

THE SENATE

Minutes of the 344th meeting of the Senate, held on Wednesday, 13th March 2019

PRESENT:	Professor Alec Cameron (Chair) Dr Shakil Ahmad Dr Parveen Akhtar Salma Amin Professor Frank Austermuehl Professor Tony Clark Elizabeth Dolan Professor Frank Eperjesi Dr Raquel Gil-Cazorla Dr Stuart Greenhill Saskia Loer Hansen Helen Higson Stephen Luke Dr Carol Marley Dr Shehzad Naroo Dr Mike Peters Professor Gertrud Reershemius Professor Kate Sugden Jenny Thompson Dr Victoria Uren Dr Keqing Wang	Rabia Ahmed Professor Sahar Al-Malaika Amna Atteeq Karen Caine Professor Leon Davies Professor Jun Du Professor George Feiger Professor Simon Green Professor Sarah Hainsworth Professor Chris Hewitt Professor Lee Jenkins Alison Levey Professor Stefan Manz Dr Jörg Mathias Professor Helen Pattison Dr Johan Rewilak Neil Scott Dr Eirini Theodosiou Professor Jonathan Tritter Professor Ivan Wall Dr Sylvia Wong
APOLOGIES:	Professor Asif Ahmed Kimberly Tze Yee Chong Professor Simon Cooper Professor Andrew Devitt Dr Doina Gherghel Dr Peter Lewis Professor Corinne Spickett Chris Wanley	Ifti Hussain Alice Coombes Professor Ivo De Loo Dr Panos Doss Andrew Harris Professor Francisco Leyva-Leon Professor George Tadros Dr Uwe Wunderlich
IN ATTENDANCE:	Dr Hannah Bartlett (M18/81-85) Steve Jones (M18/81-85) Mark Smith John Walter (Secretary)	David Farrow Dr Liz Moores (M18/73-74) Rebecca Stokes (M18/81-85) Chris Wilson (M18/81-85)

FOR REPORT AND APPROVAL

Minutes

18/52 RESOLVED:

To approve the minutes of the 343rd meeting of the Senate, held on Wednesday, 21st November 2018.

Matters Arising

18/53 RECEIVED:

Paper SEN-18-1674-A, a summary of actions taken in response to matters arising from the previous meeting.

Doctor of Education (EdD) – New Award (M18/23)

18/54 NOTED:

That the Doctor of Education (EdD) award has been included in the University Ordinances (5.3.3.5).

Appointment of Emeritus Professor (M18/33)

18/55 NOTED:

That the Provost had sent a letter of appointment to the new Emeritus Professor.

Development of Aston's Research Web Pages (M18/44)

18/56 NOTED:

That a Research Marketing Manager had recently been appointed who had established a task group, which would be broadened to include School representatives, to review and take actions to enhance the University research web presence as a matter of the highest priority.

Senate's Annual Report to Council for 2017/18 (M18/46)

18/57 NOTED:

That Council had approved Senate's Annual Report to Council for 2017/18 and this provided the assurance to enable Council to authorise the Vice-Chancellor to sign off the Annual Assurance Return for 2018 for submission to the OfS. The Provost and the Director of Governance would ensure that the Senate breakout group's suggestions as to how the Annual Report could be improved would influence the preparation of next year's Report.

Business Information Dashboard (M18/47)

18/58 NOTED:

That the Project Steering Group had made good progress with the development of the Business Information Dashboard.

New Approach to Research Integrity (M18/48)

18/59 NOTED:

That the new policy, procedures and systems to support and enhance Research Integrity had been implemented. The new Research Integrity Committee held its initial meeting on 21st February 2019, and agreed its terms of reference and *modus operandi*.

What Could Work Better – Implementation of Academic IT Systems (M18/50)

- 18/60 RECEIVED: an oral report on behalf of the Director of Digital Services that, as part of the Digital Strategy, all business cases for major system changes were now considered by the Digital Strategy Investment Committee (DISC) with senior representation from each School, and as part of the approval process DISC would review implementation time lines, which would help to ensure that the needs of busy academics were properly taken into account during implementation.

Council

- 18/61 RECEIVED:

The minutes of the Council meeting of 28th November 2019.

International Strategy Committee

- 18/62 RECEIVED:

The minutes of the International Strategy Committee meetings of 3rd December 2018 and 21st February 2019.

