Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), Professor C Harvey, Professor E Ritchie, Professor A C Stevenson and Professor N G Wright (Pro-Vice-Chancellors), Dr S Ali, Dr P E Andras, Dr J C Appleby, Dr D R Bell, Professor V G Bruce, Ms E Budge (Education Officer), Professor S J Bull, Professor J E Calvert, Professor D I Clarke, Ms E Collingham (student member), Mr W Connolly, Professor E G N Cross, Professor D Ford, Ms A Georgiou (President, Union Society), Professor J R Hentschke, Professor B H Hirst, Dr D J Kennedy, Mr P Mercer (Student Support Officer), Professor D Parker, Ms S M Robson, Professor D J Roddy, Professor P Watson and Dr K Wolff.

In attendance: Dr J V Hogan (Registrar), Mr R C Dale (Executive Director of Finance), Mrs C Harvey (Academic Registrar), Mrs V S Johnston (Executive Director of Human Resources) and Ms E M Niven (Administrative Officer).

Dr E Clewlow (Head of QuILT) was present for item 87.

Professor E Ritchie (Pro-Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning) was not present for item 86.

M I N U T E S

81. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

82. RETIRING MEMBERS

The Vice-Chancellor thanked the retiring members for their contribution to the work of Senate. It was also the last meeting of Senate for Cathryn Harvey (Academic Registrar) and Senate offered Mrs Harvey its best wishes for her retirement.

83. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of Senate held on 27 April 2010 were approved as a correct record and signed.

84. MATTER ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Progress of business

Received a business tracking form.

[Circulated with the agenda as Document B. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

85. VICE-CHANCELLOR’S BUSINESS

Received the Vice-Chancellor’s report.

[Circulated with the agenda as Document B. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]
(i) **Coalition Government**

The Vice-Chancellor had attended a recent meeting of Universities UK at which members had received a presentation from the Institute for Fiscal Studies. It was explained that the Government’s main priority was to reduce the country’s deficit and that it was expected to do this predominantly by cutting public spending rather than raising taxes. It was thought that public spending would be reduced by between 6% and 6.5% cumulatively for four years.

At its meeting on 7 June, Council had received the budget for 2010/11. It was considered that the strategy would be able to sustain the University.

The Browne review of Higher Education Funding and Student Finance was expected to report in the autumn of 2010. The issue of tuition fees was an area of disagreement for the coalition government and an agreement had been reached whereby the Liberal Democrats could abstain if there was to be a vote on the issue of increasing tuition fees. If the Browne review was to conclude that tuition fees should be increased, 2013/14 would be the first year in which any increase could take effect. In the intervening years, the sector would have to cope with reduced government funding.

The Government had raised the possibility of Further Education Colleges offering Higher Education degrees. The Vice-Chancellor was due to meet David Willetts MP, Minister of State for Universities and Science, in the near future and it was expected that this issue would be discussed.

(ii) **Regional Development Agency**

The new government had stated its intention to remove regional development agencies except where there was evidence that they were popular with local authorities and the business community in their region. Where this was the case, the agencies were expected to evolve into local enterprise partnerships. Representatives from ONE North East had attended a recent meeting of Universities for the North East (Unis4NE) where they had lobbied for its continued support. On 17 May, the Association of North East Councils (ANEC) and the Northern Business Forum (NBF) had written to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government expressing their support for ONE. The Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of Unis4NE, had sent a further letter of support which included a request for a ‘3-way partnership between, Business, Local Government and Universities’ if a local enterprise partnership was to be established (copies of these letters are attached as Appendix I).

(iii) **University Modernisation Fund**

The University had recently been informed that its application to HEFCE’s University Modernisation Fund had been approved. The University would receive approximately £2.6m in one lump sum to fund 176 additional student places. One third of the money received would be used to cover the cost of teaching the students in their first year. The remainder would be used to fund efficiency activities during the year, which would help the University to reduce its future cost base. The savings which would arise from the investment in the efficiency activities would be used to support the future costs of the additional new entrants in their subsequent years of study.

