

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

**Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2012**

*Present:* Principal, Professors Logan, Hannaford, McGeorge, Greaves, and Ross, Dr Ziegler, Professors Baggs, Skakle, Soulsby, and O'Donoghue, Dr J Morrison, Dr S Davies, Professor Naphy, Dr B Connolly, Dr J Masthoff, Dr S Lawrie, Dr D Hendry, Dr M Ehrenschwendtner, Dr K Shennan, Ms C Banks, Dr J Lamb, Dr C Brittain, Dr M Brown, Dr R O'Connor, Dr T Weber, Dr DJ Smith, Dr J Stewart, Dr T Wills, Dr T Burns, Dr A Pillai, Professor Duff, Mr S Styles, Mr N Curtis, Professor Haerpfer, Dr AD King, Dr M Delibegovic, Professor Lambin, Dr L Hastie, Dr A Jenkinson, Dr N Vargesson, Dr I Stansfield, Dr J Cleland, Professor de Bari, Dr S Fielding, Dr P Benson, Dr D Pearson, Dr D Martin, Dr S Duthie, Dr L Williams, Professors Chandler and Guz, Dr D Jolley, Dr T Mighall, Professor Coghill, Miss T Birley, Miss J Bjorkqvist, Mr P Bond, Mr J Douglas, Mr L Butler Perks and Mr T Majchrowski

*Apologies:* Mr S Cannon, Professors Haites, Houlihan, Morgan, Rodger, Wallace, MacGregor, Paterson and Crotty, Mrs L Clark, Professors Zalewski, Buckland, McCaig, Macrae and Reid, Dr R Wells, Professor Schaper, Gow and Nelson, Mr M Radford, Mrs J Bruce, Professor Sir Ritchie and Hutchison, Dr WD McCausland, Dr B Marsden, Mr McMurtry, Professor Mealor, Dr D Robson, Dr M Durham, Professor Syrotinski, Dr P Bernhagen, Dr R Vij, Professor Robinson, Dr A Carrington, Dr A Jack, Dr I Greig, Dr J Pettitt, Dr D Scott, Dr A Denison, Professor Heys, Dr LP Erwig, Professors Francis and Galley, Dr H Wallace, Professor Newton, Dr S Semple, Dr R Bull, Dr T Thevar, Professors Watson and Dobney, Dr L Philip, Dr M Reed, Professor Grebogi, Norman, Webster and Edwards, Miss L Sivula, Mr H Grieve, Miss F Johansson, Mr M Fortune, Miss K Kaushik, Miss J Paton, Mr J Filous, Miss R Munday, Mr N Marley, Mr A Khan, Mr A Denham, Mr M Burke and Mr J Kenter.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

38.1 The Senate approved the minutes of the meeting held on 2 May 2012.

**STATEMENT BY PRINCIPAL**

39.1 The Principal welcomed the Senate to the last meeting of the academic year and thanked those Senators who would be ending their term of office for their commitment to the role. The Principal stated that he had nine items to report, the first of which was an update on the recruitment campaign. He reported that the University had received around 1500 applications for the posts and he thanked those staff who had been involved in processing and assessing those applications. He emphasized to Senate that excellence was the only criterion. The Principal then reported on the outcomes of the Staff Satisfaction Survey. He reported that the overall response rate of those who were satisfied with their role was 68.7%, which represented a 3% drop from the previous year. However, this drop in satisfaction reflected the general position in similar surveys conducted in the UK. He reported that areas that had come out positively were health and safety, team meetings, and pensions. Those areas that had not done well were workloads, training and development, and benefits. He added that overall the University had done better in some areas than in others. The results would be distributed shortly. Some areas would require more investigation and the qualitative responses needed to be analysed. Following this action plans would be drawn up, to be ready for September. The Principal then updated Senate on applications, reporting that the University had received more applications this year than in any previous year. The University will meet its quota on Scottish/EU students. Numbers of RUK applications are lower than last year, though it is expected that the University will go into clearing with 100–200 places. The Principal reported that the University will receive less research grant income, though he added that the number and quality of applications for research funding were good, especially those to the Scottish Funding Council for Innovation Centres funding. The Principal reported to Senate that the General Dental Council had confirmed that the Aberdeen degree satisfies the requirements of the Council. The Principal brought the attention of Senate to two outstanding staff achievements: Professor Mandy Ryan, who has been ranked as one of the world's top 100 health economists, and Professor Kevin Edwards, for being selected to deliver the Rhind Lectures at the Royal Society of Edinburgh. He also congratulated Elidh McLeod, a current Geography student, and Ryan Whelan, a Law alumnus, who had both been selected to carry the Olympic Torch through Aberdeen. He added that he had been invited to the British Universities and Colleges Sport (BUCS) Athletics Championships

