



SENATE MINUTES

This paper presents the minutes of the last meeting of Senate held on 18 June 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 Josie Fraser	Interim Vice-Chancellor
Professor Ian Pickup	Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Dr Rachel Penny	Acting Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students)
Professor Kevin Shakesheff	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation)
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
Gary Elliott-Cirigottis	Director of Library Services
Jo Dyer	Director of Learner and Discovery Services

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS)

Professor Eleni Andreouli	Dr Richard Marsden	Dr Emma Barker
Dr Zoe Doye	Professor Lisa Lazard	Dr Lystra Hagley-Dickinson
Dr Martin Clarke	Dr Sinead McEneaney	Professor William Brown
Professor Rosalind Crone	Tony Murphy	

Faculty of Business and Law (FBL)

Carol Howells	Ash Odedra	Claire Maguire
---------------	------------	----------------

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

Professor Richard Holliman	Dr Christopher Douce	Professor Sally Jordan
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		

Faculty of Wellbeing, Education and Language Studies (WELS)

Mel Green	Bärbel Brash	Dr Renu Bhandari
Dr Judy Chandler	Dr Gillian Ferguson	Dr Hannah Marston
Dr Kerry Jones	Dr Mark Addis	Dr Naomi Watson

Steph Doehler	Paulette Johnson	
Institute of Education Technology (WELS)		
Professor Eileen Scanlon	Dr Tim Coughlan	
Associate Lecturers		
James Hutchinson	Rocky Grove	Dr Kate Hammond
Mike Hay	Rob Parker	Tony Cox
Dr Vince Mitchell		
Students appointed by Open University Students Association		
Natalie Baker	Nichola Connolly	Andrew Kolapo
Cinnomen McGuigan	Morgan Scofield-Marlowe	Samantha Osys
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	
Co-opted members		
Martin Boyle	Lorraine Jones	Professor Devendra Kodwani
John D'Arcy	Ben Lewis	
In Attendance		
Anna Barber, Director - Academic	Dr Camilla Briault, Director – GCLS	Paul Traynor – Chief Financial Officer
Christian Cull – Deputy Director of Communications	Sharon O'Kelly – Executive Business Manager, VCO	Maria Kantirou – Head of Academic Strategy and Planning
Dr Laura Chambers – Head of Governance	Rachel Garnham (Student Charter)	Christine Mera (GWS)
Tyrrell Golding (GWS)		
Apologies		
Professor Denise Whitelock	Professor Mark Durkin	Professor Olga Jurasz
Dr Rachel Slater	Dr Kambiz Saber-Sheikh	Professor Diane Butler
Dr Thomas Martin	Jo Strang	Paul Farrington
Professor Caroline Clarke	Professor Adrienne Scullion	Professor Jon Pike
Kit Power	Paris Graham	Dr Maria Aristeidou

1 MINUTES

S-2025-01-M

Senate **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 2 April 2025, subject to the amendment of paragraph 7.5 d) from 'Noted that, in the past, information for students had been edited for marketing purposes, which could not be changed for months' to 'Noted that, information for students had been edited for marketing purposes, sometimes in the process introducing errors, which could not then be corrected for months'.

2 REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

2.1 The Interim Vice-Chancellor welcomed members to the meeting and updated Senate on several areas, including:

- a) **KMi:** A Review Group had been convened to recommend models for the future structure, functions, finances and reporting arrangements of KMi from the start of the

academic year 2025/26. The Review group included representatives from KMi, STEM, LDS and People Services, Chaired by the Executive Dean of FASS, and aimed to make its recommendations in a timely fashion.