The majority of the additional places would be allocated to SAgE with a small number allocated to Modern Languages and Medical Sciences. Support from colleagues was requested in helping to promote and fill these additional places.
(iv) **Science Central Masterplan**

At its meeting on 7 June Council had received a presentation on the Science Central Masterplan and had agreed that it could go out for public consultation.

(v) **NewcastleGateshead’s Economic Masterplan**

The city development corporation, 1NG, was due to launch its economic masterplan (1Plan) on 16 June. The key aim of the masterplan was to set out a blueprint for the economic and physical regeneration of Newcastle and Gateshead. The theme of sustainability which ran throughout the document linked closely with the University’s second Societal Challenge Theme. The University had expressed its support for the 1Plan.

86. **EXECUTIVE BOARD PORTFOLIOS**

Considered a report from the Vice-Chancellor.

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

After noting that:

1. Newcastle University was amongst the first of the UK Universities to appoint a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Engagement. The post was now well established and it was important to maintain the relationships which had been created. There were considered to be two aspects to the Engagement portfolio – relationship building and business development. It was proposed that the relationship building aspect of the Engagement portfolio should be brought together with the Internationalisation portfolio and that these activities should be allocated to Professor Ritchie who should become the Deputy Vice-Chancellor. The business development aspect of the Engagement portfolio would be allocated to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research and Innovation and the Executive Director of Finance.

2. The above arrangements would result in a vacancy in the Pro-Vice-Chancellor Teaching, Learning and Student Experience role and it was proposed that this should be advertised in September 2010.

3. The arrangements described above would come into effect from 1 January 2011 and in the intervening period the members of Executive Board would cover the existing Engagement activities on a collective basis.

4. It was suggested that considered should be given to revising the title of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research and Innovation to reflect the wider remit, which would now include business engagement.

**Resolved that:**

(i) **Senate suspend Standing Order X.2-5 concerning a joint selection committee for the post of Deputy Vice-Chancellor and agree that Professor Ella Ritchie be appointed Deputy Vice-Chancellor from a date to be determined to 31 July 2014, subject to the approval of Council.**

(ii) **A Pro-Vice-Chancellor Teaching, Learning and Student Experience be appointed to replace Professor Ritchie, subject to the agreement of Council.**
(iii) Subject to Council’s approval of (i)&(ii) above, a joint selection committee be established for the post of Pro-Vice-Chancellor Teaching, Learning and Student Experience with membership as follows:

- The Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
- Three members appointed by Council
- Three members appointed by Senate

(iv) Members of Senate be invited to submit expressions of interest or nominations of those interested in serving on the joint selection committee to the Vice-Chancellor by 30 June 2010.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor be authorised to appoint three members on the joint selection committee on behalf of Senate.

87. QAA INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT (Minute 67, 27.4.2010)

Considered a report from University Teaching and Learning Committee.
[Circulated with the agenda as Document E. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. Senate had been presented with the full version of the QAA Institutional Audit report together with an action plan which had been prepared to address the audit’s recommendations. The action plan also sought to address issues which had been identified during the preparation for the audit and in the student written submission.

2. The University had been pleased with the commendations it had received which highlighted two areas which were considered to be important aspects of the University’s mission, i.e. research-led teaching and the University’s approach to employability.

3. The University’s academic support services had also received praise. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning congratulated and thanked the academic and administrative staff who had been involved in the audit and in particular Dr Simon Meacher (Senior Development Officer), Dr Ellie Clewlow (Head of QuILT) and their team.

4. A number of recommendations had been made which fell into two categories; advisable and desirable. The advisable recommendations were considered to be aspects which required preventative or corrective action. Work was already underway to address the recommendations relating to the Internal Subject Review process and personal tutoring. A report from the Working Group on Personal Tutoring had been received by Faculty Teaching and Learning sub-committees and was due to come to Senate in the autumn. The University had also been advised to strengthen its oversight of collaborative provision and a review of this was underway.

5. The desirable recommendations required the University to extend the opportunities for students to benefit from the learning technology that was available and also to strengthen arrangements for sharing good practice internally.

