UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

SENATE

7 June 2005

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair for item 70), Professor J B Goddard (Deputy Vice-Chancellor) (in the Chair for items 71 - 88), Professor E Ritchie and Professor A C Stevenson (Pro-Vice-Chancellors), Dr P E Andras, Dr J C Appleby, Professor J B Batchelor, Dr R J Boys, Dr J E Calvert, Professor P F Chinnery, Dr E G N Cross, Mr C Donnelly (student member), Professor A M R Gatehouse, Mr T Gorman (Communications Officer), Ms L Hargreaves (Welfare Officer), Professor C R Harwood, Professor M A Hughes, Professor C B Riordan, Professor J Wheelock and Mr A M Wilton.

In attendance: Dr J V Hogan (Registrar), Mr P S Mitchell (Academic Registrar), Mrs V S Johnston (Director of Human Resources), Mrs D A Michie (Senior Assistant Registrar), Mr D Bulmer (Education Officer elect) and Ms S White (Welfare Officer elect).

Professor E Martin (Dean of Research, SAgE) attended for item 71 and Mrs A McNeill (Assistant Registrar) attended for items 75 and 76.

Dr Andras and Dr Boys were not present for item 86.

The student members were not present for items presented under reserved business.

MINUTES

PART A: STRATEGIC ISSUES

70. TACKLING THE PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Considered a paper from the Vice-Chancellor.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document A. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Members were reminded of the continued confidential classification of this paper.

After noting that:

1. The paper stemmed from the discussion at the last meeting of Senate on the challenges arising in particular from the House of Commons Select Committee report on ‘Strategic Science Provision in English Universities’;

2. Challenges were also emerging from the award of Science City status to Newcastle. The University was one of the partners involved in the development of the concept of Newcastle as a Science City and a great deal of management time, particularly that of Professor Goddard and Professor Young, was being spent on this. Science City could...
provide great opportunities for the University but, in contrast, if handled incorrectly there was a risk that it could become a threat;

3. Detailed plans to take forward Science City had to be submitted this month but these had to remain confidential at this stage as they contained commercially-sensitive information;

4. At the same time as the proposals for Science City were being developed, the University was also playing a leading role in the North of England Science Initiative, part of the Northern Way. This Initiative involved collaboration between the eight research universities in the North and it was the first time these universities had ever worked together in this way. It was aimed at improving the economic performance of the North of England. One of its aims was to reduce the gap between the research expenditure in the North of England and the South. For example, the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Imperial, UCL and the London School of Economics had a research income of approximately £820 million, as compared to £620 million for the eight Northern Universities, and they taught approximately half the number of students so allowing them to be much more research productive;

5. The research themes in the Northern Science Initiative were very similar to those proposed for Science City, with water and water quality being the only one not included in Science City to date;

6. Another research theme was to be added to the proposals for Science City to cover the contribution made by the work taking place in computing and electronics. This was a recent proposal which had been made after the paper was written;

7. The City Council was committed to the development of Science City and the Leader had attended a meeting of the Northern Way;

8. The senior management team had spent some time investigating the possibility of developing and exploiting the University’s intellectual property portfolios in Singapore. Singapore was strategically situated for links with the Far East and China and did not suffer from the intellectual property difficulties which China experienced. Approximately 6,000 multinational companies and 1,000 Newcastle alumni were based in Singapore, which would assist with the work of the University, and the costs of operating there were believed to be 50% of those in the UK. This initiative was being gradually developed, with the assistance of Ken Chong, a Newcastle graduate, and it was hoped that proof of concept could be taken to Council for consideration in December 2005;

9. The University was considering the establishment of special investment vehicles to take some enterprises forward and allow the potential of the existing portfolio of technology to be maximised. However, there were a great many issues related to this;

10. The development of the Molecular Engineering Initiative provided an opportunity to bring together a number of disciplines and generate major synergy between them;

11. A number of key developments in science and technology had emerged both recently and rapidly and responding to the various challenges these posed required the investment of a great deal of time by the senior management team. It had become necessary to
review the team so that the University could be sure that it was responding in as
effective a way as possible. It was therefore being proposed that a Pro-Vice-Chancellor
(Strategic Development) be established to assist with this work;

