

## MEETING OF THE SENATE

20 JANUARY 2016

**Present:** The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Birch and Professor Brown, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Badcock, Professor Beveridge and Professor Burgoyne, Professors Barr, Balogun and Begon, Dr J Bridge, Professors Chalker, Clegg and Cunliffe, Mrs E Eades, Professor Edwards, Dr S Edwardson, Professors Elliott, Elsheikh, Foxhall, Gabbay and Garde, Dr L Harkness-Brennan, Professors Harris and Hollander, Dr R Huzzey, Dr S Jones, Professor Jones, Dr P Leftwick, Professors MacEwan, Marshall and McGrath, Dr E Michalopoulou, Professors Morris, O'Sullivan, Plater, Ralph, Rempe-Gillen, Richardson, Richter, Robinson and Touramanis, Dr R Urbano Gutierrez, Professors Walley, Whitehead and Youngson.

The President, Deputy President and Vice-Presidents of the Liverpool Guild of Students and the student representative from the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences were present as representatives of the student body.

**In attendance:** The Director of Human Resources, the Head of Strategic Planning, the Head of Corporate Governance and Support and the Governance Co-ordinator.

**Apologies for absence** were received from 12 members of the Senate.

**1. WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS**

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the following new members of the Senate:

Professor Julia Balogun  
Professor Dominic Elliott  
Professor Douglas Mair  
Professor Tom Walley

**2. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST****2.1 Disclosure of Interest**

Members of the Senate were asked to declare any interest that could give rise to conflict in relation to any item on the agenda. No such interests were declared.

**3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The unreserved minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 4 November 2015 were taken as read and agreed.

**4. LIVERPOOL MEDICAL STUDENTS' SOCIETY (LMSS)**

The Vice-Chancellor reported that:

- a) There had been publicity in the national press regarding the decision of the University and the Guild to de-ratify LMSS.
- b) There had been expected reactions from students, LMSS, graduates and the press to this. However, the University remained confident that the decision to de-ratify the LMSS was appropriate under the circumstances on legal and ethical grounds.
- c) The University was responding to enquiries from the press, students, graduates and members of the public and was seeking ways to inform key stakeholders of the facts of the investigation and the consequent decisions, and to dispel misinformation being circulated by LMSS.
- d) The Guild was responding to a petition requesting a no confidence vote in the Guild President and it was expected that a referendum would be held.
- e) The Medical School was establishing transition arrangements, in consultation with the Guild and their students, to set up a new student medical society and to ensure continuity of welfare and academic support for students.

## 5. HONOURS AND APPOINTMENTS

The Vice-Chancellor reported that:

- a) Professor Dan Faulkner, from the Department of Earth, Ocean and Ecological Sciences, had been awarded a Royal Society Leverhulme Trust Senior Research Fellowship to further his research into the mechanics of earthquakes.
- b) Professor Charles Forsdick, from the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures, had been awarded an Arts and Humanities Research Council Leadership Fellowship in 'Translating Cultures'.
- c) Professor Peter Myers, from the Department of Chemistry, had been awarded the prestigious Martin Medal 2016 by the Chromatographic Society in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the advancement of separation science.
- d) Professor John Neoptolemos, from the Institute of Translational Medicine, had been appointed as the Clinical Chair of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence Committee for Pancreatic Cancer.
- e) A book entitled *Comparative Peace Processes* by Professor Jon Tonge from the Department of Politics had been named Choice Outstanding Academic Title for 2015 by the American Library Association.
- f) Professor Margaret Whitehead, Head of the Department of Public Health and Policy, had been awarded a damehood in the New Year's Honours List for services to Public Health.

## STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

### 6. STRATEGIC REVIEW - OUR NEW STRATEGIC PLAN 2026

The Senate received a paper providing the working draft Strategic Plan and supporting strategies, the developing KPIs/SPIs, the Raising Performance Matrix, feedback from the White Paper consultation, and information regarding the planned next steps.

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The new Strategy 2026 was now close to completion and was with an external design company who would assist with its design and production, as well as the development of an interactive website. The new Strategy had been informed by the extensive feedback received from staff, students and external stakeholders over the last 12 months. Next steps included the development of supporting strategies, implementation plans and KPIs, again to be informed by the feedback gathered throughout the process. The final Strategy and outline implementation plans, KPIs and targets would be presented to Council for approval on 10 February 2016.

It was **NOTED** that:

- b) The Raising Performance Matrix and the suite of measures used in its compilation had been discussed extensively at the Leadership Away Days held in November.
- c) The KPIs would be refreshed as necessary over the life span of the Strategy.
- d) Whilst it was recognised that postgraduate student satisfaction could not currently be externally benchmarked in the same way as undergraduate student satisfaction, the University would continue to strive to increase the satisfaction levels of all students.
- e) There continued to be a firm commitment to transparency and improving internal communications.