6. It was agreed that the review of the University’s quality assurance arrangements should seek to determine the appropriate quality indicators and from this, a framework should be prepared which provided academic units with a degree of flexibility. For example, the process should allow schools to determine the most appropriate mechanism for obtaining student feedback and it should be possible for this to differ from one school to another.
Resolved that:

(i) Professor Ritchie and the team in QuILT be thanked for their work.

(ii) The QAA Institutional Audit Action Plan be endorsed by Senate.

88. TWO-YEAR DEGREES

Considered a report from Professor Ella Ritchie, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning on behalf of Executive Board.

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

After noting that:

1. The issue of two-year degrees had been discussed on a previous occasion by both Senate and Council but Council had asked for it to be given further consideration. The paper which was presented to Senate had been received by Executive Board and UTLC.

2. It was suggested that the organisational changes which would be needed if two-year degrees were to be introduced would be a secondary consideration as systems would be required to adapt to suit the University’s chosen mode of delivery.

3. The list of drawbacks for the University of the two-year degree were considered to be compelling but it was suggested that further consideration should be given to the needs and requirements of the post-21 age group as they could become a larger market in future. It was also considered that the needs of part-time students would become increasingly important.

4. The experience of academics who taught large numbers of sponsored students from the Middle East suggested that their employers were keen for them to complete their studies as quickly as possible so that they were available for work. Some employers were of the opinion that students lost focus over the summer vacation and it was therefore considered that two-year degrees might be popular with this group. However, loss of reputation would be a serious risk.

5. To avoid undermining efficiency measures, it would be necessary to offer two-year degrees on a sufficiently large scale. Even if two-year degrees were not introduced, further consideration needed be given to the out-of-hours provision of support services and the possibility of delivering more services electronically.

6. Two-year degrees would need to receive popular support so as not to undermine the value of a Newcastle degree.

7. It was possible that two-year degrees would restrict the ability of some students to support themselves through part-time working.

Resolved that the University should be open to and ready to consider alternative modes of delivery of undergraduate degrees but no further consideration should be given to two-year degrees at the present time.

89. STATUTES (Minute 48, 2.3.2010)

Reported that Senate, at its meeting on 2 March 2010, had considered proposed changes to the University Statutes and resolved that the proposed changes, including the changes to the Model Statute, be supported in principle subject to further consideration of a number of
detailed points made during the meeting and further discussions with UCU, with a view to bringing a final version of the proposed changes to the June meeting of Senate.

Received:

(i) An explanatory document prepared by Dr John Hogan, Registrar.

(ii) A paper from UCU.

[Circulated with the agenda as Documents G & H. Copies filed in the Minute Book.]

Considered proposed amendments to the University Statutes which had been considered by Academic Board and Convocation.

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

After noting that:

1. Following advice from the University’s solicitors it was proposed that powers should be reserved to the University and Senate and Council should be delegated ‘functions’. It was suggested that, as an autonomous democratic organisation, it was more appropriate for the word ‘powers’ to be retained in relation to Council and Senate. It was noted that the letter from the solicitors which explained the reason for this change had been presented to the Working Group on Governance, who had been persuaded by the reasoning put forward. It was agreed that the relevant extract from this letter should be circulated to members of Senate.

2. It was suggested that the description of the means of appointment of the student representatives and sabbatical officers on Senate and Council should be consistent.

3. The membership of Senate had been revised, both to reduce the size of Senate and to ensure that it would have a majority of elected academic members, as requested by the UCU. Senate’s Standing Orders ensured that it would not be necessary for a non-professorial member of Senate to step down should they be appointed to a Chair during their term of office.

4. As a result of the procedures described in the Model Statute (current Statute 57) it had been necessary to establish a standing Redundancy Committee to deal with the large number of redundancy cases the University was required to consider each year. These were mostly members of staff who were coming to the end of a fixed term contract and for whom the University had received a fixed level of funding which was not to be renewed. There had been approximately 190 such cases in the previous year which had placed a large burden on the Redundancy Committee.

