UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

SENATE

8 March 2005

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), Professor J B Goddard (Deputy Vice-Chancellor), Professor E Ritchie and Professor T F Page (Pro-Vice-Chancellors), Dr P E Andras, Dr J C Appleby, Dr H M Berry, Dr R J Boys, Dr S Cholerton, Dr E G N Cross, Ms R S Currie (Education Officer), Professor P S Davis, Professor A M Dickinson, Mr C Donnelly (student member), Professor A M R Gatehouse, Ms R C Gilroy, Professor M Goodfellow, Mr T Gorman (Communications Officer), Dr G R Hammond, Ms L B Hargreaves (Welfare Officer), Professor C R Harwood, Dr A C Hurlbert, Dr T B Kirk, Dr C O Record, Professor R A Seymour, Professor J Wheelock and Mr A M Wilton.

In attendance: Dr J V Hogan (Registrar), Mr H B Farnhill (Bursar), Mr P S Mitchell (Academic Registrar), Mrs V S Johnston (Director of Human Resources), Mrs D A Michie (Senior Assistant Registrar) and Dr R D Harrison (Administrator).

Mr L M Aviss attended for item 45 and Mrs M O Grant attended for items 45 and 54.

Professor Goddard was not present for item 54. Dr E G N Cross, Professor P S Davis, Mr A M Wilton, Professor R A Seymour and Dr G R Hammond were not present for item 57.

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

MINUTES

PART A : STRATEGIC ISSUES

45. FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY AND THE UNION SOCIETY
(Minute 20, 16.11.04)

Considered the Final Report of the Committee to Review the Relationship between the University and the Union Society together with a covering report from Executive Board.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document A. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. There had been some differences of opinion among members of the Committee, which was inevitable when three separate parties were being represented, and this had been part of the reason that it had taken so long to complete the Review and why the recommendations were for more work to be undertaken rather than for definite actions to be implemented. In addition, as the Committee was not in a position to state that precise developments
should take place, as it had no budget, it could only recommend a way forward in the light of comparisons with other universities;

2. The Review had also been affected by the change in sabbatical officers at the end of July 2004 as the new officers obviously had not the knowledge which had been acquired by their predecessors;

3. There was a need for a clear vision for future provision of services and facilities and this could only be achieved if a clearly defined, good working relationship between the University and the Union Society was developed which could operate on a strategic rather than a tactical basis. This vision would be developed by the University and the Union Society in partnership but the University would need to initiate this work;

4. The proposed Partnership Group, although needed, was not an appropriate body to develop the vision as it would be too large. A sub-group of this Group, with representatives of the University and the Union Society, should focus on the development of this vision (including what should be in the Union Building and what in the new Student Services Building, and how space should best be configured) and draw up the associated costs. It should then report its recommendations to the Partnership Group, Executive Board, Senate and Council;

5. It would be important that the sub-group developing the vision of the future should be able to demonstrate as quickly as possible how that vision would look, so that visitors to the University – parents and potential students – could see what would be provided once the work had taken place;

6. The ambiguous legal position was not helpful in addressing future capital works. The Trustees were currently discussing the situation with the Charity Commissioners to explore the best way forward. Under these circumstances, two of the representatives of the Trustees had informed the Chairman and the Union Society that they did not agree with recommendation 10(f), although no objection to the wording had been raised in the meetings;

7. Executive Board had been supportive of the need to provide good facilities for the students and the comparative figures on space provision suggested that Newcastle was behind other universities in this. The student population had grown substantially in recent years but no additional space and facilities had been provided. However, if this was to be properly addressed there would need to be major investment. It would therefore be important to clarify the legal position. However, the priority should be to agree the vision of what was needed and then resolve any legal difficulties which might hinder that being achieved as, once a mutual vision was agreed by all three parties, it was likely that an accommodation could be found on any legal obstacles;

8. It was important that opportunities provided through changes in the estate were not lost, particularly the possibility of space being made available for Union activities in the new Student Services Building. The Union Society was involved in discussions on this development. However, it did not consider that there would be sufficient space available in the new Building to make available enough space to meet its needs in their existing Building;
9. The Union Society currently provided a wide range of services, which needed to respond to the changing demand and culture of the student population. It also worked with the community, for example over 100,000 hours of work was carried out by SCAN. In order to best address the needs of the students and the community, the Union drew up a business plan each year and included its vision for the future in both this and the subvention submission;

10. If the Union Society was to change to the same financial year as the University, it would require support from the University as it considered that this would be major task. It would be helpful therefore if the Union Society and the Bursar could discuss this matter and other financial issues, such as the subvention process;

11. The Union Society should consider making the most of the opportunity provided by any refurbishment to address any problems relating to alcohol. Although it was recognised that profits from the commercial services provided in the Union were currently used to support the non-commercial services as well as paying for running those services, consideration could be given to using any increased profits to support a welfare scheme, bursaries or scholarships. No University funding supported commercial services. However, the Union Society was aware that it needed to provide more alcohol free space and the desirability of ensuring that access to services should be through areas which were alcohol free.