12. Following restructuring, a great deal of strategic planning had been devolved to the
Provosts but it was now recognised that, in order to achieve better co-ordination of
strategic and planning issues, more central support should be provided to assist the
Faculty Pro-Vice-Chancellors as it was essential that the University had a coherent
approach. The proposed Pro-Vice-Chancellor and the new Pro-Vice-Chancellor
(Planning and Resources) would therefore liaise closely with the Faculty Pro-Vice-
Chancellors and the heads of school to develop detailed plans;

13. It was important to have a management team which was flexible and could respond
quickly to changing circumstances, but which also had clarity of role for each of its
members with no overlap of responsibilities. Therefore the structure proposed would be:

- The Faculty Pro-Vice-Chancellors with their main responsibility being managing
  faculty matters but with some central duties as required
- The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)
- The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Affairs and Research Liaison) whose
  responsibilities from August 2005 would include leading on: the RAE submission;
  European matters (such as Framework 6 programmes); the Northern Way project;
  external liaison (such as internally within the UK and internationally with Monash,
  Auckland, the US and China); and the academic aspects of the Singapore
development
- The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) whose responsibilities would be:
  the development of the capital, annual and five-year plans; data management and the
  development of key performance indicators; to chair Financial Monitoring and
  Budget Scrutiny Group, be a member of the Budget Setting Group and of Finance
  Committee; and, in liaison with the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (T & L) and (EARL),
  review the cost effectiveness of teaching and research
- The proposed Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Strategic Development

A paper, which outlined the respective roles and responsibilities of all members of the
senior management team and how they interlinked, including the faculty pro-vice-
chancellors, could be drafted to clarify this in more detail;

14. The University Research Institutes were key to the development of research in the
University and the proposed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Development) would work
closely with the Institutes and be responsible for introducing ways in which they worked
more effectively together. An Institute Board might be one way of encouraging this
greater co-ordination. However, it would be important for the Institutes to retain their
links with their faculties as it was essential that all areas of the University were co-
ordinated and worked together;

15. The role of the new Pro-Vice-Chancellor, if approved, would be University wide,
although he would focus his attention primarily on the science and technology agenda as
it was important that this area was successful. However, he would work with all the
University Research Institutes, not just those relating to science and technology. Other
members of the senior management team would support Humanities and Social Sciences
and Medical Sciences in different ways and ensure that the University could respond positively to any challenges which emerged;

16. The recently established post of Dean of Clinical Medicine in the Faculty of Medical Sciences was created to act as the interface between the National Health Service and the University as it was acknowledged that this relationship was key if the University wished to achieve growth in medicine;

17. The growth in income referred to in the paper had mainly come from the substantial rise in student numbers but the large capital sums received through the PCA and SRIF awards, income from overseas students, research income and funds from the Regional Development Agency had also contributed;

18. The movement of senior staff to different posts did raise certain issues with regard to line management. However, a great deal of work had been taking place in the University in relation to succession planning, with money from the government’s funds for rewarding and developing staff being used partly for this;

19. The introduction of increased support from the central University offices could be seen to reduce the autonomy of the pro-vice-chancellors/provosts and the faculties. However, the pro-vice-chancellors/provosts were major budget holders, which gave them a great deal of autonomy, and the increased support was aimed to create a more integrated structure with effective co-ordination between the different areas;

20. While the themes in Science City did not necessarily reflect the current University Research Institutes, they did represent particular strengths in University research and were areas which could become Research Institutes in the future. Stem cell research, for instance, had grown out of the Institute for Human Genetics and was likely to develop into its own Institute in the future. The aim was to build up emerging areas of strength and this should benefit the existing Institutes as well as the new areas.

and after a vote on the recommendation contained in Document A in which more than two thirds of the members present voted in favour,

Resolved that:

(i) The Vice-Chancellor would prepare a paper on the structure, roles and responsibilities of the senior management team and bring it to a future meeting of Senate;

(ii) Senate endorse the recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor for the creation of a fourth Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Development) post under Statute 13, for submission to Council.

[Note: The Chairman of Council had subsequently approved the recommendation in (ii) above on behalf of Council.]

[See also Minute 84.]
71. RESEARCH ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Received an oral report from the Vice-Chancellor and Professor E Martin (Dean of Research, Faculty of SAgE), together with a paper.