## 7. RESPONSE TO BIS GREEN PAPER ON HE CONSULTATION

The Senate received the University's response to the BIS Green Paper Consultation.

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) Following publication of the BIS Green Paper 'Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice' in November, HEIs and other stakeholders had been invited to respond to the proposals.
- b) In order to develop the University's response, views had been sought from members of the Senior Executive Group and from Heads of Schools and Institutes. The response had been approved by the Senior Management Team and submitted to BIS by its deadline of 15 January 2016.
- c) The response outlined the University's:
  - In principle support for the Teaching Excellence Framework and the intention to raise the profile of high quality teaching and learning.
  - Concern regarding:
    - the introduction of an Office for Students (OfS), effectively as a consumer body, combining and realigning the remaining roles of HEFCE and OFFA;
    - the potential for separating Teaching and Research funding;
    - the smoother mechanisms for providers to enter and exit the sector; and
    - the focus on undergraduate students, with little reference to mature, part-time, distance learning and postgraduate students.
- d) A number of the changes proposed in the Green Paper would require primary legislation to implement. There was no indication of when any subsequent White Paper would be published.

It was **NOTED** that:

- e) The University would continue to monitor the impact of the replacement of student maintenance grants with loans and the withdrawal of some types of funding on inclusivity and widening participation.

## 8. DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMON ACADEMIC WORKLOAD MODEL FOR THE UNIVERSITY

The Senate received a report providing an update on work underway to select and develop an academic workload system to be used by all academic areas.

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) Academic workloads had traditionally been self-managed in Russell Group (RG) institutions, although this was now changing with a number of RG universities implementing one of the commercial systems available.
- b) Following the introduction of the last Strategic Plan, the People and Organisational Development group had been set up with one of its objectives being to establish a common academic workload model. Although it had not been successful in this task, a number of Schools and Institutes had introduced approaches to suit their needs. However, staff feedback on the University's Athena SWAN action plan, Strategy 2026 and last staff survey had identified that the introduction of an institution wide academic workload model was still required.
- c) The main advantages of a standard workload model delivered through a commercial system included:
  - transparency, fairness, reasonable workloads and equity across the institution;
  - a better understanding of the workload of the academic workforce to enable workforce planning to be carried out more effectively;
  - the avoidance of numerous disparate approaches and inconsistent/inaccurate data; and
  - a consistent application of the academic workload framework and principles.
- d) To achieve a common model, there needed to be in place an agreed policy and tariffs to underpin the selected commercial system and a methodology which minimises significantly the need to enter data more than once, which pulls and pushes data into other data sets and which provides outputs relevant to a number of central processes including the Planning and Performance Cycle.

- e) The workload model would need to:
- recognise the full range of academic duties, professional practice and continuing professional development;
  - take into account individual circumstances where possible;
  - ensure that legal requirements on working time and breaks are met;
  - help departments to plan and monitor workloads;
  - be flexible to cope with change; and
  - be able to take into account accepted local circumstances.
- f) Acknowledging that the launch of a commercial workload model, calibrated for the University, would take time, the Senior Management Team had agreed that, for the short term, contribution data sets should be drawn together from locally maintained and centrally held data in the three Faculties (already in place across FSE), for presentation back to individuals and validation by the end of January. The Faculty Directors of Operations and members of Strategic Planning and Computing Services would then explore how the maintenance of the contribution data set could be achieved.
- g) A Board had been set up to oversee progress to the full implementation of a workload model and selection of the commercial software, with membership comprising the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education (Chair), Director of Human Resources and representatives from each of the Faculties. The Board would develop an academic workload framework to provide a consistent set of principles and guidance, but with scope for local variance where required. The framework would include guidance on tariffs or allocations for particular academic activities.

It was **AGREED** that:

- h) The introduction of a common academic workload model which would ensure transparency, fairness and equity across the institution should be broadly supported.
- i) Senate's comments should be given further consideration by the Board established to oversee the project. These centred around:
- The importance of the model being able to reflect differences between disciplines so that it could be a powerful tool for use by heads of departments.
  - The need for careful consideration to be given to the tariffs to be used.
  - How widely the information would be made available would need to be agreed, recognising the data protection implications.
  - The potential for use of the model to enable ring-fencing of time for specific activities and to give rise to improvements in work life balance.
  - The importance of the accuracy of any data collected automatically.
  - The need for an appropriate balance so that academic staff are not forced to spend inordinate amounts of time justifying their work plan rather than making progress with their work.
  - The focus should be on the model as an enabler for high quality work and the optimisation of working lives.