at the new Olympic Stadium in London, at which several Aberdeen University students were competing. Finally, the Principal concluded by thanking all staff for their considerable efforts during the examinations period in marking, modulation and returning results.

### **HE ONLINE UPDATE**

- 40.1 The Senior Vice-Principal updated the Senate on the talks with HE Online regarding delivery of University programmes online (oral update). He thanked Senators for the full and open discussion that had occurred at the previous meeting of Senate and pointed staff to the minute of the meeting, which captured the discussion in detail. He added that the concerns of Senate echoed the concerns of the group who were involved in the discussions with HE Online and reported that the University was seeking clarity on those various issues with HE Online. The Senior Vice-Principal stated that the group were aware of the potential impact on staff workload and were considering how this might be managed. He reiterated that the University was continuing to exercise due diligence and that the established quality assurance mechanisms, which included Senate, would continue to be applied to the process. He re-emphasised that discussions were ongoing and that no deal had been done. He added that, on the positive side, online delivery would greatly enhance our ability to widen access.
- 40.2 There followed a discussion, the main points of which are summarized below:
- It was commented that the University appeared to be presenting this as a dialogue about online delivery, whereas in fact there were two separate issues. The University needed to separate the discussion about online and distance learning from that of discussions with a for-profit provider. It appeared that the University had already decided that HE Online was the provider it wanted. It was asked whether any efforts had been made to explore other options, such as an inhouse solution. In response, the Senior Vice-Principal noted that it was a helpful comment but reiterated that the University had not decided on a partner of choice. HE Online had approached the University and discussions were ongoing given their experience in the field. The University had had discussions with other providers and other universities, including Laureate and Liverpool, about their experiences. It was pointed out that Aberdeen University was a novice in this field and that an inhouse solution would not be straightforward.
  - One member pointed out the circulation to Senators from the Universities and Colleges Union (UCU) and asked whether the University had noted these concerns. It was added that considerable debate had taken place in the USA regarding free provision of online learning, and that some universities there had developed inhouse platforms to deliver free online non-credit-bearing tasters of degree programmes. The member added that it would be preferable to see the discussion widened, and not focused on a for-profit provider. In response, the Senior Vice-Principal stated that the University had been aware of the items raised in the UCU communication and that they were being investigated part of the normal process of due diligence. In response to the comment about inhouse development, it was pointed out that any online work the University undertook, whether inhouse or with a partner, would have to be backfilled to a greater or lesser extent, and that this involved cost.

### **RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK UPDATE**

- 41.1 The Vice-Principal (Research and Knowledge Exchange) updated the Senate on preparations for the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) exercise (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). He reported that preparation continued and that the University was waiting to hear whether or not the REF Team approved the University's Equality and Diversity Code of Practice. The University had already commenced training given that the Code was based on what had been used last time (with updates for legislative changes) and which was considered an example of good practice then. It was added that a review of Units of Assessment would be completed in September. It was reported that all relevant outputs had now been sent out to the external reviewers for feedback, and that this feedback would be used to inform the shape and size of the University's submission. The Vice-Principal reminded Senators that the success of the process relied on staff populating the PURE system and ensuring that it was kept up-to-date. The Vice-Principal thanked all staff for their continued efforts in contributing to the exercise and stated that he would update Senate again in November.

## IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR PERSONAL TUTORS

- 42.1 The Vice-Principal (Learning and Teaching) updated the Senate on implementation plan for the Personal Tutors scheme (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Vice-Principal brought Senators' attention to the follow-up paper outlining the implementation plan for the Personal Tutors scheme. The plan took on board issues raised in the comprehensive discussion that had taken place at the previous meeting of Senate. The plan detailed the overall timescale, suggested communications and their timing, and the format and timing of staff training. The Principal added that he considered the scheme to excellent and that both he and the Senior Vice-Principal would be offering to be Personal Tutors.
- 42.2 There followed a discussion, the main points of which are summarised below:
- The Student President stated that AUSA fully supported the system and saw it as an excellent and long-awaited scheme that would aid retention, progression, employability and the entire student experience in a very positive way. She stated the University was to be congratulated on having finally introduced a system that the majority of other universities had had for some time. She added that AUSA would prefer the scheme to be introduced immediately as students had been lobbying for such a system for some time, though recognized that in order to be done properly it was better to wait for appropriate staff training to take place. She concluded by saying that the support of the students for this scheme could not be overemphasized.
  - A member commented that it was important to know that students wanted this scheme, but did wonder whether some students might be disadvantaged by it as some staff would be better at the role than others. In response, the Vice-Principal pointed out that quality assurance mechanisms would be in place after training to minimize the chances of this happening.
  - A member commented on the cross-disciplinary nature of the role and wondered how tutors would be able to answer a lot of the questions that might be posed by their tutees. It was asked whether there would be a concise list of central points of contact made available to Tutors so that they knew who to go to for answers. The Vice-Principal noted that this was a good suggestion that would be put in place.
  - A member stated that he was not convinced by the longer term plan to encompass advising into the Tutor role. It was thought that Tutors would be bombarded with questions they could not answer and that they could not do advising without knowledge of the discipline and its degrees. The Vice-Principal reminded Senate that there would be an enhanced technical solution to the advising aspect of the role with the introduction of OneSource, and that that was why the roles were remaining separate until that system was in place.
  - A member noted concern that students would be confused by not knowing who to go to when both Advisers and Tutors were in place. It was also noted that the proposed schedule did not mention registration – which was the main point in the advising year. It was added that it was impossible to see how something as complex as advising could possibly be aided by a computer programme. In response the Vice-Principal said that a student could go to see either Adviser or Tutor and that they could be redirected if necessary. He added that AUSA would be briefed on how the roles differed. He pointed out that technology could be an immense aid and he suggested staff speak with colleagues who had experience of using such systems for confirmation of this.
  - A member commented that the Personal Tutor role was pastoral, but how could the same person give advice on courses to sign up for or career path? It was considered that this would be much easier if the Tutors came from within the School. In response the Vice-Principal pointed out that there were other services to assist students, for example Careers. Tutors would be advising on generic graduate attributes, and all Tutors would be able to ask a student what they were doing to enhance their graduate attributes, what they had done in response to feedback on their courses, assessments and specific graduate attributes, for example. The emphasis would be, as it is now, on students being responsible for their own development, and of their Tutors prompting them in this respect. The Vice-Principal added that wherever possible students would be assigned to Tutors with a related discipline. Though this was not considered to be essential to the success of the relationship and the biggest advantage to be gained was by having fewer students per Tutor, and that could only be achieved by having the potential for Tutors who were not in the same discipline.
  - A member commented that discussions had taken place within the School of Divinity, History and Philosophy (DHP) about the Personal Tutor system and, although opinions were mixed, on the whole it could be said that the Senators from DHP would find it hard to support such a scheme. They were supportive of improving the current Advising system but had concerns that the Personal Tutor system is simply a box-ticking exercise. The Senators from DHP wondered why the system could not be more flexible so that students could discuss what they wanted to discuss and when. In response, the Vice-Principal assured Senate that this was not a box-ticking exercise and much thought had gone into the system, including consultation with AUSA. He reiterated that the system

was a framework that was flexible as it did not preclude students from discussing other matters with their Tutors and in addition to the suggested times. The framework set out a minimum expectation, though some students might not want to meet as often.