[The slides, which were circulated with the Agenda as Document B and used in the presentation given by Professor Martin, are attached. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

(The slide number to which notes 2 to 11 and 13 refer is given in brackets at the end of the note.)

1. The forthcoming Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) was one of the most critical issues facing the University and a great deal of discussion was currently taking place about the preparation required for it. Visits to schools were taking place and these should be completed by December 2005;

2. A major change from previous RAEs was that it would be quality profiles for each submission of research activity which would be assessed, not units of assessment as previously. Individuals would not be considered, solely the overall output (slide 2);

3. One of the roles of the main panel would be to look at interdisciplinary research but, to date, there was not a great deal of information on this area. It was hoped that this would be forthcoming as it would be a major issue for this University (slide 5);

4. Details of the membership of each of the sub-panels were available on the internet at http://www.rae.ac.uk/news/2005/panel.htm (slide 5);

5. The overall quality profiles of a submission would contain three elements: research outputs, the research environment and esteem indicators. The panels would determine the weighting allocated to the different areas but feedback indicated that in engineering 50% would be allocated to outputs, 70% in science and 80-85% in medical sciences. The criteria for each panel would be published in July (slide 6);

6. Individual outputs would be merged and the University would only be informed about the overall quality profile result (slide 7);

7. There would be the opportunity to provide an explanation of why an output had been selected in order to assist with its rating. However, it seemed likely that only seminal work would be rated as four star (slide 9);

8. The sub-panels would assess the research outputs and, typically, a minimum of 10% of them would be read. The research environment component of the submission would include PhD students and the esteem indicators component would include funding and the editing of journals. Esteem indicators would also take into account the stage a person was in their career. However, this was a difficult component to judge and it was hoped that there would be clear guidelines (slide 10);

9. The sub-panels would be looking for a variety of sources of funding in RA3b to indicate breadth (slide 12);
10. RA5a, research environment and esteem, would consider interdisciplinary research and this is where the Research Institutes would need to be included (slide 13);

11. HEFCE would publish the draft assessment criteria in the second week in July. These would be sent to universities and to subject associations. Responses were required by 19 September 2005 and so the University was planning to send the criteria to schools and give them three weeks to respond. Feedback should go to faculty research strategy groups, then to University Research Strategy Group and finally to University Research Committee. It was important that staff did provide feedback as this would be the University’s only opportunity to comment on and influence the proposals (slide 17);

12. It was likely that feedback from the subject associations would carry more weight with HEFCE than from the universities so any staff who had contacts in those associations should use their influence there;

13. It would be a high-risk strategy to rely on a piece of work being published between the census date of 31 October and the end of the publication period on 31 December 2007. Every effort should therefore be made to have work published by the census date (slide 18);

14. It would be important for University staff to concentrate on both getting their PhD students to complete and on driving the quality of their own work upwards. It would be quality of outputs that was judged and the contribution of individuals would not be so important. Therefore poaching high-fliers would make little positive difference to an overall profile and could have an adverse impact as the panels looked for that in their assessments;

15. Information on how panels would treat staff who had just retired would be published in July.

Resolved that Professor Martin be thanked for her useful presentation.

PART B : GENERAL BUSINESS

72. MINUTES

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 26 April 2005 be approved as a correct record and signed.

73. MATTER ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Progress of business

Received a business tracking form.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document D. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]
74. **VICE-CHANCELLOR’S BUSINESS**

(a) **Retiring Members**

It was reported that this would be the last meeting of Senate for Dr J C Appleby, Dr J E Calvert, Professor M A Hughes, Dr E F S Kaner, Dr C O Record, Professor C B Riordan, Professor J Wheelock and Mr A M Wilton, and also for the student members Mr C Donnelly, Ms R Currie, Mr T Gorman and Ms L Hargreaves. The Vice-Chancellor thanked all of those members on behalf of the University for their valuable contribution to the work of Senate.

(b) **Guardian League Table**  
(Minute 61(d), 26.4.2005)

Reported that Senate, at its meeting on 26 April, had resolved that a report on the issues involved and how they might be addressed should be made to the next meeting of Senate. The report was attached as Annex I to the paper of Vice-Chancellor’s business.  

[Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Noted that:

1. When the Guardian League Table was published in 2004 the University had been placed 56th. As a consequence, the Registrar had held a meeting with the compiler of the League Table and he had agreed to make certain changes to the method by which it was compiled. This year the University had been placed 43rd;

2. The Times and the Sunday Times used the same data for their league tables as the Guardian but in both of those cases the University received a higher ranking as they used a different process to assess universities. The Planning Office was unhappy with the methods used by the Guardian. However, it judged that it would be an inefficient diversion of resource to tackle this one table and the University should rather focus on the wider issue of data management, data integrity and data consistency across functions;

3. While the rating in the Guardian League Table was likely to have little impact overseas, it could have an impact in the UK;

4. It would be important to look at the areas which were not as successful as well as the way in which figures were presented. The University should not be driven by league tables but review its own position, such as the state of staff:student ratios and the quality of the student experience, for its own benefit. With regard to staff:student ratios, Executive Board had agreed that a number of posts should be created to help address the situation and make it easier for staff to carry out research;

5. The results of the National Student Survey, which were due in September, might replace league tables in the future as they would be based on the actual comments of students and not just on HESA data.
(c) **Devonshire Building**

Reported that the Devonshire Building, which housed the University’s Institute for Research in Environment and Sustainability, had won a Green Gown Award for Sustainable Construction.

(d) **Chancellor of Northumbria University**

Reported that the former Metropolitan Police Commissioner, Lord Stevens, had been appointed as Chancellor of Northumbria University from December 2005.

75. **STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PANEL, DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES**

Considered proposed changes to the Student Disciplinary Committee and Panel members and consequential changes to the Student Disciplinary Procedures.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document E. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. Since the Student Disciplinary Procedures had been approved there had been a major increase in the number of students referred to Disciplinary Committees. There were currently only 12 panel members and the increase in cases meant that they were having to sit on a greater number of committees. It was therefore being proposed that the number of panel members should be increased from 12 to 15;

2. In addition, to help reduce the workload for panel members and to ensure that cases were dealt with swiftly and effectively, it was being proposed that in certain circumstances a case could be reviewed by a single panel member. However, some students might not be comfortable with their case being judged by only one person and so how this system worked should be reviewed in a year’s time.

Resolved that the proposed changes to the Student Disciplinary Committee and Panel members, and consequential changes to the Student Disciplinary Procedures, be approved.

76. **UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS**

Considered a Report from the Academic Office concerning changes to University Regulations.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document F. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

(a) **General Regulations**

After noting that:

1. The proposed changes were a combination of:

   - Minor amendments to correct the titles of document, encourage students to access documents via web pages and make paragraphs more clearly understood, and
• Additional paragraphs to articulate University procedures when students had been found to have made a fraudulent application for admission to the University;

2. The additional paragraphs were required as, although the University was currently covered by contract law, it did not have a procedure for dealing with students who either applied to the University or were admitted fraudulently;

3. Some of the minor amendments made could have implications. For example, the removal of the words ‘for the time being’ from regulation 4 could cause the University problems in the future as it would mean that the declaration would not be valid for any subsequent change;

4. In regulation 16, the word ‘reasonably practicable’ should be reinstated as the University Regulations should cite the wording of the Act referred to in it;

5. Regulation 34, which had been marked for deletion, should be reinstated as a power of Senate could not be taken away by another body. If Senate wished to delegate this power then it would need to take that decision;

6. The deletion of the phrase ‘acceptable to Senate’ from regulation 46(a) could have serious implications as it could open up an argument that any circumstances which prevented a candidate from attending or completing an examination were acceptable, which could not be the case.

Resolved that:

(i) Mr Wilton be asked to give further scrutiny to the minor amendments to the General Regulations and report back to the Regulations Sub-Committee;

(ii) Subject to minor amendments arising from the above exercise, Senate approve the changes to the General Regulations with effect from 1 September 2005.

(b) Undergraduate Progress Regulations and Examination Conventions

Resolved that Senate approve the changes set out in Appendix 2 to Document E with effect from 1 September 2005.

(c) Taught Postgraduate Entrance and Progress Regulations and Examination Conventions

Resolved that Senate approve the changes set out in Appendix 3 to Document E with effect from 1 September 2005.

