



SENATE MINUTES

This paper presents the minutes of the last meeting of Senate on 8 October 2025 held at The Hub Lecture Theatre, Walton Hall Campus.

Action Required

Senate **approved** these minutes as a correct record of the meeting.

Present

Professor David Phoenix	Vice-Chancellor
Professor Josie Fraser	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Professor Ian Pickup	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students)
Professor Mark Brandon	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) (Interim)
Professor Allán Laville	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Equality, Diversity and Inclusion)
Professor Michael Fernando	Executive Dean, Faculty of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
Professor Klaus-Dieter Rossade	Executive Dean, Faculty of Wellbeing, Education and Language Studies
Professor Adrienne Scullion	Executive Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Professor Mark Durkin	Executive Dean, Faculty of Business and Law
Professor Bart Rienties	Director of the Institute of Educational Technology
Gary Elliott-Cirigottis	Director of Library Services
Jo Dyer	Director of Learner and Discovery Services

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS)

Dr Zoe Doye	Dr Richard Marsden	Dr Emma Barker
Dr Martin Clarke	Professor Lisa Lazard	Professor William Brown
Professor Rosalind Crone	Dr Sinead McEneaney	Dr Thomas Martin

Faculty of Business and Law (FBL)

Carol Howells	Ash Odedra	Claire Maguire
Professor Caroline Clarke		

Faculty of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)

Professor Richard Holliman	Dr Christopher Douce	Professor David Sharp
Dr Tacey O'Neil	Dr Hayley Ryder	Cath Brown
Dr Helen Fraser	Frances Chetwynd	Dr Gareth Neighbour
Dr James Bruce	Jill Shaw	Dr James Hague
Dr Magnus Ramage	Dr Susanne P Schwenzer	Rehana Awan
Dr Sotiria Psoma	Dr Jotham Gaudoin	Dr Rachel Slater

Faculty of Wellbeing, Education and Language Studies (WELS)

Mel Green	Dr Laura Paterson	Dr Renu Bhandari
-----------	-------------------	------------------

Dr Judy Chandler	Dr Gillian Ferguson	Dr Hannah Marston
Paulette Johnson	Dr Mark Addis	Dr Naomi Watson
Jo Strang		
Institute of Education Technology (WELS)		
Dr Elizabeth Fitzgerald	Dr Tim Coughlan	Professor Denise Whitelock
Associate Lecturers		
James Hutchinson	Dr Vince Mitchell	Dr Kate Hammond
Mike Hay	Rob Parker	Tony Cox
Rocky Grove		
Students appointed by Open University Students Association		
Natalie Baker	Nichola Connolly	Andrew Kolapo
Scarlet James	Ben Richards	Mathew Ashmore
Academic-related staff		
Vicky Jones	Billy Khokhar	Anna Page
Dr Caitlin Adams	Farnaz Rais	Frances Gill
Dr Hossam Kassem	Lou Evans	Ellen Cocking
Dr Rachel Leslie	Rukhsana Malik	Kit Power
Paris Graham	Paul Farrington	
Co-opted members		
Martin Boyle	Lurrairie Jones	Professor Devendra Kodwani
John D'Arcy	Ben Lewis	
In Attendance		
Anna Barber, Director - Academic	Dr Camilla Briault, Director – GCLS	Dr Laura Chambers – Head of Governance
Christian Cull – Deputy Director of Communications	Sharon O'Kelly – Executive Business Manager, VCO	Maria Kantirou – Head of Academic Strategy and Planning
Guy Mallison, Interim Director of Strategy	Lisa Hower, Assistant Director of Communications (Internal)	Sharron Jenkins, Manager, Academic Strategy and Planning,
Malcolm Sweeting, Pro-Chancellor	Rashik Parmar, Council member	Professor Dame Julia Goodfellow, Council member
Nikki Humphrey, Council member	Jill Gribble, Assistant Director PVC (Students)	Emma Greening Assistant Director PVC (Students)
Paul Traynor, CFO		
Apologies		
Professor Jon Pike	Dr Lystra Hagley-Dickinson	Tony Murphy
Dr Kambiz Saber-Sheikh	Dr Kerry Jones	Professor Olga Jurasz
Steph Doehler	Professor Eleni Andreouli	

1 WELCOME

- 1.1 The Vice Chancellor welcomed members to the first Senate meeting of the academic year. He also welcomed members of Council to the meeting, noting that it was the annual Senate meeting when Council members were invited to attend as part of the governance assurance process.