Resolved that:

(i) Senate thank Mr Aviss and the members of the Review Committee for their hard work;

(ii) Senate supported the proposal to develop a clear vision on the accommodation and facilities which would be required to meet the needs of the student population, accepted the need for this to be developed urgently and agreed that a small group be established to take this forward;

(iii) Senate accepted the need to establish a Partnership Group and the membership of this Group should be determined at a later stage;

(iv) The Bursar should discuss with the Union Society how to achieve the change in the end of its financial year and any other financial issues which needed to be addressed;

(v) Consideration should also be given on how best to take forward links with Northumbria University.

PART B : GENERAL BUSINESS

SECTION I

[Minutes & matters arising: Vice-Chancellor’s business]

46. MINUTES

After noting that, when discussing Minute 44, Senior staff appointments and confidentiality, Senate had additionally resolved that Senate would delegate authority to the Vice-Chancellor
to approve senior appointments for approval by Council (with the exception of the Vice-Chancellor and the Secretary to Senate and Council).

Resolved that:

(i) The Minutes be amended to take in the additional resolution noted above;

(ii) Subject to that amendment, the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2005 be approved as a correct record and signed.

47. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(a) Progress of business

Received a business tracking form.

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

(b) Freedom of Information Act – briefing
(Minute 36, 18.1.05)

Reported that:

1. Following the meeting, Mr Dane had been asked to investigate the development of a policy on what should be released to students following the publication of examination results and what would be the most appropriate form of recording decisions and discussions so that receipt of a large number of requests under the Freedom of Information Act might be avoided. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) had held a discussion with Mr Dane on this and related teaching issues and work was in hand;

2. One of the questions raised in the mock Audit had been what impact would the Freedom of Information Act have on the information which was released to students.

(c) Honorary Degree candidates
(Minute 38(b), 18.1.05)

Reported that Mr Richard Adams had accepted the University’s invitation to have conferred on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Civil Law. Therefore, five honorary degrees would be awarded at the Congregation on 6 May 2005.

Noted that Mr Adams was the founder of Traidcraft, which was part of a coalition working towards ending world poverty. Both the University and the Union Society were active in this area and the recent Make Poverty History evening in the University had attracted a large audience. It might be appropriate to draw attention to this at the Congregation ceremony.
(d) **Access Agreement**  
(Minute 39(j), 18.1.05)

Reported that a copy of the Access Agreement, which had been sent to OFFA on 20 January, had been sent to all members of Senate on 27 January.

[Members of Senate were reminded that the document should continue to be regarded as strictly confidential and its contents not divulged to any person who was not a member of Senate until after it had been approved by OFFA.]

(e) **Annual Report of the University**  
(Minute 42, 18.1.05)

Considered whether Senate wished to suggest any amendments to the distribution list for the Annual Report.

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

After noting that:

1. The following could be considered for inclusion in the distribution list:
   - those on the distribution list for information on Public Lectures
   - British embassies abroad
   - those people who were on a list of benefactors held by the Vice-Chancellor’s Office
   - City Councillors
   - Regional bodies

2. The distribution list might be useful when drawing up invitation lists for such events as the opening of a building.

**Resolved that:**

(i) *The list should be reviewed and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor should take this forward;*

(ii) *Senators should submit any suggestions to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor.*

(f) **Code of Practice and General Principles for Governance in Higher Education**  
(Minute 39(e), 18.1.05)

Reported that Council had appointed Sir Leslie Elton, Mr P M Johnson and Dr J C Appleby as its representatives on the Working Group on Governance.

48. **VICE-CHANCELLOR’S BUSINESS**

The Vice-Chancellor’s business was tabled at the meeting.  
[Copy filed in the Minute Book.]
Reported that the Vice-Chancellor was suggesting tabling this item in future in order to allow more time for business to be discussed.

*Resolved that the Vice-Chancellor’s business be tabled at meetings in the future.*

**SECTION II**

[Items of business]

49. **PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (PLANNING AND RESOURCES) UNDER STATUTE 13**

Reported that, in accordance with Senate Standing Order XI.A, ‘a proposal that a Pro-Vice-Chancellor should be appointed in accordance with Statute 13 may be made to Senate at any time by the Vice-Chancellor …..’

Considered a recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor for the creation of a third Pro-Vice-Chancellor post under Statute 13.