Learning and Teaching Committee

- 18/63 RECEIVED:

- i) The minutes of the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) meeting of 28th February 2019.
- ii) An oral summary from the Provost of the recent work of the LTC, which had been greatly assisted by the proactive engagement of the student representatives.

Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy

- 18/64 NOTED:

- That the LTC had received a progress update on the implementation of the University Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy, noting that the newly established Academic Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Forum had met for the first time on 16 January 2019, and that a wide range of actions had been taken in line with the main themes of “being preventative, being aware and being supportive”, and responding to risk and crisis management.
- That members of Senate indicated that staff would welcome the provision of additional information on the support available to students experiencing mental health issues and on who they should contact, particularly after hours and on weekends.

ACTION: The Academic Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Forum to provide appropriate communications to staff and students on the services and support available to students experiencing mental health issues.

Student Voice/Communication with Students

- 18/65 NOTED:

That LTC had received an update on progress with the Student Voice project which was looking at how the University communicated with students, and whether that communication was appropriate and consistent. The project was run jointly with the Students’ Union and would be

developing a Student Communication Strategy which would attempt to identify the most effective channels and media through which to communicate with students.

Admissions Steering and Strategy Committee

18/66 RECEIVED:

The minutes of the Admissions Steering and Strategy Committee (ASSC) meeting of 13th November 2018 and 8th January 2019.

Research Committee

18/67 RECEIVED:

The minutes of the Research Committee (RC) meeting of 6th February 2019.

Schedule of Research Grants and Contracts

18/68 RESOLVED:

To approve Paper SEN-18-1675-A, the Schedule of Research Grants and Contracts, and that the following members of staff be congratulated on attracting substantial awards:

Members of Staff	School	Awarding Body	£
Prof Patricia Thornley, Dr Mirjam Roeder, Prof Anthony Bridgwater, and Dr Katie Chong	EAS	EPSRC	1,760,025
Prof Sergei Turitsyn, Prof Paul Topham, Dr Alex Rozhin, Prof Edik Rafailov, Dr Sergei Segeyev, Dr Laura Leslie, and Dr Richard Martin	EAS	ERDF	1,418,979
Prof Mark Hart, Dr Bettina Becker, Dr Michael Anyadike-Danes, and Dr Carlo Corradini	ABS	ESRC	1,004,394
Prof Monder Ram, Dr Judith Scully, Dr Luke Fletcher, and Prof Mark Hart	ABS	ESRC	726,031
Prof Andrew Ellis	EAS	EPSRC	634,133
Dr Aristeidis Matopoulos	EAS	ESIF / ERDF	577,847
Dr Andrew Schofield	LHS	EPSRC	409,881
Dr Bimal Arora	ABS	International Development Research Centre (IDRC)	390,555
Dr Diego Faria and Dr George Vogiatzis	EAS	EPSRC	358,731
Dr Jianhua He	EAS	European Commission	278,101
Prof Nicholas Doran	EAS	Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd	191,729
Dr Dmitry Nerukh	EAS	European Commission	181,046
Dr Nicola Logan	LHS	Nevakar Inc.	165,551
Dr Richard Martin	EAS	Sarcoma UK	119,745
Prof Anthony Bridgwater and Dr Yang Yang	EAS	European Commission	110,498
Dr Jane Waite	LHS	Autistica	99,086

Report on Action taken on behalf of Senate by the Chair and Vice-Chair

18/69 RESOLVED:

To ratify the action taken on behalf of Senate by the Provost as set out in paper SEN-18-1676-A.

Register of Collaborative Programmes

18/70 RESOLVED:

To approve a Register of Collaborative Programmes in paper SEN-18-1677-A, noting that the University needed to ensure that its registration as an HE provider with the OfS was kept up-to-date in terms of partnership arrangements.

ACTION: Director of Quality and Director of Governance

Report on Student Disciplinary and Fitness to Practise Matters

18/71 RECEIVED:

A report on Student Disciplinary and Fitness to Practise Matters (in paper SEN-18-1678-A), noting that unfortunately two students had been expelled: one for a second plagiarism offence, and one for a police caution for possession with intent to supply proscribed substances and a subsequent University offence of inappropriate behaviour in relation to being in possession of drugs paraphernalia.

Appointment of Emeritus Professor

18/72 RESOLVED (nem con):

To approve the appointment of Professor Keith Wilson as an Emeritus Professor following his retirement from the University.