- 1.2 The Vice-Chancellor noted that a motion had been received from a Senate member regarding the challenges around Artificial Intelligence (AI). The motion had not met the conditions to be included on the agenda but had raised some important issues, so there would be a substantive item at the January 2026 meeting instead.
- 1.3 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students) explained that there was a lot of activity underway on AI and academic integrity, both in the short-term and longer-term, including the recent Festival of AI Exploration and Strategies in Teaching and Assessment (FAIESTA), a 'Green paper' to be presented to Senate in January to progress the development of a set of agreed principles. A group would be convened to work on the paper, comprised of staff working on AI and Senate members.

2 CODE OF CONDUCT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

As this was Senate's first meeting of the academic year, members confirmed they had read the Code of Conduct and the Conflict of Interest Policy.

3 MINUTES

S-2025-03-M

Senate **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2025.

4 MATTERS ARISING

S-2025-04-01

- 4.1 Senate **noted** an update on matters arising and actions taken since the meeting held on 18 June 2025.
- 4.2 It was asked when the KMi Review would be considered by Senate. The Vice-Chancellor explained that Senate would receive a report after it had been considered by the STEM Executive, as they had commissioned the review. The report received by Senate would outline which aspects of the review were within the remit of Senate to consider.

5 CHAIR'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

- 5.1 The Vice-Chancellor thanked the members of Senate that had participated in the workshop on 6th October 2025, to reflect on Senate's role as the University's academic authority. The session had been an opportunity to develop clarity of expectations and help support the creation of a high trust culture. As part of the discussions, the Vice-Chancellor had been keen to focus questions on the remit of Senate, the assurances needed for Council as the ultimate authority, the grey areas between operational and strategic matters, the importance of maintaining debate at a strategic level, and utilising sub-committees for detailed analysis. He explained that the intention was not to stifle debate as Senate members were encouraged to bring forward strategic items for discussion, but to note that for matters outside of Senate's remit there were other appropriate forums to raise those issues such as Town Hall events or emails to the senior executive.
- 5.2 The Vice-Chancellor updated Senate on several areas, including:
- a) **Regulatory and policy landscape:** The University continued to play an active role across the ever-changing policy landscape. In England, relationships had been strengthened with Lord Vallance, the Prime Minister's Skills Advisor, and senior officials within Skills England, focusing on Opportunity and Growth Missions, HE/FE collaboration, and skills pathways. It was important to ensure the OU was considered as part of the Oxford-Cambridge growth corridor, as well as engagement with local

partners, such as Milton Keynes City Council given their interest in developing access to education for local communities, and innovation and growth in Milton Keynes.

- b) **MK Civic agreement:** The OU was leading the development of a Civic University Agreement for Milton Keynes alongside Cranfield and MK College, with the OU validating some of the colleges courses as part of an Institute of Technology.
- c) **Nations:** In Northern Ireland, work on funding reviews and the expansion of OpenLearn Hubs continued; in Scotland, the OU was contributing to teacher professional development and language and culture initiatives; and in Wales, engagement with Medr and the Welsh Government continued ahead of the new four-nations registration framework from 2027.
- d) **Lifelong Learning Entitlement (LLE):** There were still questions around the technical specifications of the LLE, which would present major opportunities in modular study, credit transfer, and new partnerships. For the first time, funding in higher education would be aligned with the OU's model of education.
- e) **Access and Participation Plann (APP):** The new 2025/26–2028/29 APP had started with several priority cohorts to make further progress on, including Black students, those with mental health difficulties, and students from the most deprived areas.
- f) **REF 2029:** Research England had paused criteria-setting for three months, with final guidance due in December 2025. This would not impact preparatory work but could be linked to entry into the REF via development of criteria around research environment. Code of Practice development and Impact and Outputs reviews would continue as planned in winter 2025/26.
- g) **Metrics:** The OfS had published updated continuation, completion, and progression metrics in August 2025, which would be discussed later in the agenda. Overall, continuation and completion remained areas where additional work was needed, particularly given OfS' proposals to reduce the weighting of contextual statements in the next TEF. The 2025 Graduate Outcomes survey was positive and showed broadly stable results, which was a testament to the work being undertaken. The 2025 NSS results showed strong performance across most themes and nations, with strengths in Organisation and Management, and Assessment and Feedback. Areas for focus remained Student Voice and Academic Support.
- h) **Student numbers and recruitment:** Student numbers were roughly on target. The University would need to consider whether the appropriate resource was in place for the incoming mix of students, particularly with more 18-year-olds who may need more work to support and retain them.
- i) **Academic Misconduct:** Whilst the volume of academic conduct cases was in line with last year, there were varying patterns across schools. The volume of cases would continue to be monitored, patterns identified, and a group would be convened to accelerate the actions arising.