- b) **Student Numbers, Budgets, Financial performance:** Recruitment for 25J had progressed well, with a promising rise in conversion from reservation to registration. However, the intake forecast for 25J was the lowest in over eight years, so the planned savings in 2025/26 would still be needed. Thanks to disciplined management, the current forecast showed a £5.7 million deficit, with further work to narrow that in quarter four. The Return to Surplus programme remained firmly on track to deliver around £100 million in recurrent financial improvement by 2025/26. An additional 3% cost saving had been introduced across each of the next two years.
- c) **TAR :** The Tuition and Assessment Reform (TAR) work had overachieved the stretch target and realised savings of over £24m.
- d) **Growth and Working Smarter:** Delivery was now underway for Growth and Working Smarter (GWS). Early resource requirements had been discussed with the Planning Coordination Group (PCG) and existing budgets were beginning to be reallocated to develop tools that to support curriculum changes, study pace innovation, and the wider working smarter ambitions. A communications plan and new intranet hub had launched as the shaping and delivery moved to the wider University.
- e) **Curriculum:** The new Curriculum Strategy Group had fast-tracked its triage process and was building a prioritisation framework with key decisions expected by July, ahead of schedule.
- f) **Artificial Intelligence (AI):** The University continued to look closely at the role of AI and the impact on teaching, research, and the functioning of the University more broadly, using a purposeful and inclusive approach which was grounded in the OU's values. A dedicated Senate workshop on AI was planned for early September.
- g) **Voluntary Severance:** The Open Voluntary Severance scheme had launched on 24 February 2025 and would close on 31 December 2025. By 6 of June 2025, 479 applications (322.94 FTE) had been received, resulting in 337 offers being made with an FTE value of 234.93.
- h) **Independent Review and Freedom of Speech:** Work to implement Nicola Dandridge's independent review recommendations continued, with an updated action plan and impact metrics due to be reviewed by Council in July. On 26 June, new webpages on Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom would go live ahead of legislation coming into force in August, including the Code of Practice, supporting guidance, case studies, and policies. The Events Policy, approved by Council in May, would be published shortly. A new OU Code of Conduct was being finalised to unify 11 people-related policies and clarify behavioural expectations, including freedom of expression and respect. The complaints processes had been simplified, online guidance improved, and post-exit procedures reviewed, to reduce tribunal risks. A refreshed approach to management development was being piloted, focusing on core skills like conflict resolution, performance management, and inclusive recruitment, and a new model for addressing conflict within academic disciplines was also being introduced.
- i) **Awards, Grants, Recognition and Events:** Recent successes included:

- i. Professor Mahesh Anand became the first UK scientist to receive lunar samples from China's Chang'e-5 mission, now housed on the OU campus.
 - ii. In STEM, the Living Roof Lab was turning a rooftop of the MK campus into a vibrant hub for green research, while the partnership with Medical Detection Dogs continued to push the boundaries of cancer detection.
 - iii. In FASS, a £1.2m grant from the Templeton Foundation was supporting pioneering work on digital religiosity and wellbeing, and OpenARC marked a milestone with its first research festival in May.
 - iv. In WELS, OU student nurse Fay Dudson won a Student Nursing Times Award and Professor Kwame Akyeampong was appointed to the prestigious Yidan Prize Advisory Committee.
 - v. In FBL, £120k had been secured to fund a Research Fellow working with the Centre for Policing Research & Learning (CPRL).
 - vi. The OU had come 3rd in the Uni Compare rankings for employability and was placed 6th for course quality.
- j) **Chancellor:** A Joint Committee of Council and Senate had been formed to oversee the appointment of the OU's next Chancellor. Following a University-wide consultation for nominations, an appointment was expected to take place after the summer, with the new Chancellor hopefully starting by the end of the calendar year.
- k) **Senate members:** Several members who would be leaving Senate at the end of the academic year were thanked for their time and commitment to Senate. Magnus Ramage was congratulated on his recent election as the Senate member of Council.

2.2 Senate raised a number of issues regarding generative AI and exams, noting that:

- a) Problems within the current exam process caused by AI had now become evident and urgent action was needed. Senate noted examples where paid and free AI had been unable to answer exam questions designed in November but could now answer them perfectly.
- b) Other Universities were returning to in-person exams.
- c) The challenge of the situation had increased pressures on staff. To write an exam that was ChatGPT proof would take a significant amount of staff time, and they needed to be able to act quickly.
- d) Where students were able to cheat on exams, there was a risk of losing credibility, which would take years to regain.

2.3 It was suggested that there should be a clear solution from VCE. It was also suggested that before the Senate session in September, every module team should be brought in for a fact-finding opportunity.

2.4 The Interim Vice-Chancellor explained that:

- a) The GEN AI team were taking the situation very seriously and working hard on solutions, but the situation was moving very fast. It was a journey that the whole sector was on and there were no easy answers. The scale of the challenge needed to be understood, and resources considered. There was unlikely to be one solution across the board; it must be considered locally by teams, and would be where the OU's teaching

innovation would be utilised. VCE would then think about the overarching issues, such as resourcing or changing policies where they may be preventing timely action.