- A member who was a regent for medical students commented that a similar scheme already operated within Medicine – the Regent Scheme. The scheme was successful and well liked by the students and the Regents. Regents were not only from within the discipline. He added that he did not feel that one needed to know a great deal about the medical degree because one was part of a network of colleagues. It was a good scheme because in the Regent students have someone they can contact and who is supportive. The students are very appreciative of the scheme. It is not as much work as one might imagine.
- Another member supported the statement. He commented that what was good about the Personal Tutors scheme was the framework of meetings and prompts for subjects to be discussed. He considered that the fact that the pastoral aspect was integrated with the framework was excellent and to be welcomed.
- A member asked whether it would be the responsibility of staff to chase students who do not appear. What would be the consequences for staff if students got into problems as the Personal Tutor scheme was introducing an element of responsibility that staff had not had previously. It was co-opting a moral responsibility for the well-being of students. There was concern about what was appropriate and whether Tutors could contact parents if students were under 18 or living at home. It would involve far more work than was suggested by the paper. It was considered that the Personal Tutor scheme was a very heavy-handed solution to what could have been a simple improvement of the advising system. In response, the Vice-Principal commented that it was simple enough to send an email to a student who did not show up, asking whether they were alright, they might simply have forgotten. But if a student chose not to use the system, that was their choice.
- The member then commented that Advising was a largely mechanistic system but the Personal Tutor role would be more than that. There was a need to be cautious and aware of the boundaries if staff were to mix pastoral with academic support.
- A member responded to say that those issues arose with Advising anyway, the same sorts of issues arise. As an Adviser she was fully supportive of the Personal Tutors scheme. She commented that Advising was not perfect as it was and not all Advisers were good at the job. Many students suffered as a result of poor or incorrect Advising. It was added that if a student does not turn up to a scheduled meeting it was a prompt that something might be wrong – so it was a positive thing to have the framework as one could then follow-up with a student and find out whether they needed support. It would be much easier with only 10 students to spot whether a student was in trouble – this was not possible as an Adviser with 40 students. If a student failed to respond one could bring them to the attention of the School retention officer. It was added that technical support could make advising on academic matters is much simpler. At the moment an Adviser needed experience and knowledge to know what a course entailed; a technical solution would obviate the need for this as that information would be available through a simple search. The member concluded that students would have a far better experience overall with the Personal Tutor system.
- Another member commented that the system would be better for students and for staff. It would be nice for Tutors to have meetings in which they could have positive interaction with their tutees. It was added that Advisers currently have difficulty with some of the degree regulations so could not see that the problem would be made worse with the Personal Tutors scheme, especially as one would have fewer students. It was hoped that the technical solution would include information on the degree regulations, not just on course requirements or content – so incorporate an ‘enhanced’ version of the Calendar.
- Another member echoed this request and added that it would be helpful to have more Registry staff available to answer queries. While Registry staff were always helpful, additional resource to support Personal Tutors might be required.
- A member commented that he could not quite believe that all staff would take on the role, and wondered what would be done to ensure this happened. It was asked what mechanism would be in place to ensure that all staff took part in the scheme. In response, the Vice-Principal stated that Heads of College and School, as line managers, would be responsible for ensuring all their staff took part.
- Another member stated that Heads of College and School would themselves be acting as Personal Tutors and the new system would be an inclusive and positive process offering far better support than the current advising system.

42.3 The Principal concluded the discussion by stating that that this had been a helpful and important debate. He reminded Senate that it had taken the University three years to agree to implement the Personal Tutor system.