77. FEES SCHEDULE

Considered the Fees Schedule for 2005-06.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document G. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Resolved that Senate approve the Fees Schedule for 2005-06.
78. **REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE**

Received a Report from the meetings of UTLC held on 6 April and 10 May 2005.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document H. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

79. **ANNUAL REPORT FROM ACADEMIC AUDIT COMMITTEE**

Received the Annual Report from Academic Audit Committee for 2004-05.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document J. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

80. **CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS OF UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES**

Considered recommendations for the appointment/re-appointment of Senate appointed Chairmen and members of University Committees.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document K. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Resolved that the recommendations in Document K be approved.

81. **TIMETABLELING : RISK MANAGEMENT**

(Minute 40(a), 18.1.2005)

Received a response to the issues raised by Senate at its meeting on 18 January 2005 regarding timetabling risks.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document L. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

82. **MEMBERSHIP OF SENATE**

Reported that:

(a) The following had been appointed by the faculties shown to serve on Senate from 1 August 2005 until 31 July 2008:

   Humanities and Social Sciences:  Professor G J Docherty
   Medical Sciences:  Dr S G Ball
   Science, Agriculture & Engineering:  Professor A G O’Neill

(b) The following had been elected/*re-elected to serve on Senate from 1 August 2005 until 31 July 2008:

   non-professorial constituency
   
   Dr C D French
   Dr S D Hogg
   Dr T B Kirk*
   Dr L Y J Liu

   professorial constituency

   Professor T Anderson
   Professor D A C Manning
   Professor P P Powrie
83. **REPORTED BUSINESS**

Received a report of action taken in accordance with agreed procedures, approved where necessary by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of Senate and/or the Chairman of Council on behalf of Council, and by other University bodies and Chairmen.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document M. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

**PART C : RESERVED BUSINESS**

84. **PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT)**

Reported that, in accordance with Senate Standing Order XI.A, ‘A proposal that a named person shall be nominated for appointment to a Pro-Vice-Chancellorship under Statute 13 may be made at any time to Senate by the Vice-Chancellor........’

Considered a recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor for the appointment of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Development).

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document N. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After a vote in which in which more than two thirds of the members present voted in favour,

*Resolved that Senate endorse the recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor that Professor M P Young be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Development) for a period of three years for submission to Council (dates to be confirmed at a later date).*

[Note: The Chairman of Council had subsequently approved the recommendation on behalf of Council.]

85. **PRO-VICE-CHANCELLORS/PROVOSTS UNDER STATUTE 43**

Reported that:

(a) Professor Young’s appointment as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Development) would create a vacancy in the office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (SAgE);

(b) In accordance with Senate Standing Order XI.B ‘notice of any vacancy in the office of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor/Provost occurring for any reason before the date of the expiry of the term of office shall be formally reported to Senate and Council. Senate and Council shall at that time decide what action to take in accordance with Statute 43.’

Considered what action to take in accordance with Statute 43 regarding the vacancy which would occur in the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (SAgE) post on the appointment of Professor Young as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategic Development).

*Resolved that the vacancy be filled following the procedure set out in Senate Standing Order XI.B.*
86. **REPORT FROM THE STATUTORY COMMITTEE ON PROMOTIONS TO PERSONAL PROFESSORSHIPS AND READERSHIPS**

Considered the Report from the Statutory Committee on Promotions to Personal Professorships and Readerships.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document O. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

*Resolved that the recommendations in the Report be approved for submission to Council.*

[Note: The Chairman of Council had subsequently approved the recommendations on behalf of Council.]

87. **CONSOLIDATED REPORT FROM FACULTY PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES**

Considered the consolidated Report from Faculty Promotions Committees.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document P. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

*Resolved that the recommendations in the Report be approved for submission to Council.*

[Note: The Chairman of Council had subsequently approved the recommendations on behalf of Council.]

88. **ACADEMIC DISTINCTIONS - TITLE OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS (STATUTE 31(4))**

*Resolved that the title of ‘Professor Emeritus’ be conferred on the following from the dates shown:*

- **Professor G K Anderson, from 1 October 2005**
- **Professor D F Graham, from 1 October 2005**
- **Professor R Middleton, from 1 October 2005**
- **Professor C R Slater, from 1 October 2005**
- **Professor J V Soames, from 1 August 2005**