Action: Provost

UNIVERSITY STRATEGY

TEF Subject Level Pilot and its Implications for Aston

18/73 RECEIVED:

A presentation from Dr Liz Moores on the TEF Subject Pilot and its implications for Aston.

18/74 NOTED:

The following points:

- The Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF) was designed to enhance provision and to inform prospective students. Aston currently had the highest TEF “Gold” rating at provider level. The OfS was currently carrying out subject pilots on behalf of the DfE to find the most effective way of producing TEF ratings at subject level, in addition to at provider level. Following the completion of the pilot programme, TEF ratings at both provider and subject level would be announced in spring 2021.
- Aston was one of the 50 HEIs that had been invited to join the second TEF Subject Pilot in 2018/19. “Subjects” were largely based on CAH2 codes and Aston had received metrics for and submitted narratives for 18 “subjects”. Metrics had been provided for teaching quality,

learning environment, and student outcomes/learning gain derived from such sources as the NSS, HESA/ILR, and DLHE.

- As a provider Aston's initial hypothesis was "Gold". In terms of subject level "initial hypotheses", Aston had: 4 Gold (Optometry, Computer Science, Business and Management, Logistics), 3 Gold/Silver (Biosciences, Engineering, Politics) and 11 Silver. But the University also had some further very positive metrics to use to try to obtain additional Gold ratings via the narrative (eg Chemistry) and some missing data precluding Gold via initial hypothesis (eg Economics). Joint Honours students were split between subjects on a 50:50 basis.
- A narrative was used to assess the strength or weakness of the initial hypotheses. The initial hypotheses might be moved up (or down). There was a need to present a coherent story of understanding Aston's student body; having policies in place to support that body; and evidence that those policies were currently effective. Where metrics were either missing or weaker than desirable, Aston would need to provide alternative (internal) evidence to support arguments of strength. A single negative flag on any of the metrics could prevent a Gold award, which implied that the University would need to be proactive in mitigating weaknesses in metrics (eg monitoring the performance of specific groups of disadvantaged students and taking mitigating action to ensure they succeed).
- All of the University subject-level and institutional-level reports had been submitted to the OfS for the subject-level pilot. Participation in the pilot Subject Level TEF was valuable preparation for the University in that the TEF feedback (expected in June 2019) would facilitate the identification of areas of potential weakness and any missing/insufficient metrics, as well as demonstrating where narratives could be enhanced and sharpened. The use of the Tableau business intelligence software, would assist with the analysis and interpretation of the data at subject level and in relation to relative performance of specific groups.
- The Vice-Chancellor thanked Dr Moores and all those involved for their contributions which should put the University in a good position for the future TEF exercise.

Vice-Chancellor and Chief Executive's Report

18/75 RECEIVED:

The Vice-Chancellor and Chief Executive's Report in paper SEN-18-1679-A, which summarised progress being made with high-level institutional strategic objectives, as well as current University news for the information of members of Senate and Council. The following points were noted:

Student Recruitment for 2019/20 Entry.

- 2018 had been a difficult year both for the sector and for Aston with its applications down by 15%. 2019 had seen a significant bounce back for Aston with applications up by 15% on last year. The quality of the applicant pool for Aston had improved, so it had been possible to make offers to a higher proportion of applicants in a quicker time-frame.
- This positive result was very much a team effort, but the co-ordinated efforts of the UG marketing team, the Student Recruitment Office, and the Admissions Team had been particularly effective. Efforts within the Schools, to revamp and introduce new programmes, had played an important role in this growth.
- The challenge now was to achieve a high level of conversion of applications into offers, acceptances and then enrolments. It was anticipated that Aston would need to enter the UCAS Clearing process, but would be seeking to recruit a smaller number than in previous years.
- While the PVC International and the international team were pursuing the international recruitment strategy with enhanced resources, the turnaround in Aston's international numbers would likely take two years to realise. At this stage, the University was behind on international applications relative to last year.

External Challenges

- The future level of funding per student for home students was in doubt, subject to the outcome of the Augar Review and the Government's response to this report. Predictions were of a decrease in base funding per student, but offset by higher funding for some disciplines (assumed to be STEM).
- Brexit also remained a potential risk to revenues, both with regard to EU student numbers and research funding.