- b) In-person exams would be harder for the OU to implement than for other universities and could also make awarding gaps worse for the large number of students with disabilities. Creative thinking would be needed on how to undertake assessments that would not discriminate against disabled students.
- c) There were already levers in place for atypical exam results, and teams should be encouraged to use those resources. More checks and balances may be needed.
- d) The OU was not unique in these challenges and the credibility across the sector was at risk.

- 2.5 A question was raised around the timetable for the models for the future structure of KMi, as Senate would not be able to discuss any proposals before they were implemented at the start of the academic year. At the April meeting, the motion was agreed that 'decision-making on the formation, closure or restructuring of schools, institutes or other academic subunits within faculties, including KMi, should involve a thorough case that is reviewed by Senate. Following review by Senate, decisions will be made by the appropriate authority, which could be Senate, Council or the Vice-Chancellor.'
- 2.6 The Interim Vice-Chancellor explained that nothing from the review outcomes that was within the purview of Senate, would be enacted until after being reviewed by Senate.

3 UPDATE FROM FACULTY - WELS

S-2025-02-01

The Executive Dean, WELS, presented an update to Senate, highlighting the challenges addressed by the work of FBL, the impact the Faculty was making (particularly in training the public sector workforce, influencing policy, practice and public debate, and wide-reaching, diverse and flexible provision) and how the Faculty approached its work (collaboration and co-creation by design, valuing everybody's contribution to success and being a leading force for equality, diversity and inclusion).

4 PROGRESS WITH UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES TO DELIVER GROWTH AND WORKING SMARTER

S-2025-03-02

- 4.1 The Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor introduced the paper to update Senate members on overall progress and to provide the opportunity for a more in-depth discussion about the work on study pace and learning and assessment. He highlighted that the work on study calendar and study pace was an opportunity to bring greater impact for students and that student experience was the connecting factor running through all the areas of the work.
- 4.2 Senate discussed the two possible models of a new OU study calendar. Senate:
- a) Asked for reassurance that the registration process was being considered in parallel with the two models, especially as Model 1 could have the potential of increasing the re-registration points which could increase the risk of attrition with the current registration model.
 - b) Expressed that the suggested models could be problematic for many students, who may already struggle to complete even 30 credits at the current pace. It was suggested that it

would be interesting to know if personal tutors would help students with compressed study and complex agendas.

- c) Requested clarification on how the University would ensure that accessibility, including the needs of disabled, neurodivergent, and chronically ill students, would be fully considered and integrated into the development and implementation of a new study pace model. It was particularly important to consider resilience to life events and the ability to catch up after time off. A shorter duration may make it more difficult for students to catch up, which could result in more deferrals.
- d) Noted that the shorter duration would also impose a very significant additional burden on module teams and asked whether costs and timescales had been considered.
- e) Suggested that there should be consultation with Module Chairs and Staff Tutors on the models to look at the detail and sense check them, before any decisions were made.
- f) Asked how the aim to 'simplify processes for staff and students' aligned with other work taking place on tuition strategies, and whether the review of tuition strategies would include a wider review of tutor workload, TMA submission rates, and whether the proposed Tutor Student Ratio (TSR) for tutor groups of mostly 20 would be practically applied as an average or a minimum.
- g) Asked whether consideration had been given to how assessment strategies would work for the 60 credits in one term as opposed to 60 credits in two terms. It was noted that the OU had more assessments within modules compared to other universities, as they were used as teaching opportunities. It would be important to ensure that students on both presentations would receive an equivalent experience as far as possible.

4.3 The Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Acting Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students) and Academic Leads for the Study Pace and Curriculum priorities explained that:

- a) The diagram included in the paper was to aid discussion, but the exact method was yet to be discussed. The use of different start dates would be considered, looking at areas such as alignment and financing. These options had not been presented in the diagram as neither model precluded different start dates.
- b) Feedback had suggested that 30 credit modules did not currently equate to half of 60 credit modules, so the issues around students struggling with the pace of current 30 credit modules could be addressed in future by adjusting 30 credit modules. There was also a pilot taking place regarding personal tutors.
- c) The study pace work was still at the feedback stage and a meeting was scheduled with OpenSU to gather views from students with disabilities. As well as looking at workload issues, there would also be consideration of the support structures in place within the study pace work, but also other areas. If a student decided to study full-time and then was impacted by life events, it would be essential to look at ways to support them. These challenges were areas being explored by the team, but any examples would be useful to feed in.
- d) All of the factors and complexities around cost and time were being considered. There was representation from faculties, units and Finance in the discussions to receive their input and challenge.