5. The University was in discussion with the UCU regarding the procedures which would replace the detail that would be removed from the Model Statute. Were the proposed changes to be approved, the detail contained within the Model Statutes would continue to apply until replacement procedures had been approve by Senate and Council.

6. It was considered that the principle of academic freedom was well preserved in the revised version of the Statutes.

7. Rather than a particular number of academic staff (currently suggested as 6) being considered as a collective redundancy and requiring consideration by Senate, it was suggested that Senate should be made aware of potential redundancies that would have significant implications for the academic character and mission of the University.
8. The suggestion made by UCU that the Chairman of Redundancy Committee was arguing for the committee’s continuance was considered to be a misrepresentation of the Chairman’s comment. It had been suggested that there remained a need to promote the PDR process and performance management procedures, but it was not necessary for this to be done by a Redundancy Committee.

9. It was desirable generally to avoid the inclusion of operational detail in the statutes themselves as this made is more difficult for the University to respond to changes in legislation in a timely manner.

Resolved that:

(i) The extract from the University solicitor’s letter concerning the recommendation that the word ‘powers’ be replaced with the word ‘function’ be circulated to members of Senate for information.

(ii) Further consideration be given to the principle of ensuring that the Senate had an opportunity to comment on proposals to dismiss academic staff by reason of redundancy where that dismissal had significant implications for the academic character and mission of the University.

(iii) Subject to the above changes, the proposed statute revisions be submitted to Council for approval, together with Senate’s comments above.

[Note: One member of Senate asked for their abstention from resolution (iii) to be recorded]

90. REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

Considered a report from the meetings of UTLC held on 28 April and 26 May 2010.

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

Streamlining the University’s response to special circumstances presented by students

After noting that:

1. Concessions were not delegated to UTLC but were the responsibility of the University Concessions Committee (UCC).

2. Academic Units were required to make a recommendation on a concessions case to UCC and in 90% of cases this recommendation was upheld. It had, therefore, been decided that the concessions process should be streamlined, to avoid duplication and to provide a more straightforward and efficient process for students. The Office of the Independent Adjudicator has also recommended that institutions should undertake a review of their concessions procedures.

3. UCC provided a means of ensuring decisions were impartial and consistent across the University and it was suggested that the protection this afforded would be removed by the proposed new arrangements. UTLC had discussed these issues and it had been agreed that additional training would be provided to staff in academic units to ensure decisions continued to be consistent across the University.

4. The current arrangements were considered to be confusing for some staff and any means of simplifying the process was welcomed. Students would be required to complete only
one form under the new arrangements which would remove much of the confusion. In the interests of impartiality, it was suggested that academic units could partner with another academic unit to ensure that the local concession committee included members from outside the school or institute.

5. In particularly difficult cases it was considered important to have an arbiter who was seen to be independent and impartial.

6. Academic units would have detailed knowledge of a student’s situation and whilst this could be considered to limit the impartiality of a decision it could also assist in the decision-making process.

7. Work was to be done to strengthen and clarify the appeals procedure and it was suggested that the provision of an appeals procedure provided an appropriate safeguard for students. Senate would be asked to consider amendments to the current Academic Appeal Panel and Academic Appeal Procedure during the 2010-11 academic year.

8. It was proposed that responsibility for concessions matters should be delegated to UTLC and that UCC should be abolished from 2011/12. The majority of concessions powers would then be delegated to academic units.

Resolved that further consideration be given to the concerns raised by Senate. A response should be submitted to the first meeting of Senate in the new academic year.

Senate noted the remaining items in the report.

91. RESEARCH STRUCTURES IN THE FACULTY OF SAgE

Considered a report from Professor Nick Wright, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research and Innovation on behalf of Executive Board.

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

After noting that:

1. All existing academic work of IRES would be fully subsumed within NIReS and that all external members of IRES would automatically become members of NIReS.

2. Council, at its meeting on 7 June, had approved the recommendations subject to the agreement of Senate.

Resolved that the following recommendations be approved:

(i) That, with effect from 31 May 2010, the Institute for Research on the Environment and Sustainability (IRES) cease to continue as an Institute and Professor David Manning cease to be Acting Director.