## COMMON READING PROGRAMME: THE BIG READ

- 43.1 The Director of Teaching and Learning, College of Arts and Social Sciences (CASS), updated the Senate on the Common Reading Programme: the 'Big Read' (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). He reported that the College were undertaking a common reading programme which involved all first-year students reading the same book – Matthew Green's *The Wizard of the Nile: the Hunt for Joseph Cony* – before they arrived at University. During the Freshers' Week there would be a formal matriculation ceremony, with a lecture by a member of staff. It was intended that this would introduce students to the academic approach at an early stage of their university experience. The book was chosen to be inclusive as it was a topic of current interest amongst young people and covered a very wide range of topics. The lecture at the matriculation ceremony would introduce students to the way that academics, rather than the popular media, for example, approached issues of this nature. All first-half-session tutors were being given a copy of the book and were being asked to use it as an ice-breaker in their first tutorials. It was noted that 6% of CASS students left within the first month, and it was hoped that the common reading programme would engender a sense of belonging early on. He added that the publisher, Granta Books, had given the University a 75% discount, and was also working with the University on events for later in the year, including a visit from the author.
- 43.2 There followed a discussion, the main points of which are summarized below:
- A member asked how students with dyslexia or other disabilities were being catered for. In response, the Director said that Granta were arranging 200 licences for electronic versions of the book. A Braille version had not been available.
  - A member asked what support would be available for students who might have been involved and who might find the subject matter disturbing. It was considered that thought should be given to those students from West Africa who might have been involved and what effect this might have. In response, it was said that the subject matter might be disturbing, but it was something that young people globally were aware of because of the viral video on YouTube. It was stated that the book was not particularly academic, though not an easy read either. It was added that if it did raise issues for certain students then support would be in place for them.
  - A member added that AUSA had been involved in the discussions over the choice of book and it was considered to be a good choice to engage as wide a range of students as possible. The book was not graphic, and raised political, legal, religious and ethical issues. It was suggested that those who thought the book might be problematic should read it before making such a judgement.
  - A member asked whether any consideration had been given to a more old-fashioned text or one of the classics. While the benefit of topicality could be seen, might it not be a better introduction for students to be introduced to a classic text such as Plato's Republic, for example. In response, the Director stated that much debate had taken place over the text chosen and that classic texts had not been ruled out. However, most important factor was that the text chosen could not be one that differentiated students based on their educational background, and a text such as Plato's Republic would very much differentiate students and alienate some based on their background. The purpose of the Programme was to be inclusive and provide a text that everyone would feel able to comment on whatever their background. The choice could have been a classic text, but what was wanted was a text that would not aid certain students and disadvantage others. Plato would be differentially intimidating to certain students, Green's book is not.
  - A member commented that the Programme was an excellent idea and that they looked forward to the Programme being introduced for Life Sciences and Physical Sciences students in future years.
  - Another member added that it was an excellent idea though the University should continue to ensure the Programme is not used in a penalizing way; feedback from the students this year will be crucial.

## REPORT FROM THE UCTL

The Senate approved and noted the actions taken by the University Committee on Teaching & Learning at its meetings on 16 May 2012, as under:

### 1. Amendments to Regulations

- 44.1 The Senate approved, for its part, the Draft Resolution Changes in *Regulations for Various Degrees* (copy filed with principal copy of minutes) and agreed to forward these to the University Court for approval. The Senate agreed to ask the University Court, in accordance with the provisions of Section 6 (2) of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, the draft Resolution be passed forthwith so that amended provisions may be applied with effect from date on which they are passed by the University Court.

### 2. Amendment to the Code of Practice on Student Discipline

- 44.2 The Senate approved, for its part, the draft Resolution, 'Amendments to the Code of Practice on Student Discipline' (copy filed with principal copy of minutes) and agreed to forward to the University Court.

### 3. Curriculum Reform

#### (i) Discipline Breadth Exemption Requests

- 44.3 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Committee had approved an application from the School of Education for exemption from Enhanced Study for some of its programmes. The Committee noted that the case submitted by Education was founded on the fact that they do not have control over School placements, which are imposed by General Teaching Council (GTC) requirements. The Committee noted that for the Bachelor of Education, Bachelor of Music Education and Bachelor of Music: Music and Communities at levels 3 and 4, placement time cuts through the standard course structure, preventing students on these programmes from taking Enhanced Study. The Committee agreed that there was currently little alternative for the students affected and agreed to award exemption for these programmes for one year in the first instance.

The Committee noted that the School of Education will revise all their programmes in light of Curriculum for Excellence in 2013. The Committee recommended that the School of Education take a lead in devising a sixth century course which would be compliant to the needs of these students to avoid this situation recurring in future years.