- j) **Independent Review:** Guidance for staff and students on freedom of speech and academic freedom, including a revised Code of Practice, Events Policy, and External Speaker Registration process, was in place and working well, with further staff training planned.
- k) **Awards, Grants and Recognition:** Recent successes included:
- i. Diane Butler and Carlton Wood, who were awarded National Teaching Fellowships for outstanding impact on student outcomes.
 - ii. The OU, including PolicyWISE, was awarded £4.9m ESRC funding for research initiatives.
 - iii. Three award shortlist nominations for the THE Awards; Cora Beth for 'Most Innovative Teacher of the Year', the SAGE (Supporting Adolescent Girls' Education) programme in Zimbabwe with the research strand led by Professor Alison Buckler, for International Collaboration of the Year category, and Dr Patrick Murphy and colleagues in STEM for the Widening Participation or Outreach Initiative of the Year.
 - iv. Two WELS Associate Lecturers were recognised in the King's Birthday Honours list: Dr Diane Swift (OBE) for outstanding services to education, and Diane Powle (BEM) for services to nursing and education.

5.3 Senate:

- a) Noted that student registration had recently closed for three days due to technical issues and asked for reassurance that the issue wouldn't be repeated.
- b) Asked whether it was understood whether the LLE would be likely to affect funding for second degrees.

5.4 The Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellor explained that:

- a) An answer to the cause of technical issues would be provided outside of the Senate meeting.
- b) There was not yet a specific answer regarding funding for second degrees, but the OU had highlighted it as an issue. As the LLE was designed to support flexible, lifelong learning that was open to all, it was hoped that it would not be made harder for students to study for second degrees.

For the next agenda item, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor took the Chair.

6 STRATEGIC REFLECTIONS AND AMBITIONS

S-2025-04-02

6.1 The Vice-Chancellor introduced the paper, which set out the key contextual drivers for the new OU strategy and an initial outline of its key components. He explained that:

- a) The process had just started and any revisions arising from Senate would be incorporated before wider engagement with the University, which was taking place until December 2025. Following that engagement, there would be a second iteration of the new Strategy in the New Year. There would be further engagement with Senate before consideration of the final version by Council in July 2026. There would be workshops and sessions across the organisation, led by the Vice-Chancellors Executive, and

separate sessions for Senate if requested. Research was highlighted across the three pillars.

- b) The starting point for the Strategy was that the OU was needed now more than ever. The similarities between the current context and when the founding mission was developed included the need and ambition to widen the access to education, the need to address equity of outcomes and to think differently about new technologies. The Strategy should also continue to focus on advocating for high quality curriculum.
- c) For the first pillar, 'Creating Societal Impact', the proposal was to work with colleges and employers to help take education to where it was needed most. Given that 20% of the UK population had no qualifications, support to succeed via college engagement could significantly increase the potential for completion and success. Our work to expand research and impact was also included under this pillar
- d) The second Pillar, 'Advancing Social Mobility', would build on ongoing work within the University, such as Growth and Working Smarter. The focus of this pillar was how to ensure equity in the outcomes achieved, to understand the ambitions of the students, to then help deliver those ambitions, and to support them post tuition. One of the central strands of this pillar was around student support and community as well as scholarship.
- e) The third pillar, 'Empowering Communities through Partnership and innovation', had both an international and local dimension. The OU was a global organisation but could also have local impact across the Nations and regions by convening schools, employers, and communities to co-create local solutions.
- f) As the Strategy developed, there would be further reflection on the enablers such as people, digital, estates and finance.

6.2 Senate welcomed the ambitious nature of the Strategy and its aims. Senate:

- a) Expressed concern that Artificial Intelligence and data analytics were mentioned in the document as though they were universal solutions and not tools with flaws.
- b) Welcomed the references to the important issues of community and belonging. There was often an assumption that all students were career focused, but many OU students chose to study for personal development, especially disabled students. There must also be awareness of those without digital access.
- c) Asked whether there was a predetermined list of strategically important taught subjects for postgraduate courses and whether the Strategy would be focused internally to pull through from undergraduate to postgraduate, as there had not traditionally been marketing for that pathway.
- d) Questioned whether the OU was currently doing enough to reach people through outreach programmes, such as school fairs, prisons and job centres. The importance of building transferable skills was not always well understood, and it was useful to be able to explain in-person what the OU could provide.
- e) Asked whether the reference to outcomes after students had left was looking to solve social problems that were outside of the capacity of the University.