(ii) That, with effect from 31 May 2010, the Sir Joseph Swan Institute for Energy Research change from an Institute to a University Research Centre, to be called the Sir Joseph Swan Centre for Energy Research.

(iii) That the Sir Joseph Swan Centre for Energy Research be established for a period of three years from 1 June 2010, and that Professor Dermot Roddy be appointed Director for the same period.
(iv) That, with effect from 1 June 2010, the Newcastle Institute for Research on Sustainability (NIReS) be established for a period of five years, with Professor Paul Younger and Professor Tony Roskilly as NIReS Director and Director of Research respectively.

92. NORTH EAST ENGLAND STEM CELL INSTITUTE (NESCI)

Considered a report from Professor Nick Wright, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research and Innovation on behalf of Executive Board.

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

Resolved that:

(i) Senate approve a change in the status of NESCI from an Institute to a Research Centre, with the title ‘NESCI at Newcastle’, for a period of three years from 1 August 2010, subject to the agreement of Council.

(ii) Subject to Council’s approval of (i) above, that Professor Michael Whitaker be appointed Director of ‘NESCI at Newcastle’ for a period of three years from 1 August 2010.

(iii) University Research Committee be asked to review ‘NESCI at Newcastle’ in 2012 against a set of KPIs appropriate for comparison with University Research Institutes.

(iv) The press protocol be reviewed as a matter of urgency. In general, the protocol should emphasise the primacy of the University concerned and not NESCI.

(v) The MoA be reviewed and amended in line with the above recommendations if considered necessary and that the formal NESCI Board be placed in abeyance whilst the MoA was reviewed.

93. UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTRES

Considered a report from Professor Nick Wright, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research and Innovation on behalf of Executive Board.

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

Resolved that:

(i) The Centre for Software Reliability be re-approved for a period of three years from 1 August 2010 and that Professor Tom Anderson be re-appointed as Director for the same period.

(ii) The Centre for Knowledge, Innovation, Technology and Enterprise (KITE) be re-approved for one year from 1 August 2010 and that the new Goldman Chair be appointed as Director for the same period.

(iii) The Centre for Bacterial Cell Biology be re-approved for a period of three years from 1 August 2010 and that Professor Jeff Errington be re-appointed as Director for the same period.

(iv) The Centre for Biopharmaceutical Bioprocessing be re-approved for a period of three years from 1 August 2010 and that Professor Gary Montague be re-appointed as Director for the same period.
(v) The NewRail Research Centre be re-named the Newcastle Centre for Railway Research (Newrail), the Centre be re-approved for a period of three years from 1 August 2010 and that Professor Mark Robinson be re-appointed as Director for the same period.

94. CO-OPTED MEMBERSHIP OF SENATE

Reported that Senate, at its meeting on 19 June 2007, had resolved that from 2007-08 only professors should be eligible to be elected in the professorial constituency of Senate and that the Librarian and holders of other posts whose remit was essential for the successful academic work of the University (who had previously been specified by Senate as being equivalent to professors for this purpose), and who were not already included in the Senate electorate, should be considered by Senate as potential candidates for co-option as members of Senate.

Considered whether Senate wished to co-opt any persons whose remit was essential for the successful academic work of the University, who were not already included in the Senate electorate, as members of Senate.

Resolved that Ms Jacqui Henderson be re-appointed as a co-opted member of Senate until 31 July 2013.

95. MEMBERSHIP OF SENATE

Reported that the following had been elected Sabbatical Officers of the Union Society for 2010-11 and would be members of Senate for the same period:

- President: Mr Tom Delamere
- Education Officer: Ms Elizabeth Collingham
- Student Support Officer: Ms Sarah Fears

96. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES

Considered a report on the appointment/re-appointment of Chairmen and members of committees.

[Circulated with the agenda as Document R. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Resolved that the recommendations in the report be approved.

97. NEW PROBATION POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Considered a report from Mrs Veryan Johnston, Executive Director of Human Resources on behalf of Executive Board.