#### **BUSINESS FROM THE FACULTIES**

#### **9. FACULTY OF HEALTH AND LIFE SCIENCES - EDUCATION REVIEW/RESTRUCTURE OF THE INSTITUTE OF LEARNING AND TEACHING**

The Senate received a report on the outcomes of the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences Education Review, with a particular focus on the recommendation to restructure the Institute of Learning and Teaching.

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Review had been undertaken to assess the extent to which the current organisational structure and culture within the Faculty supports the delivery of high quality undergraduate and postgraduate taught education and teaching.
- b) The Review had been prompted partly by changes in the external environment and partly by concerns raised by staff within the Faculty regarding the current approach.

- c) The Review involved a high level of consultation. Over 500 Faculty staff had responded to an online survey, and the Guild had consulted with the student community. Academic and professional services leads had been asked to comment directly and a full day panel meeting had been held.
- d) A series of 19 recommendations had been agreed and presented to the Faculty Forum in December. These focussed on four key areas: communication; management and finance; staff engagement; and structure.
- e) Whilst there was a clear acknowledgement that structure could not resolve all of the issues raised through the Review, there was agreement that a change in structure could contribute positively to the Faculty's need to:
- address the difficulties that arise from management of a structure of the size of the Institute of Learning and Teaching;
  - give the teaching units equal status with the existing Institutes and equal representation on the Faculty Management Team;
  - give the teaching units more autonomy and budgetary control;
  - establish new Institutes with sufficient financial critical mass to act as Level 2 units;
  - create a critical mass of Teaching and Scholarship staff to develop working practices and pedagogic research;
  - enable cognate areas of teaching activity to gain benefit from functioning together; and
  - support, deliver and co-ordinate common aspects of education across the Faculty.
- f) Academic and professional services leads from across the Faculty had been asked to comment upon potential changes to the Faculty structure and how different models might impact positively upon the delivery of education. As a result of this consultation, a preferred structure had been identified which would mean that the Faculty would have:
- eight Level 2 Institutes with equal status and representation on the Faculty Management Team; and
  - an Education Directorate which would span the Faculty and would enable CPD development, widening participation, quality assurance, educational research, and technology enhanced learning.

It was **NOTED** that:

- g) The implementation of the agreed recommendations when taken as a whole should serve to bring about the desired improvements and to emphasise the equal status of research and teaching.

It was **AGREED TO RECOMMEND** that:

- h) The proposal that the existing Institute of Learning and Teaching be split into three and replaced by the Institute of Clinical Sciences, Institute of Veterinary Science and Institute of Life and Human Sciences should be approved and that Ordinance 19 (The Academic Organisation of the University) should be amended accordingly.

## **REPORTS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES**

### **EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

10. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Education Committee held on 3 December 2015.

#### **11. QAA HIGHER EDUCATION REVIEW (HER) VISIT**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The QAA had informed the University that it had 'met UK expectations' in the four areas assessed.
- b) The features of good practice expected to be highlighted in the full report included the role of the Quality Assurance Process Review Group in developing and improving the University's approach to quality assurance, and the strategic and effective role played by the Centre for Lifelong Learning in training and supporting staff in pedagogic practices and developments and disseminating good practice.

- c) The recommendations were likely to focus around: strengthening the monitoring and oversight of external examiner reports; modifying annual monitoring processes to record explicitly consideration of the maintenance of academic standards; strengthening the arrangements for the appointment of external reviewers and external examiners; development of a systematic approach to making taught students aware of responses to their feedback on learning opportunities; establishment of formal channels to capture/act on research students' views and to ensure that actions taken are reported back; and to ensure programme learning outcomes and any changes to the Code of Practice on Assessment are communicated to students in a timely and accessible way.
- d) The affirmations were likely to relate to the work underway around: involving students in various processes; the Liverpool Doctoral College; and transparency to students in relation to external examiners and additional programme costs.

## 12. **DESTINATION OF LEAVERS FROM HIGHER EDUCATION (DLHE) SURVEY AND ENHANCING GRADUATE EMPLOYABILITY**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Education Committee had received a report summarising the headline results from the DLHE statutory return 2013-14, outlining activity underway to deliver the 2014-15 survey, and introducing strategic developments that might help the University to enhance student employability, with a view to enhanced future performance in national measures of graduate employment.
- b) Strategic developments to enhance employability included:
  - A new strategy would be in place for 2016-17. The University's first employability summit would be held in January 2016, to enable input from students, academic colleagues, graduate employers, and the HEA to the new strategy.
  - A new strategy for employer engagement with a view to linking students to a wider range of employers offering graduate level roles regionally and nationally.
  - The development of a range of data measures to inform the University's employability offer.
  - The University's Enterprise Co-ordinator had moved into the Careers and Employability team, opening up the potential for developments in this area.
- c) The Careers and Employability Service had been short-listed in several categories in the National Undergraduate Employability Awards, including Best University Placement Service, Most Improved Commitment to Employability, and Outstanding Contribution to Work Experience (for Darren Siggers).