- f) Questioned whether new curriculum would be developed for the educational partners in pillar three, or whether it would involve offering existing curriculum.
- g) Suggested that one of the pillars should be related to staff, particularly as satisfied staff would deliver good teaching. Numbers of staff had recently reduced, but nothing had been discontinued to cope with this reduction in staffing. Academic staff also needed the time and space to undertake research in order to achieve research excellence. It was also suggested that OU staff should aim to be more representative of the demographics of the student body.
- h) Asked whether more could be done to meet the needs of the 300k students missing from education since the pandemic.
- i) Suggested that there should be reflection on the current strategy to inform the development of new one.
- j) Suggested that the accessibility of the paper must be improved, including the use of acronyms, for all staff to be able to contribute equally to the consultation.

6.3 The Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students):

- a) Noted the concerns around AI and explained that it was one of the reasons the previously mentioned green paper approach was being undertaken. There would need to be a decision as a community on how AI would be utilised. Human-centred ethically utilised AI was the current focus to this discussion and how it would benefit students and staff.
- b) Agreed that there must be an understanding of the future range of students with their different ambitions so that they could all be supported in the most appropriate way. The Strategy would also recognise the importance of building skills such as resilience, critical thinking, digital fluency, entrepreneurship and civic agency.
- c) Explained that there was not a predetermined list of strategically important taught subjects for postgraduate courses. There was further work to do on defining the postgraduate experience to differentiate the work from undergraduate and achieve good student outcomes.
- d) Explained that the OU was the largest centre for secure environment study in the UK. There had also been increased investment into marketing approaches with schools, sixth-forms, teachers and parents in recent years, with some success. A recent online event had attracted over 600 young people. There was always more that could be done, but the return on investment must be balanced. As more school pupils experienced challenges that prevented them living away at university accommodation, it was increasingly important for the OU to answer that need, so the implications for marketing would need to be considered.
- e) Explained that the document aimed to stimulate debate about what the University was seeking to do, not outlining how at this stage.
- f) The initial thinking for how to support students after leaving the University was around building relationships with those students as individuals and what could be offered to them beyond course provision, which might include signposting them to the support already in place (OpenLearn, careers advice etc).

- g) Noted that in terms of partnerships, colleges were able to identify local needs. The OU could then map this need onto OU qualifications and offer a pathway into study with the OU or support local validated solutions.
- h) Explained that the document outlined the academic ambitions of the University. Research was a key part of the University's work, not an add-on.
- i) Noted that it wouldn't be possible to solve the issue of the students missing since the pandemic in isolation but work with employers and the job centres etc might be possible.
- j) Explained that several of the papers later in the meeting would review progress on the current strategy. There would be a number of metrics to carry forward as measures to track how the new Strategy was delivered.
- k) Invited members to feed in any suggestions on ways to improve the paper. There would be other methods for staff to engage and be included in the consultation.

6.4 The Vice-Chancellor reflected that at this stage, with minor revisions it could go forward for wider consultation. Any further comments on the wording could be sent to the Interim Director of Strategy. Another Senate session would also be arranged to review an updated draft. The aim was that by the end of the consultation period a Strategy had been developed that was owned collectively by the organisation.

7 EQUITABLE OUTCOMES UPDATE

S-2025-04-04

- 7.1 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students) introduced the paper, which provided an update on the work of the Equitable Outcomes Portfolio. He noted that the Office for Students' (OfS) had clear measures for both outcomes and equity, through their Condition B3 'Student Outcomes'. He explained that there had been a dip in pass rates at the OU, which was not to say that the work undertaken on pass rates had not been effective but that there would be a delay in seeing results, so the existing work must continue. Alongside those efforts, the Access and Participation Plan (APP) work continued to remove barriers for different cohorts, which should have a universal impact to drive success for all students.
- 7.2 The Assistant Director (PVCS) and the Assistant Director (Access, Participation and Success) from the Office of the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Students), presented additional data on the B3 measures and the overarching quality landscape. The following points were highlighted from the data:
- a) Being below the performance thresholds for each metric set by the OfS could leave the University at risk of an OfS assessment but also undermined our mission to provide educational opportunity.
 - b) The rate of attrition varied for students with different characteristics. Students discontinued at each stage of the module journey at a greater rate if in one of the APP priority groups (those residing in IMDQ1, those with a mental health difficulty and Black students). The data also demonstrated that inequity was compounded if a student belonged to more than one of the marginalised groups.
 - c) The point in the student journey with highest risk of losing students appeared to be the first and second year of study with significant attrition linked to TMA01. The key areas to

focus on were the first year of study, the link between year 1 and 2 and the link between year 2 and 3.