National Student Survey (NSS)

- The University had commenced the NSS earlier this year compared to previous years, supported by a campaign to encourage participation and reinforce positive developments relating to the student experience at Aston. A response rate of 50% had been achieved so far. The University and the Students' Union had been striving to address issues raised by students as promptly as possible and to inform the students about any action taken to resolve their issues. An increase in Aston's overall student satisfaction score in the NSS would impact on the Times ranking produced in September and help Aston's next TEF submission.

Estates Strategy

- The Vice-Chancellor's report included a summary of the preferred option (option 5A) and the strategic decisions agreed for the medium-term development of the Campus. Council had approved the Executive's proposal to defer part of the estate plan implementation to address affordability and to ensure that a robust design and planning process was undertaken. This meant that substantial expenditure on a new building would commence in the 2019/20 financial year, not the current year.

Digital Aston

- Phase 1 of the Digital Aston project was progressing well. It involved a thirteen-week period of activity to lay the groundwork for the long-term delivery of Digital Aston and had five areas of focus:
 1. Establish the implementation team for DigitalAston
 2. Set up digital leadership and governance arrangements (including the Digital Investment Strategy Committee and the Systems Owners Group)
 3. Improve communications
 4. Support IT Services improvements
 5. Prepare business cases for three key projects identified in the work by Nous.
 - a. Digital student Experience (based on an Aston mobile App.)
 - b. Customer Relationship Management (CRM)
 - c. How data is managed and used (a data management system).

Phase 2 would focus on the development and implementation of the three above business

QS World Subject Rankings

- Aston University had been recognised in the global top 100 for the business and management category in the 2019 QS world subject rankings.

HESA/OfS Non-continuation Performance Indicators for 2017/18

- The recently published HESA/OfS non-continuation performance indicators for 2017/18 demonstrated that Aston's non-continuation rate (2.8%) was much better than its benchmark target (6.8%) given the profile of the University's student population. Aston's performance was actually more impressive in relation to students from low participation neighbourhoods where the difference between the actual non-continuation rate (2.8%) and the benchmark target (7.0%) was even higher. Aston's value-added position was sector leading. The Executive had agreed that this positive news should be communicated strongly to Council, students, staff and other stakeholders.

University Strategy Review

18/76 RECEIVED:

Paper SEN-18-1680-A, a report on progress with the implementation of the University Strategy including:

- Completion of the first review of the taught programmes portfolio, removing programmes where appropriate in order to 'sharpen and strengthen' Aston's offer and better align it to the needs of students and business.
- Further incorporated graduate employability into the review and decision-making process for the approval of new taught programmes and with the aim of further improving graduate outcomes.
- Introduced 'MyEngagement' – a learning analytics platform which enables students to understand how the amount and type of engagement might influence the outcome of their studies.
- Introduced a new research strategy and governance structure for research integrity.
- Designed a piloted a workforce planning model so that resource management could better account for student numbers, growth and demand, the external environment, succession planning and future skills requirements.
- In April the Executive would be undertaking a 12 month progress review to ensure that the scope and approach for the remainder of the implementation period was fit for purpose.
- The Estates strategy and Digital Aston would be significant and positive drivers of the remainder of implementation.

Issues raised by Student Representatives and the Students' Union Senate

18/77 RECEIVED:

A report from the SU in paper SEN-18-1681-A, together with an oral report from the SU President.

18/78 NOTED:

- The SU's efforts to support the student representation framework through improved communication channels, consultation and training, with a view to removing barriers to increased student engagement.
- Issues considered at the SU Senate included i) lectures took place after 1pm on a Wednesday (the Provost confirmed that no compulsory lectures took place after 1pm). ii) a talk by Dr Liz Moores on TEF and the Subject Level TEF Pilot to assist students to gain a better understanding; iii) the reoccurring theme raised by students of group work and the element of 'free riders' not pulling their weight. Students were consulted on their views and suggestions on guiding principles of how group work should be undertaken and assessed. This had resulted in positive change and work was in progress in implementing peer- and self-assessment as guiding principles which should improve how group work operated and how it was perceived by students.
- A campaign was held during the recent examinations to promote healthy eating and the importance of this to students' examination performance as well as their general well-being. The Union had provided free breakfast every morning for students and over 100 students had benefitted.
- The SU had organised a survey during "Speak Week" and had received over 1,200 responses to the question "If you ran the University, what would you change?". The SU was currently in the process of analysing the responses, but initial analysis suggested that the main focus of responses related to academic interests, study space, facilities and transport.
- The SU was strengthening academic communities, with a focus on developing and supporting academic societies.