Additionally, the School of Education requested exemption for all four years of the Bachelor of Arts in Childhood Practice and the Bachelor of Arts in Professional Development. The Committee agreed to exemption for one year, at which point the exemption should be reviewed.

The Committee considered an application from the School of Divinity, History and Philosophy for exemption for the Bachelor of Divinity from Enhanced Study. The Committee noted that the programme attracts students training for the ministry, who often already have first degrees. In light of this, these students often feel that they have complied with Enhanced Study by way of prior degree.

The Committee agreed that Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) to cover Enhanced Study would require a formal policy with clear guidelines. The Committee noted that this situation was likely to affect other students and not just those undertaking the BD. The Committee agreed that where it is clear that a student demonstrates prior Enhanced Study, they can be given APL, the consideration of which should be completed on an individual basis rather than on a blanket basis for the programme as a whole. The Committee noted that the Admissions selectors had been asked to come forward with a formal APL policy.

#### (ii) Honours Classification following Curriculum Reform

- 44.4 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Committee had approved the proposal that where Enhanced Study courses taken by a student are drawn from courses at levels 3 and 4, these should contribute towards Honours degree classification. The Committee agreed that normally students would not be permitted to take a level 1 or 2 course to make up their Enhanced Study requirement within Honours programmes. Where these are permitted exceptionally, these should not normally contribute towards Honours degree classification and in such cases, a student's degree should be classified on 180 or 210

credits (for a two year honours programme) or 90 or 105 credits (for a one year Honours programme) depending on the amount of Enhanced Study taken at level 1 or 2.

### **(iii) Feedback Framework and (iv) Partnership Agreement**

- 44.5 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Committee had noted the Feedback Framework and Partnership Agreement previously discussed by UCTL and approved by Senate. The Committee recognised the importance of ensuring the documents are kept up to date and relevant and agreed that the documents should be reviewed on an annual basis.

In considering the Feedback Framework, the Committee noted concern at the three week timescale for the return of feedback to students. The Committee agreed the importance of feedback being provided as quickly as possible and in advance of the next piece of assessed work, or the course examination. The Committee agreed that Schools should make clear in course guides when feedback would be returned to students.

Members of the Committee sought clarity on the Feedback Framework's section on providing exam feedback to students, specifically on whether if students are provided with generic feedback they can still request individual feedback. The Committee agreed that all students have the right to receive individual feedback, should they request it.

The Committee agreed that the Feedback Framework should be updated to replace PDP with information on Achieve and Feedback logs.

In regard to the Partnership Agreement, the Committee queried the purpose and title of the Partnership Agreement and also expressed concern about the limited awareness of the document by students and staff. The Committee agreed that it would be appropriate to undertake a review of the document and agreed to establish a small sub-group to undertake this work.

## **4. Changes to the Academic Quality Handbook**

### **(i) Student Course Evaluation Form (SCEF) and (ii) External Examining**

- 44.6 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Committee had approved the proposed changes to the Academic Quality Handbook as detailed at the following link: [www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal](http://www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal). The changes reflect those previously approved by the Committee as a consequence of changes to the QAA Code on External Examining and the recent Universities changes to the SCEF process. The changes affect sections 3, 7 and 9 of the code.

## **5. Amendments to the *Guidance Notes on Undergraduate Student Progress***

- 44.7 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Committee had approved the amendments to the *Guidance Notes on Undergraduate Student Progress* as detailed at the following link: [www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal](http://www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal).

Operation of the procedure had highlighted the fact that the *Guidance Note on Undergraduate Student Progress* required to be updated to ensure that current practice was reflected and to bring the route of appeal into the line with the University's revised *Policy and Procedures on Student Appeals and Complaints*. The opportunity was also taken to review the document as a whole in order to make it more user friendly.

## **6. Feedback Logs**

- 44.8 The Senate approved, for its part, that the Committee considered a paper on feedback logs, a mechanism to promote student engagement with feedback; encourage student reflection and action on comments made via feedback; and provide staff with contextualising information when discussing feedback with students. All students will be provided with a basic log as a template in the eportfolio tool in *MyAberdeen* along with instructions as to how to develop and maintain the log.

