Nigel White (16.4.21)
Rodney Mouring (30.4.21)
Paul Harding (28.5.21)
Chris Smith (31.5.21)
Colin Green (31.5.21)
Lyn Newdick (31.7.21)
Nick Beard (31.7.21)
Dr Andrew Russell (5.9.21)
Dr Lyn Thurloway (31.7.21)
Dr Fred Davies (31.7.21)
Dr Colin Campbell (31.7.21)
Julie Cooper (31.7.21)
Cathy Hughes (31.7.21)
Dr Geoffrey Brown (31.7.21)
Kevin Doyle (31.7.21)
Jane Waring (31.7.21)
Alison Butler (31.7.21)
Shirley Mellor (5.8.21)
John Curran (6.8.21)

21/39 List of Meetings 2021-22

The Senate received the final version of the list of meetings for 2021-22 for its information.

21/40 Any other business

The Senate recorded its thanks to the outgoing RUSU officers and student representatives. The Senate also thanked all other Senators whose terms of office were coming to an end.

Student representatives withdrew from the remainder of the meeting

RESERVED BUSINESS

21/41 Reports of Examiners for Higher Degrees by thesis (Item 24 a)

The Senate approved recommendations for the award or otherwise of Higher Degrees.

21/42 Examinations for Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (Item 24 b)

The Senate authorised the Vice-Chancellor to approve May/June/July 2021 examination results on its behalf.