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

After noting that:

1. The regional agenda had recently grown considerably and this increase made it clear that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor’s portfolio would need to be revised to allow him to be able to concentrate on that. It was therefore necessary to consider how the areas he would no longer be responsible for should be managed;

2. The proposal to create a third Pro-Vice-Chancellor post, and the need to review the portfolios of the existing Pro-Vice-Chancellors, had stemmed from the review of the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor post;

3. At the time of restructuring, when budgets were devolved to faculties, there was no planning model. The academic plans and the resources which these required, such as facilities or estates requirements, were not inter-connected and it was important that this was now addressed. In the increasingly complex world in which universities operated, there was a need to have a professional, integrated approach to planning. A new post of Director of Planning had recently been established and filled and this would assist the University to be more effective with its planning in the future;

4. In addition to this person, who would fill the professional requirements of planning, there was also a need for somebody who fully understood the academic aspects of the University’s planning. The suggested third Pro-Vice-Chancellor post would focus on this and work in a complementary partnership with the Director to improve the University’s planning process. The post would play an active role in the development of plans and horizon scanning, would liaise with external bodies on planning matters and would also be responsible for running the resource allocation model and chairing the Financial Monitoring and Budget Scrutiny Group;

5. It was important that heads of school and of faculties had support with planning. Some assistance could be provided if tools were made available but, in order to achieve integrated planning, there was a need for a senior post which could take the overview. In
addition, there was a need for a senior person to be involved in the planning process who understood and could challenge plans which were being presented. This would require a person with detailed knowledge of the University’s business;

6. All aspects of how the two roles would work together and what support would be available would be considered in detail once the new Director took up his post;

7. The Committee to appoint a Deputy Vice-Chancellor had not been informed of this proposal as it was a Council committee and it was for Senate to appoint Pro-Vice-Chancellors. It had therefore not been considered appropriate for that Committee to consider the proposal. The Committee had been informed that the Vice-Chancellor intended to review the portfolios of both the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the existing two Pro-Vice-Chancellors;

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

Resolved that:

(i) Senate endorse the recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor for the creation of a third Pro-Vice-Chancellor post under Statute 13, for submission to Council;

(ii) The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) and the Director of Planning present a paper to a future meeting of Senate which detailed their proposed approach to planning.

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

[See also Minute 55 below.]

50. REPORT FROM EXECUTIVE BOARD

Considered a report from the meeting of Executive Board held on 18 January 2005.

Resolved that:

(i) Professor John Burn be appointed Director of the Institute of Human Genetics for three years, from 1 April 2005 until 31 March 2008.

(ii) Professor Roy Taylor be appointed Director of the Magnetic Resonance Centre for three years, from 1 January 2005 until 31 December 2007.

SECTION III
[Items of minor importance or items for information only.]

51. REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

Received a report from the meeting of UTLC held on 20 January 2005.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document G. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]
52. **CONGREGATION CEREMONIES : 7 AND 8 DECEMBER 2005**

Reported that up to 10 Congregation ceremonies would be held on 7 and 8 December 2005 for the conferment of initial and higher degrees.

53. **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 H. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

**PART C : RESERVED BUSINESS**

54. **REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE APPOINTMENT OF A DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR**

Considered a Report from the Committee on the Appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor under Statute 12.

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

After noting that:

1. It was important, particularly in the coming months, to ensure that the University was well perceived in the regional community and that those outside the University could see it provided benefits externally. The current Deputy Vice-Chancellor had particular expertise in this area which would greatly assist with achieving this position;

2. There had been developments in recent months, such as the award of Science City status, which meant that circumstances had changed since Professor Goddard was re-appointed for one year in 2004. Therefore, he was now eager to continue in this role so that he could see these projects, in which he was deeply involved, through to fruition;

3. The work on developing Science City was being led by a partnership between Professor Young and Professor Goddard. Professor Young could provide the required scientific vision and credibility while Professor Goddard could complement this essential contribution with his knowledge of regional affairs. This was proving to be a successful method for taking this project forward. However, other scientists might need to have an input as well, as their contribution could be crucial to the ultimate success of the project;

4. The Northern Way project, which was being led by Professor Page, was also concerned with the development of science, through the Science Initiative. It would be important to ensure that the three people involved in these two projects worked as a team of equals on a joint venture while leading in different fora;

5. A period of re-appointment would allow others to develop regional expertise, as the University could be vulnerable in the current situation. Professor Goddard was committed to achieving this;
6. The Vice-Chancellor would be reviewing the portfolios of the senior management team so that expertise did not rest with one person alone and there was synergy between the members. He would be aiming to ensure that members of the team could support each other rather than each person having a separate, inflexible role;

7. The Committee on the Appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor had been made aware of the planned review of the portfolios of the senior management team, but not of the details as this was considered inappropriate. However, it might have been helpful if the proposal to reappoint the current Deputy Vice-Chancellor had been set in the context of the roles of the full senior management team and the proposal to appoint an additional Pro-Vice-Chancellor;

8. There was a coincidence in the dates of certain retirements and the termination of some senior appointments in 2007-08 which, without appropriate succession planning, could potentially cause difficulties;

9. A new Vice-Chancellor would be appointed in 2007 and it was important that he/she had flexibility in the composition of the senior management team. In the meantime it would be helpful if there was some stability;

10. In order to allow the approval of any recommendation to be completed as speedily as possible, and so preserve confidentiality, the lay members of Council had been asked for their views on the recommendation of the Committee on the Appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Over 50% had replied and all had indicated their agreement with the recommendation.