- e) Endorsement from staff was vital and there had been engagement with colleagues vertically and horizontally, including attendance at faculty and team meetings. Various meetings were booked in around the modules and others would be welcomed. Meetings with Staff Tutors would be scheduled for after the EMA assessment period, and engagement with Associate Lecturers was ongoing.
- f) There was a lot of work in progress on tuition strategies and tutor workload which would continue. There had not yet been any modelling or proposed changes, but the issues were being worked through and taken very seriously.
- g) The question of how assessment strategies would work across the different presentations was being explored and feedback from colleagues was welcomed. The challenges already existed and were being worked on, so the models were a good way of exploring the solutions and achieving the balance needed.

4.4 Regarding the work on the Learning and Assessment priority, Senate:

- a) Suggested that academic misconduct was not just related to students developing a confident understanding of academic integrity, and that more should be planned to prevent deliberate academic misconduct.
- b) Noted a concern around the idea that assessment should reflect "real world skills" and suggested that assessments should be appropriate for the subject being studied and the skills relevant to that subject.

4.5 It was explained that the approach of 'real world skills' would be about relevant skills, and would not reflect one particular type of assessment. A wider variety of assessment types was needed and that should include real-world use.

4.6 On Curriculum, Senate:

- a) Expressed concerns that creating curriculum faster may see corners being cut, which would have an impact on quality and student experience.
- b) Requested further information on the students being lost through the Credit Transfer experience.

4.7 The Interim Vice-Chancellor explained that:

- a) The Curriculum Strategy Group was investigating options before moving forward. The main objectives of the work did include faster curriculum ideation, production and refresh, but also operational efficiencies and improved student experience as well.
- c) The OU was more successful at credit transfer than other universities, but there was a lot of room for improvement, which is why it was included in the priorities. The scoping and trialling of initiatives had already begun with the aim of continuous improvement.

4.8 Senate discussed the overall approach for the GWS work and asked:

- a) For clarification and assurance on the oversight and co-ordination of the work. GWS was a set of major changes, but it was not set-up as a large change project with a dedicated group to provide oversight and challenge. There would be a huge number of changes in a short period and all the moving parts of the work would need co-ordination.

- b) How the University would ensure that student voices were meaningfully included and consulted at every stage as decision making processes were streamlined. It was suggested that students should be involved in discussions early in process when the direction was being set, not just consulted at later stages.

4.9 The Interim Vice-Chancellor and Acting Pro-Vice-Chancellor explained that:

- a) VCE and the Senior Team were providing the oversight for the GWS work. There was an integrated structure and resource plan in place. The appropriate leaders were involved, they had received monthly reports, and provided the challenge required. The work was designed to be a set of activities in the areas that would most effectively support the current students and help to recruit new students. The work involved leveraging existing groups working in those specific areas and putting leads in place.
- b) Input from students was vital and a lot of the priorities identified had come from the work with students. There had been engagement with the Student Curriculum Panel (around 14 thousand members), which had enabled the team to look at feedback and characteristics as well. There had also been examples of co-design. It was acknowledged that it was essential to receive input and challenge from students throughout the process.

5 ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW REPORT

S-2025-03-03

5.1 Senate noted a report on the annual effectiveness of Senate. The report had been light-touch, with no proposals to change Senate's terms of reference due to the review of the University's Charter and Statutes that was due to commence, which would involve consideration of the responsibilities of Council and Senate (S-2025-03-04 Review of the Charter and Statutes).

5.2 Senate:

- a) Discussed whether figures relating to disability should be included in the report. It was explained that disability was considered in the overall report of the diversity of governance committee members, but that it would be considered next year for the Annual Effectiveness Review Reports.
- b) Suggested that accessibility of papers should be considered in the report.
- c) Noted the importance of induction for student members. As the recruitment of student members was outside of the biennial election schedule, the Governance Team would work with OpenSU on the induction program for those members.