The Committee noted that the mechanism was intended to run for first year Undergraduate students and optionally open to Undergraduates at higher levels. The Committee acknowledged that there was no obvious reason why Postgraduate students could not also make use of the mechanism. Dr Morrison agreed to send the relevant information on feedback logs to Dr Connolly for consideration.

## SENATE APPOINTMENTS

45.1 The Senate noted, for its part, the following appointments as Directors of Undergraduate Programmes for session 2012/13 which had been approved by the Senate Business Committee:

- Dr Steven Lawrie as DUP for Arts & Social Sciences
  - Dr Marie-Luise Ehrenschwendtner as DUP for Divinity
  - Mrs Jayne Bruce as DUP for Education
  - Dr David Hendry as DUP for Engineering
  - Dr Mike Radford as DUP for Law
  - Professor Lewis Ritchie as DUP for Medicine & Dentistry
  - Dr Kath Shennan as DUP for Science
- The Senate is also noted the appointment of Professor Igor Guz (*vice* Professor R Ogden) as a member of the Committee for Research, Income Generation and Commercialisation.

## ELECTION OF NON *EX-OFFICIO* MEMBERS TO THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

46.1 The Senate noted, for its part, the outcome of the election of non *ex officio* members to the Senate. All have been elected to serve until 30 September 2016 unless otherwise stated

### **School of Biological Sciences Constituency**

Dr J Sternberg

### **Business School Constituency**

Dr W D McCausland  
Dr J Lamb  
Dr R Bunduchi  
Professor P Dawson (to 30 September 2014)

### **School of Engineering Constituency**

Dr J Keifer  
Professor H Chandler  
Dr A Akisanya  
Dr M Kashtalyan (to 30 September 2014)  
Dr D Pokrajac (to 30 September 2014)

### **School of Divinity, History & Philosophy Constituency**

Dr A Dilley  
Dr A Bryzgel  
Dr K Friedrich

### **School of Education Constituency**

Dr Y Bain  
Dr E Curtis  
Ms S Cornelius  
Professor P Mealar (to 30 September 2014)

### **School of Geosciences Constituency**

Professor D Macdonald

### **School of Language and Literature Constituency**

Dr G Sharman  
Dr K Groo

### **School of Law Constituency**

Professor P Duff  
Dr A Simpson

**School of Medical Sciences Constituency**

Dr J Barrow  
Dr A Rajnicek  
Dr P Tiesmann

**School of Medicine & Dentistry Constituency**

Professor C Schwarzbauer  
Professor J Newton  
Dr K Khalaf  
Professor S Heys  
Dr M Cruickshank  
Dr L Aucott  
Dr R MacKenzie

**School of Natural & Computing Sciences Constituency**

Dr N Oren  
Dr A McLaughlin (to 30 September 2014)  
Dr F Guerin (to 30 September 2014)

**School of Social Sciences Constituency**

Dr M Mills  
Dr L Bennie

**Rowett Research Constituency**

Dr L Williams  
Dr S Duthie

**DEGREE CERTIFICATE FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DENTAL SURGERY**

- 47.1 The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee approved, for its part, an amendment to the degree certificate for the Degree of Bachelor of Dental Surgery which is delivered jointly with the University of Dundee. An earlier version of the certificate had been approved at its May meeting (copy filed with principal copy of minutes).

**HIPPOCRATIC OATH FOR DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DENTAL SURGERY**

- 48.1 The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee approved, for its part the Hippocratic Oath to be taken by the Bachelor of Dental Surgery students at graduation as detailed below:

“I solemnly promise to use to the best of my knowledge and ability the art and science of my profession for the good of those under my care and to make the preservation and restoration of their health my constant aim. I shall keep secret anything I see or hear in my practice that should not be divulged. I shall constantly endeavour to improve my knowledge and skills within my profession and to share useful discoveries with my fellow practitioners whom I promise to hold in fraternal regard. These things I shall do for the benefit of those whom I seek to serve and for the honour of the profession that I now join.”