## 13. **LEARNING AND TEACHING FELLOWSHIP SCHEME**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Education Committee had received a paper setting out a proposal to establish a Learning and Teaching Fellowship Scheme at the University.
- b) The Fellowships were expected to bring a number of benefits, including:
  - enhancing the student experience;
  - sharing and disseminating good practice across the University;
  - signalling internally that this was an important area;
  - providing colleagues with evidence of scholarship in their ULTRA/HEA Fellowship applications;
  - giving recognition to individuals which would also benefit their career and promotion prospects; and
  - raising the University's profile externally by Fellows' contribution to external events and conferences.
- c) A total of £12,000 would be made available for the 2015-16 year to fund up to 12 Teaching Fellowships which would have a tenure of one/two years, noting that the value of the awards centred around the recognition rather than the monetary value.
- d) The Education Committee had noted that:
  - There would be Guild involvement on the awarding panel.

- The Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors/Faculty Management Teams were supportive of the Scheme. It would be important for recipients to be afforded sufficient time to enable them to achieve the aims and objectives of their Fellowship.
- e) The Education Committee had agreed that the Learning and Teaching Fellowship Scheme should be approved.

#### **RESEARCH AND IMPACT COMMITTEE**

14. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Research and Impact Committee held on 25 November 2015.

15. **IMPACT FRAMEWORK**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The University had recently launched an Impact Framework that focussed on: Awareness raising, training and capture of best practice; Structures; Systems; and Culture.
- b) Faculties were currently capturing information about potential case studies that would then be prioritised for support and development.

16. **REVIEW OF ENTERPRISE AND COMMERCIALISATION ACTIVITY**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Research and Impact Committee had received the report of a review of enterprise and commercialisation activity and had agreed that:
- i. Further work should be undertaken to broaden the approach to this area to include all enterprise activity, including that by students (especially as they progressed through the University from UG to PGT and then PGR).
  - ii. Subject to the above, the specific recommendations of the review should be approved, as follows:
    - The establishment of an incentive and reward structure that recognises the importance of enterprise activity through the development of easily measured outcomes.
    - The replacement of the existing Operations Team that provides academic oversight of IP opportunities with a new process involving the Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor (APVC) for Research and Impact in each Faculty assessing and prioritising cases based on academic analysis and alignment with the Faculty's Research Strategy.
    - The replacement of the existing contract with 'Clearview' with a professionally managed IP team (2fte) based in Business Gateway that would receive recommendations from Faculty APVCs and undertake full commercial due diligence.
    - The replacement of the Commercial Board with a new Enterprise Review Board reporting to Planning and Resources Committee, which would receive recommendations from Faculty APVCs and the IP Team.
    - The consideration of ways to raise the profile of this activity and engage more academics.
    - Investigation of the feasibility of combining commercial development with Impact Case development (whether commercial or non-commercial) under a single unified process.

17. **SUPERVISION OF PGRS BY ECRS**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Research and Impact Committee had received a paper outlining the current position in relation to supervision of PGR students by Early Career Researchers (ECRs), and proposing that ECRs should be permitted to act as primary supervisor.
- b) The current stated policy was that ECRs could not be primary supervisors for PGR students. This was on the basis that students had a right to expect their primary supervisor to be appropriately experienced. However, this did not necessarily make the best use of the skills of available staff, and also denied ECRs the chance to broaden their experience.

- c) The Research and Impact Committee had agreed that work should be undertaken to draft a policy permitting ECRs to act as primary researchers, with suitable support and leadership put in place to mitigate any risk in this area. This policy would be taken direct to Senate for approval.

#### **COLLABORATIVE PROVISION COMMITTEE**

18. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Collaborative Provision Committee held on 4 December 2015.

#### **19. NEW FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES AT XJTLU**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved the proposed new framework for undergraduate programmes delivered at XJTLU. It had noted that the framework was now more closely aligned to UoL's to enhance consistency and that it had been updated to clarify the Chinese degree requirements regarding placements.

#### **20. CHIEF MODERATOR'S AND CHIEF EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORTS AND XJTLU'S RESPONSES**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved the Chief Moderator's and Chief External Examiner's reports and XJTLU's responses. The resulting action plans would be monitored via the annual monitoring process.