6 RECOMMENDATION FOR DISSOLVING OF MODULE AND QUALIFICATIONS RESULTS APPROVAL CLASSIFICATION PANEL (MRAQCP)

S-2025-03-04

6.1 The Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor introduced the paper outlining a proposal for disbanding the Module Results Approval and Qualifications Classification Panel (MRAQCP). He explained that the rationale was to reduce duplication, as the Panel's functions overlapped with other scrutiny groups, including Module Result Panels (MRPs), Cluster Examination and Assessment Boards (CEABs), Faculty Academic Committees for Learning, Teaching and Assessment (ACLTA's), the Equitable Outcomes Board (EOB) and the Qualifications and Assessment Committee (QAC).

- 6.2 The Module Results Approval and Qualifications Classification Panel acted on behalf of the Senate to approve the award and classification and conferment of validated degree provisions. This would remain a centralised task to be coordinated between Open University Validation Partnerships (OUVP), Academic Services and Faculties.
- 6.3 It was noted that the proposal had been considered by the Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor and by Academic Quality and Governance Committee.
- 6.4 Senate:
- a) Asked whether there had been any evaluation of whether the University's lack of qualification-level review had an impact on student outcomes compared to other HEIs.
 - b) Asked how the increased workload of the Chairs of Boards of Studies would be addressed.
 - c) Requested details on how important insights and dissemination of good practice across the University would be managed effectively.
 - d) Suggested that allowing final decisions to sit with Cluster Boards could mean there would be no check on "group think" within a School. To demonstrate whether MRAQCP was a valuable part of the checks and balances, it was asked how many occasions in the last five years MRAQCP had requested a review of the draft module results.
 - e) Raised a concern about the practicality of requiring CEAB Chairs to be from outside the School, as the detailed knowledge of the modules involved would not readily be acquired by someone in that position.
 - f) Asked whether consideration had been given to the potential impact on the committees expected to take on the additional work and whether they would be given the necessary support and resources to manage it effectively.
- 6.5 The Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor explained that:
- a) Qualification-level review was included in the road map for Growth and Working Smarter, as taking a qualification-level view may help improve student outcomes. MRAQCP, which operated at module level, did not undertake that function as this was the remit of the EOB, which considered continuation rates as measured externally by the OfS at an institutional, subject and qualification level. Qualification-level review was also covered as part of Quality Monitoring and Enhancement.
 - b) There would be a small additional increase for Chairs of Boards of Studies, with preparation for, and attendance at one additional meeting. This had been kept to a minimum, whilst maintaining peer scrutiny in the awarding and ratification process.
 - c) The assurance of academic standards and promotion of enhancement was already a responsibility of ACLTAs. The EOB, having institutional oversight of student outcomes data, would provide a scrutiny function on behalf of VCE and would work with ACLTAs to support the governance of results outcome data. Insights and good practice would continue to form part of Quality Monitoring and Enhancement processes.
 - d) There would still be scrutiny at faculty level, so there was no danger of "group think" within a School. From 2020 to 2025, there had only been three instances of non-

ratification on the day. One related to a request for clarification of an action taken, whilst the other two were related to delays in External Examiner sign-off. In all three cases the correct processes had been followed and results were released as recommended by the CEABs.

- e) It was important for there to be impartial scrutiny within CEABs from outside of the School, but it was agreed that the proposal be amended to say that the person could either Chair or be a member.
- f) There should not be additional work for committees as the responsibilities outlined were already covered in their existing Terms of Reference, but any potential impact on these committees would be investigated further. There should also be no additional workload in relation to approving results, as the responsibilities were covered in the existing awarding and ratification processes/meetings.

6.6 Senate **approved** the recommendation to dissolve MRAQCP.

7 REVIEW OF THE CHARTER AND STATUTES

S-2025-03-05

7.1 The University Secretary introduced the paper, which outlined the rationale and process for reviewing the University's governance framework including the Charter and Statutes and continuing discussions with UCU on the Procedural Agreement.