- d) Whilst those studying for first degrees were the largest population at the OU, the OfS was also concerned with the performance data for other undergraduates and postgraduates. Students in the 'Other UG' population were a significant risk area, despite no substantial differences in student characteristics to their 'UG first degree' peers, so further work was needed to understand the reasons behind this.
- e) Charts showing the relative sizes of the APP priority groups and the intersections of these groups demonstrated that continuation rates were lower for those in the priority areas, and that belonging to more than one group had a compounding impact. If performance could be improved for these priority groups, it would make a big difference to the overall performance of the University. It was asked whether the ambitions for those students were high enough and whether the aim should be higher than currently identified in the APP.

7.3 To improve performance, areas had been identified where changes in approach could help to achieve equitable outcomes (policies, systems and data, people and culture, content and communications, technology and AI). The Service Design Team had also developed eleven systemic conditions that shaped student outcomes and equity gaps across the student life cycle.

7.4 It was noted that the institutional strategy and associated plans outlining the commitment to address inequity would not be enough if those mandated plans were not understood, resourced and implemented. There would need to be an associated organisational culture shift with an understanding that it was important to embed equity into all University initiatives, such as the Academic Growth Priorities. The systems changes required covered all aspects of student experience.

7.5 Senate:

- a) Asked whether there was sufficient understanding of the barriers and student needs from the data.
- b) Noted that for support and design, there was a wealth of knowledge around what had been tried and what the impact had been, but information management was not as efficient or effective as it could be so that knowledge was not always shared.
- c) Expressed that it would be useful to understand from the point of students' first registration their prior experience and ambitions, so that it would be possible to communicate to the OfS the percentage of students that started with the intention to achieve a degree. With that improved understanding, the appropriate focus and resources could also be directed.
- d) Noted that the disability profile could be a useful tool in outlining the support needs of students, but there should be resource attached to those additional needs and reasonable adjustments, as there was currently no flexibility around group size or time allocation built in.

- e) Suggested that more effective sharing of information would enable Associate Lecturers to better support students. There was also no system in place for tutors to pass on information about support needs to future tutors, beyond the disability profile.
- f) Noted that the largest gap in progression was for those with mental health issues. It was important to support those students to develop the motivation, clarity about goals, and individual confidence throughout their student experience journey.
- g) Suggested that there was a gap between the characteristics of students and staff at the OU in terms of diversity. It would be helpful to design support structures that reflected the student body. It was also suggested that grouping students with similar needs would be beneficial.
- h) Suggested that there needed to be institution wide systemic change rather than pilot exercises, with an understanding of which of the current systems were supportive to these aims and which were barriers. Members gave examples of where University systems could cause challenges in internal processes such as curriculum design and student processes, such as registration and assessment.
- i) Noted that one of the barriers for students had been due to the need for further investment in Digital services.
- j) Highlighted the 'Understanding Me as a Learner' tool, developed and piloted in WELS as part of the work on the Learning and Assessment priority. The tool was design to focus on the personal aspect of the student, with the aim of improving the personalised learning experience.

7.6 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students) explained that:

- a) There were a number of opportunities for structural and systemic change, such as the study calendar work as part of Academic Growth Priorities. The changes would need to be big and institution wide. Colleagues had a lot of knowledge on the different areas, which would need to be brought together coherently in one place.
- b) The Academic Growth Priorities work also included consideration of how to support the staff working with students to understand their needs. There were examples of system design that would support the processes to be more personalised to the students, and this work was continuing to evolve.
- c) The Chief Digital and Information Officer was working on improvements to the current OU systems in place, as well as new technology.
- d) As the demographics of students changed, there would need to be a better understanding of how best to support them, starting with the students' engagement with the University early in the learner journey.