#### **21. KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Collaborative Provision Committee had received confirmation that Chair's action had been taken to approve a proposal for a new student exchange with Kansas State University, USA, following the resolution of issues regarding liability insurance.

#### **22. AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN CAIRO (AUC)**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved a revised proposal for a new exchange with AUC, Egypt. It had noted that the original proposal had not been approved due to concerns over student safety. The academic department had confirmed that it was prepared to absorb the costs associated with a one-way exchange for an initial two-year period, and the application was revised accordingly. The arrangement would be reviewed after two years and, in the event that there was no significant improvement in the political situation in Egypt, the partnership would either be terminated, or converted to a fee paying study abroad agreement.

#### **23. UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved a proposal to renew the exchange with the University of Georgia, USA, noting that the exchange had been successful and balanced and student feedback had been positive.

#### **24. PGR TAXONOMY OF COLLABORATIVE PROVISION**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved an updated version of the PGR Taxonomy, noting that the document had been revised in response to feedback from the Committee and input from the Academic Secretary.



25. **ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY, TURKEY - PROGRAMME MODIFICATIONS**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved a proposal for modifications to the dual BSc Computer Science programme delivered in collaboration with Bilgi. The modifications were designed to align the paperwork with current practice and the UoL Board of Studies in Computer Science had endorsed the changes.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE**

26. The Senate received a report on action taken by the Special Committee of the Senate.

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) The Special Committee had taken action to agree to recommend to Council that the following recommendations of the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees be approved:
- That an honorary degree (LLD) be conferred on Dr Mehmood Ahmad Khan, Vice-Chairman and Chief Scientific Officer of PepsiCo and a medical alumnus of the University, at one of the degree ceremonies in the summer of 2016.
  - That, in the year of the tenth anniversary celebrations of XJTLU, honorary degrees be conferred on the following:
    - Mr Nick Earlam, Founder and Executive Chairman of Plexus Cotton Ltd and key player in the creation of the Liverpool-Shanghai Partnership – LLD
    - Professor Michael Fang, Emeritus Professor of Electrical Engineering of the University and first Executive President of XJTLU – LLD
    - Professor Shuguo Wang, President of Xi'an Jiaotong University – LLD.
- b) The Special Committee had been asked to take this action to ensure that the individuals could be given as much notice as possible for diary purposes.
- c) The President of the Council, acting on the Council's behalf, had approved the above recommendations.

It was **AGREED** that:

- d) The above action taken by the Special Committee of the Senate should be endorsed.

**OTHER ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT**

**ACTION TAKEN BY THE VICE-CHANCELLOR ON BEHALF OF THE SENATE**

27. The Senate received a report outlining action which had been taken on its behalf by the Vice-Chancellor.

28. **REVISED PROGRAMME ORDINANCES**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend approval of a revised set of Programme Ordinances. A number of changes had been made to the Programme Ordinances, mainly of a minor nature, for example to reflect changes to organisational structures, or to remove detail out of the Ordinance and to refer to the relevant programme specification.
- b) The President of the Council, acting on the Council's behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

It was **AGREED** that:

- c) The above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate should be endorsed.

29. **SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE PROGRESS OF STUDENTS**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed that the following Faculty nominees be appointed as members of the Committee on the Progress of Students for 2015-16:

**Health and Life Sciences**

Dr RS Hill  
Dr E Singer  
Rev Dr DCM Taylor

**Humanities and Social Sciences**

Professor S Chapman  
Dr D Lindebaum  
Professor K Marsh

**Science and Engineering**

Dr K Johnson  
Dr J Marsland  
Dr I O'Neill  
Professor J Smith

It was **AGREED** that:

- b) The above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate should be endorsed.

30. **POOL OF FITNESS TO PRACTISE PANEL MEMBERS 2015-16**

It was **REPORTED** that:

- a) Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved a list of pool members for Fitness to Practise Panels<sup>1</sup>.

It was **AGREED** that:

- b) The above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate be endorsed.

**OTHER ITEMS FOR REPORT**

31. **FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 JULY 2015**

The Senate received, via a web link, the Financial Statements of the University for the year ended 31 July 2015 which had been approved by the Council at its meeting held on 18 November 2015.

32. **ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE 2014-15**

The Senate received the annual report of the Research Governance Committee for 2014-15.

33. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was **REPORTED** that:

The next meeting of the Senate would be held on Wednesday 16 March 2016 at 2pm.

**Appendices**

<sup>1</sup> Pool of Fitness to Practise Panel Members 2015-16