- The SU's Advice and Representation Centre (ARC) had recently recruited a new Advice and Support Manager who would also act as Lead Adviser. This was the first full time member of staff employed by ARC since 2010.

Issues raised by Academic Assembly

Turnaround Times for Marking Assessments

18/79 RECEIVED:

- i) Paper SEN-18-1682-A and an oral report from the Chair of the Academic Assembly, which indicated that academic colleagues had raised issues around the turnaround times for marking assessments. The general feeling was that to meet the targets set by the University, the quality of the feedback might not be of the standard colleagues would ideally wish to give. For some Schools the conflation of marking coursework and examinations for large groups of students after the January exams in time for module boards was particularly problematic, and for others marking assessments which contributed to final award classification in time for External Examiner moderation and boards of examiners meetings to meet to the timescales for graduation ceremonies was challenging and stressful. These time pressure were exacerbated for collaborative programmes where marking was shared with a partner and more time was often required. Individual Boards of Examiners and External Examiners had commented on these pressures.
- ii) An oral response from the Provost, who highlighted the fact that the University had over the last two years employed 180 new staff, which should help to share the assessment load and reduced the burden on individuals. It was the responsibility of Heads of Department to be aware of the assessment timescales and the turnaround times for marking, to ensure that staff had sufficient time in which to complete marking and second marking, and that the assessment load on individuals was appropriate and fair. Aston's turnaround time for assessment feedback was four weeks, which was a week longer than many other HEIs. The LTC encouraged Schools to consider carefully the design of assessments, including the loading on students and ensuring that assessment methods allowed timely feedback of an appropriate quality to students, including formative feedback. The requirements of professional accrediting bodies did constrain the pattern of assessment and the scope for reducing the assessment load.
- iii) Senate members suggested that Schools should give consideration to the further use of technology, electronic/on-line examinations and 'smart' assessments which could help to reduce the marking burden on staff and provide immediate feedback to students. Members felt that additional funding should be provided for the development and testing of such innovative approaches to assessment. Colleagues from the social sciences stressed that there was a continuing need for dialogue and feedback from staff in their disciplines to support the delivery of students' learning outcomes. Consideration could be given to the scheduling of double marking arrangements with a view to enhancing efficiency and reducing timelines.

ACTION: Provost to attend a meeting with the Academic Assembly to discuss approaches to assessment.

Finance and Planning Issues

18/80 RECEIVED:

Oral reports from the Provost and Chief Operating Officer on finance and planning issues, noting:

- That the University was required to submit a new Access and Participation Plan by 24th May 2019 which was prior to Senate's meeting on 29th May. The views of the Senate and Council

would be sought via a representative sub-group, and circulation of the principles underpinning the plan to members for comment and endorsement.

ACTION: Provost to oversee preparation of the Access and Participation Plan and arrange appropriate consultation with Senate and Council

- That the 2019/20 budget and planning process was in train. The forecast income for next year had been calculated based largely on the School plans for student recruitment and research, which was 4% higher than for the current year. Cost envelopes had been prepared using the forecast income and these were being issued to budget holders for discussion with the Executive Operations Group.

UNIVERSITY STRATEGY THEMES

18/81 RECEIVED:

An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor that in line with the operating methodology agreed by the Senate, the membership would next split into four Breakout Groups to discuss the following strategic themes:

- i) External Examiners Review (LTC-18-1635-A) and led by the Chris Wilson and Steve Jones from CLIPP.
- ii) Preparation for REF 2021 and led by Professor Simon Green, PVC for Research, and Rebecca Stokes, Director of Research Strategy Funding and Impact.
- iii) Inclusive Aston (SEN-18-1685-A) and led by Dr Hannah Bartlett, Reader, Optometry.
- iv) Prevent Duty Review (SEN-18-1686-A) and led by Alison Levey, Director of Student and Academic Services and University Prevent Lead.

At the end of the breakout discussions the four groups made the following reports to the reconvened Senate:

External Examiners Review

18/82 NOTED:

The LTC was undertaking a review of the external examiner system which aimed: i) to develop proposals to simplify the way in which fees were calculated (review definition of typical workload model) and to reduce the disparity between the fees paid to different examiners; and ii) to provide clarity and manage expectations through the development of guidance on the external examiner role, function and expected duties. The following points were discussed by the breakout group:

Key points of consensus:

- There was general support for the need to future-proof approaches/regulations for External Examiners in the face of a changing HE landscape (recognising increasing diversity of provision). For example the role of external examiners in the assessment process for degree apprenticeships, and the need for expertise from industry as well as academic expertise.
- Members recognised the value of formalising approaches to handover between External Examiners and of mentoring support for new External Examiners. There was some support for the appointment of Chief Examiners.