7.7 The Vice-Chancellor summarised the discussion, noting that Senate was supportive of the ongoing work on equitable outcomes and recognised that systemic changes would need to be made. The areas highlighted included:

- a) Recognising students as individuals and sharing information across the University.
- b) The accessibility of systems and how well they supported students with different needs.
- c) The approach to curriculum design and assessment.

- d) Diversity of culture and belonging, including how to address those needs and whether policies should be reviewed to ensure they reflect the diverse body of students.
- e) Reviewing learning systems to ensure there was a balance between local flexibility and institutional frameworks.

7.8 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students) welcomed the useful feedback, citing the discussion as an example of the value in using Senate to identify important opportunities and ideas. An update outlining a workplan around the system mased approach would be brought forward in the New Year

8 ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2024-25 **S-2025-04-03**

8.1 Senate:

- a) Raised a question around metrics relating to the sustainability of AI from an environmental perspective (use of water, electricity etc).
- b) Suggested that the rating level of some of the elements of institutional change should be higher. There had been instances of organisational change where interconnections had not come to light until after the changes had been made. There were also issues around the impact on academic staff following the reduction of academic-related staff.

8.2 The Vice-Chancellor noted that the point regarding sustainability would be considered. The rating level of the metrics would be reviewed through Council.

9 2024/25 SELF-EVALUATION AND ACTION PLAN **S-2025-04-05**

- 9.1 Senate **approved** the Self-Evaluation report and Action Plan with further accompanying appendices for submission to the Council and the SFC.
- 9.2 Senate **noted** that the version submitted to Council should be shorter and that the edits would be approved by Chair's action.

10 UPDATE FROM FACULTY - FBL **S-2025-04-06**

Due to time constraints, the update from the Faculty of Business and Law was postponed to a separate session on 3 November 2026.

11 ACADEMIC GROWTH PRIORITIES UPDATE **S-2025-04-16**

A student member of Senate suggested that the references to AI within the paper related to defensive strategies and that it would be good to embrace technological advances and be leaders in the space, whilst still understanding the current issues associated with using AI such as discriminatory biases. The Vice-Chancellor agreed with the sentiment and invited the member to provide a student view into the development of the green paper.

12 EMERITUS PROFESSORS **S-2025-04-07**

Senate **approved** the recommendation from Chairs Committee that the award of the title Emeritus Professor be awarded to Professor Nacho Romero from the Faculty of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM).

13 ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW OF ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE **S-2025-04-08**

- 13.1 A question was raised around why the protected characteristics discussed within the Annual Effectiveness Reviews was limited to gender and ethnicity. It was also asked why the categories for gender were male or female only. A response would be sought from the Workforce Data Team. **Action:** Governance Team
- 13.2 Senate **approved** the assurance statement on the effectiveness of the University's academic governance arrangements in 2024/25, to be reported to Council in November 2025.
- 14 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE REPORT S-2025-04-09**
- Senate **noted** a report from the meetings of Strategic Planning and Resources Committee held on 19 June 2025 and 18 September 2025.
- 15 ACADEMIC QUALITY AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT S-2025-04-10**
- Senate **noted** a report from the main items of business discussed at the meetings of Academic Quality and Governance Committee held on 1 July and 9 September 2025.
- 16 RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT S-2025-04-11**
- Senate **noted** a report from the meeting of the Research Committee held on 9 July 2025.
- 17 EDI COMMITTEE REPORT S-2025-04-12**
- Senate **noted** a report from the meeting of the EDI Committee held on 25 June 2025.
- 18 STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT S-2025-04-13**
- Senate **noted** an Annual Report of Student Experience Committee.
- 19 CURRICULUM PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE – ANNUAL REPORT S-2025-04-14**
- Senate **noted** an Annual Report of Curriculum Partnerships Committee.
- 20 QUALIFICATIONS AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE – ANNUAL REPORT S-2025-04-15**
- Senate **noted** an Annual Report of Qualifications and Assessment Committee.
- 21 COUNCIL REPORT S-2025-04-17**
- Senate **noted** a report of the last meeting of Council held on 8 July 2025.
- 22 SENATE FORWARD PLANNER S-2025-04-18**
- Senate **noted** a report on the future business being presented to the Senate.
- 23 ACTION BY THE CHAIR S-2025-04-19**
- Senate **noted** a report on Chair's actions taken since the last meeting held on 18 June 2025.

Future Meeting Dates
Wednesday 28 January 2026
Wednesday 25 March 2026

Wednesday 17 June 2026

Becky Sexton
becky.sexton@open.ac.uk