[Circulated with the agenda as Document S. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. The revised probation procedures did not cover academic staff on grade I. It was suggested that the consequences of an inappropriate appointment at grade I were much greater than they would be for a more junior member of staff. It was, therefore, considered important for Senate to be reassured that there was a process in place which allowed for the scrutiny of newly appointed staff on grade I.
2. Academic staff on grade I were subject to the capability procedure and were required to complete the PDR process. It was agreed that the Probation Policy could be amended to make explicit the arrangements for staff on grade I.

3. It had been noted that the University were proposing to withdraw the category of grade H research staff. This was considered to be an important academic issue which required consideration by Senate. It was agreed that a discussion on this matter would take place at a future meeting.

4. Some academic units employed demonstrators at grade E. The majority of staff employed at this grade were administrative staff and the probation procedure had been written with this category of staff in mind. It was therefore requested that line managers should be able to choose an alternative and more appropriate probation procedure for junior demonstrators employed at grade E.

Resolved that:

(i) The new Probation Policy and Probation Procedures, as outlined in Document S, be approved from 1 September 2010, subject to the agreement of Council.

(ii) The Executive Director of Human Resources be delegated authority to finalise the detailed wording of the Policy and Procedures following discussion with the campus unions, subject to the agreement of Council.

(iii) Probation Committee be dissolved from 31 August 2010, subject to the agreement of Council.

98. APPOINTMENTS TO CHAIRS AND READERSHIPS

Received a report from Executive Board on appointments to Chairs and Readerships. [Circulated with the agenda as Document T. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

99. JULY MEETING OF SENATE

Reported that, as previously notified to members, the meeting of Senate provisionally scheduled for 2 pm on 20 July 2010 had been cancelled.

100. CONGREGATION CEREMONIES

(i) December 2010

Reported that Congregation ceremonies would be held on 7 and 8 December 2010 in the King’s Hall, Armstrong Building.

(ii) July 2011

Reported that Congregation ceremonies following the end of the Summer Term 2011 would be held on:

- Monday, 11 July 2011 (all day)
- Tuesday, 12 July 2011 (all day)
- Wednesday, 13 July 2011 (all day)
- Thursday, 14 July 2011 (all day)
- Friday, 15 July 2011 (all day)
- Saturday, 16 July 2011 (a.m.)
101. 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 U. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

RESERVED BUSINESS

102. REPORT FROM THE HASS FACULTY APPOINTMENT BOARD

Considered a report from the HASS Faculty Appointment Board.

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

Resolved that the recommendation in the report be approved, subject to the agreement of Council.

[Note: In accordance with agreed procedures, the Chairman of Council had subsequently approved the recommendation on behalf of Council.]

103. REPORT FROM FACULTY PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES

Considered a 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, subject to the agreement of Council.

[Note: In accordance with agreed procedures, the Chairman of Council had subsequently approved the recommendation on behalf of Council.]

104. REPORT FROM THE STATUTORY COMMITTEE ON PROMOTIONS TO PERSONAL PROFESSORSHIPS AND READERSHIPS

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

[Circulated with the agenda as Document Q. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Resolved that the recommendations in the report be approved, subject to the agreement of Council.

[Note: In accordance with agreed procedures, the Chairman of Council had subsequently approved the recommendation on behalf of Council.]

105. ACADEMIC DISTINCTIONS : TITLE OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS (STATUTE 31(4))

Reported that, in accordance with Statute 31(4), Senate may accord the title of Professor Emeritus on professors retiring from the University.

Considered proposals from the Vice-Chancellor, following consultation with the faculty Pro-Vice-Chancellors, for the conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus.
Resolved that the title of Professor Emeritus be conferred on the following from the dates shown:

Professor Viv Cook, 1 October 2010
Professor Alasdair Edwards, 1 October 2010
Professor Michael Harrison, 1 October 2010
Professor John McCabe, 1 October 2010
Professor Mike Reeks, 1 October 2010
Professor Chris Ritson, 1 October 2010
Professor Ken Willis, 1 October 2010
Professor Terry Wright, 1 August 2010