7.2 Senate:

- a) Asked whether revisions would ensure sufficient representation on Senate of Associate Lecturers as the main group of academic student-facing staff.
- b) Noted that previous joint work on the agreement that had taken place in 2021, with the support of an ACAS facilitator, had been discontinued due to lack of resource. Assurance was requested that there would be sufficient resource to undertake this work.
- c) Asked how the Working Group had been constituted.
- d) Requested clarification on the timing of the review.
- e) Asked how, with frequent legislative changes in employment law, the documents would be kept relevant.
- f) Highlighted the work undertaken on the Charter and Statutes in 2018 and asked to what extent it was the starting point for the current review.
- g) Noted that the review of Statute 21 would bring the University in line with the wider sector.
- h) Noted that it was crucial that students remained actively involved in decision-making processes, not just consulted after decisions had been made.

7.3 The University Secretary explained that:

- a) For membership of Senate, the review would consider the appropriate representation of different categories of staff.

- b) The work to review the Procedural Agreement would be sufficiently resourced, and any previous progress that was achieved in 2021 would be utilised.
- c) The Senate members on the Working Group had been selected due to their relevant expertise, but there would also be extensive consultation with, and feedback to, Senate.
- d) There were several reasons why it was an appropriate time to review of the Charter and Statutes. The delay in modernising the Charter and Statutes had meant the documents contained provisions which not only hindered the University's ability to operate in practice but were contrary to employment legislation. Externally, there was an increase in the scrutiny on university governance, and recent regulatory intervention had drawn attention to the importance of decision making at the appropriate levels. The review would also align with other initiatives taking place, such as GWS and the review of Academic Governance commissioned by VCE Academic, which was looking at appropriate governance approval routes and decision-making.
- e) The intention was to amend Statute 21 to future proof the University against any further legislative changes in employment law, but to also move it into the Ordinances so that any updates required in the future would not require approval from the Privy Council.
- f) It was important to understand the work that had been undertaken on the Charter and Statutes in 2018, but there was a new approach to this review and lawyers would be re-reviewing the Charter and Statutes with the current context. It was agreed that paper considered by Senate in 2018 would be circulated to Senate for information.

Action: Governance Team

7.4 Senate **noted** the proposed review of the University's governance framework.

8 STUDENT CHARTER REVIEW

S-2025-03-06

- 8.1 The OpenSU President and Acting Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students) introduced the new Student Charter, noting that it had been a staff and student collaboration. Discussion had taken place regarding whether 'Student Charter' was the most appropriate name, but in order to maintain continuity this had not been changed.
- 8.2 Senate noted that point 13 of the Charter had been changed to 'We support our commitments to the Welsh language' as a way of simplifying the wording, whilst retaining the key point around Welsh language and bringing it in line with the rest of the document.
- 8.3 Senate **approved** the new Student Charter.

9 EMERITUS PROFESSORS

S-2025-03-07

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

10 HONORARY DEGREES 2025

S-2025-03-08

Senate:

- i) **Noted** the schedule for the conferment of Honorary Degrees at ceremonies during 2025.

ii) **Approved** the list of nominations recommended by the Honorary Degrees Committee.

11 EXTENSION OF THE EMPLOYABILITY STRATEGY S-2025-03-09

Senate **approved** the recommendation from Student Experience Committee that the current Student Employability Strategy be extended to the end of the 2026/27 academic year.

12 ACADEMIC QUALITY AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT S-2025-03-10

Senate **noted** a report from the meeting of Academic Quality and Governance Committee held on 20 May 2025.

13 FINANCE UPDATE S-2025-03-11

13.1 It was asked whether the University had considered the financial implications for students over 60 who may be unable to access study opportunities under the Lifelong Learning Entitlement (LLE). The Interim Vice-Chancellor explained that the University was still waiting for guidance on LLE but would ensure there were supportive funding routes available.

13.2 Senate **noted** the report.

14 COUNCIL REPORT S-2025-03-12

Senate **noted** a report of the last meeting of Council held on 13 May 2025.

15 SENATE FORWARD PLANNER S-2025-03-13

Senate **noted** a report on the future business being presented to the Senate.

16 ACTION BY THE CHAIR S-2025-02-18

Senate **noted** a report on Chair's actions taken since the last meeting held on 2 April 2025.

17 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

It was suggested that if there were agenda items reporting from the Senate sub-committees, these could be presented by the Senate representatives from those committees.

Future Meeting Dates
Wednesday 8 October 2025
Wednesday 28 January 2026
Wednesday 25 March 2026
Wednesday 17 June 2026

Becky Sexton
becky.sexton@open.ac.uk