Resolved that Senate endorse the recommendation of the Committee on the Appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor under Statute 12 that Professor J B Goddard be re-appointed as Deputy Vice-Chancellor for a further three years, from 1 August 2005 until 31 July 2008, for submission to Council.

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

55. PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (PLANNING AND RESOURCES) UNDER STATUTE 13

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, subject to Council’s approval of the recommendation in minute 49 above, a recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor for the appointment of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources).

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

After noting that:

1. The University was fortunate in having a senior member of staff with a full understanding of the University’s business who also had experience of reviewing the resource allocation
model and the planning process. It was clear that he was aware of what was required to take this area forward;

2. While it could be argued that there should be open competition for this post, in this case it was clear there was only one person with the requisite skills and experience and so a specific appointment was being proposed;

3. The process being followed for the appointment was completely correct, however the University could be considered to be inconsistent in its procedures as some appointments were made from a committee and others not. Those not considered by committees were in general new posts and the person to be appointed had been identified. However, it was recognised that the non-committee route had the disadvantage that a candidate was discussed in a large, open forum which could make it difficult for a member to speak against the candidate;

4. While it would clearly cause some difficulties for and concerns within the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences to lose an effective Pro-Vice-Chancellor, it would in the University’s overall best interests if this appointment was made.

After a vote in which members voted unanimously in favour,

Resolved that Senate endorse the recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor that Professor A C Stevenson be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) for a period of three years, from 1 August 2005 until 31 July 2008, for submission to Council.

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

56. PRO-VICE-CHANCELLORS/PROVOSTS UNDER STATUTE 43

Reported that:

1. Professor Stevenson’s appointment as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) would create a vacancy in the office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Humanities and Social Sciences);

2. 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 (Humanities and Social Sciences) post on the appointment of Professor Stevenson as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources).

Resolved that the vacancy be filled following the procedure set out in Senate Standing Order XI.B.
57. CONSOLIDATED REPORT FROM FACULTY APPOINTMENT BOARDS

Considered an extension for a further two years until 31 July 2007 (unless otherwise indicated), to the appointment of the following whose initial three year period of appointment will end on 31 July 2005:

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Dr E G N Cross    Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Professor P S Davis  Head of School of Arts and Cultures
Professor W Li    Head of School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences
Professor I McLoughlin  Head and Director of UNuT Business School
Professor L Anderson  Head of School of English Literature, Language and Linguistics
Mr A M Wilton    Head of Newcastle Law School
Mr T Shaw  Head of School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape

Faculty of Medical Sciences

Professor R K Jordan    Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Professor R A Seymour  Head of School of Dental Sciences
*Professor S Bond    Head of School of Population and Health Sciences (until 31 July 2006)
Professor I N Ferrier  Head of School of Neurology, Neurobiology and Psychiatry
Professor T W J Lennard  Head of School of Surgical and Reproductive Sciences
Dr G Hammond  Head of School of Medical Education Development

Faculty of SAgE

Professor P A Christensen  Dean of Postgraduate Studies
Dr H Finlayson    Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dr A Younger  Head of School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development
Professor A Incecik  Head of School of Marine Science and Technology
Dr J Lloyd  Head of School of Computing Science
Professor D Parker  Head of School of Civil Engineering and Geosciences
Professor O R Hinton  Head of School of Electrical, Electronic and Computer Engineering

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

After noting that:

1. It would be helpful if the full list of heads of school, together with their periods of office, could be presented in future in order to provide the overall picture, particularly as there could be issues relating to succession planning;
2. The Human Resources section was monitoring the situation in relation to succession planning in schools as well as at the more senior level;

3. Some appointment panels were currently underway in cases where the current head was either about to retire or had indicated they did not wish to continue.

Resolved that:

(i) The recommendation in the report that an extension of a further two years until 31 July 2007 (unless otherwise indicated) be made to the appointment of the persons named, whose initial three year period of appointment would end on 31 July 2005, be approved for submission to Council;

(ii) The Director of Human Resources present a report to the next meeting of Senate which gave full details of all heads of schools, together with their periods of office.

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