Points of contention:

- There were differences of view about the extent to which External Examiners should be exclusively assessment focused or more actively student-experience focused.

Points to note:

- There was some indication of a disconnection between current policy and practice, although this was all described in terms of exceeding policy requirements. Members

suggested that adding to regulations could increase risk to compliance (ie complexity increased risk of non-compliance), and acknowledging and embracing the implications of this could be regarded as an institutional strength.

- Members generally favoured a transparent approach, allowing external examiners the facility to sample from the full range of students' work.

ACTION: Provost and Dean of CLIPP, to ensure that the above comments inform the review of external examiners.

Preparation for REF 2021

18/83 NOTED:

- The following documents had recently been published:
 - i) Guidance on REF 2021 Submissions (the technical rules for the REF),
 - ii) Panel Criteria and Working Methods (how the panels would operate)
 - iii) Guidance on Codes of Practice (guidance on drawing up a code of practice on: the fair and transparent identification of staff with significant responsibility for research; determining who was an independent researcher; and the selection of outputs).
- In accordance with the published REF guidance, an Aston Code of Practice was under preparation by a group led by the PVC Research with colleagues from RKE, HR, and Associate Deans Research. The draft Code would be subject to wide consultation and to approval by the Executive and Senate prior to submission to Research England by noon on 7th June 2019.
- At institutional level, Aston's REF preparations were broadly on track. Good progress had been made across the board in terms of outputs assessment and impact case study preparation, including the collection and collation of evidence of impact and writing up compelling narratives. In order to optimise Aston's REF submission, Academic colleagues were encouraged to continue their good working in producing high quality outputs and in spending research grants and funding.

ACTION: PVC Research to continue oversee the preparations for the REF 2021

Inclusive Aston

18/84 NOTED:

The breakout group received copies of the Inclusive Aston: Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2019 to 2026 and discussed its implications and implementation. The following points were discussed:

Learning Points:

- The background to the Diversity and Inclusion Strategy.
- The importance of having reliable data and the ability to interpret this data efficiently.
- How the equality Charters and awards could be used to frame investigations of Aston's current position with a view to informing SMART action plans.
- That it was very important to embed this work; specific groups could tackle specific action plans but cross-institutional plans were need to create a truly inclusive environment. Examples of this included the Inclusive Marketing project and work that was being done to look at inclusive practice within learning and teaching.

Action Points:

- To create a clear mission statement for the start of the Strategy to include the aspiration that Aston would be a place where anyone could operate at the most senior levels regardless of personal circumstances.
- To look at how Diversity and Inclusion initiatives could be better communicated throughout the institution.

- To create a checklist for staff to ensure that all meetings consider the potential for direct and indirect discrimination (unconscious bias).

ACTION: Dr Hannah Bartlett and the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Forum to take forward the action points

Prevent Duty Review

18/85 NOTED:

That the breakout group discussed a range of issues around how Aston University fulfils its obligations around the Prevent Duty. A key message was that whilst the University had a range of relevant policies and procedures, communication could be improved considerably to ensure that staff and students knew where to locate such information. Specifically, it was suggested that key policies could be included on the introductory page to the forthcoming Prevent Training that all staff would have to undertake. It was also agreed that it would be opportune to review the Freedom of Expression and Events Policy, in the light of the recently issued Equality and Human Rights Commission's Freedom of Expression guidelines, and the Speak Up (Whistleblowing) Policy, particularly in relation to how this applied to students. Members felt that the procedure for approval of external events was generally effective and not too bureaucratic, as it was proportionate and risk-based in operation and only required additional information and assurance where the level of risk increased. No events had been yet been prevented from proceeding, although it had been necessary to apply conditions.

ACTION: Alison Levey and the Prevent Steering Group to take forward the review of the Freedom of Expression and Events Policy and the Speak Up (Whistleblowing) Policy

WHAT COULD WORK BETTER?

18/86 NOTED:

That no matters had been reported.

DATES OF NEXT SENATE MEETING

18/87 NOTED:

That Senate would meet at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, 29th May 2018.

JGW/21.3.19