UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

Minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2010

Present: Principal, Professors Houlihan, McGeorge, Haites, Rodger, Ross, Stollery, Black, Soulsby and O'Donoghue, Dr J Morrison, Professors Cotter, Walkden and Naphy, Dr B Connolly, Dr M Ehrenschwendtner, Mrs Clark, Mr MJ Radford, Professor Long, Ms C Banks, Mr A Arthur, Professor Hutchison, Dr J Lamb, Dr WD McCausland, Dr C Brittain, Dr B Marsden, Dr M Brown, Dr R O'Connor, Dr T Weber, Mr DC McMurtry, Dr P Mealor, Dr D Robson, Dr DJ Smith, Dr M Durham, Dr J Stewart, Professor Syrotinski, Dr T Wills, Mr T Burns, Professor P Duff, Mr N Curtis, Dr R Vij, Dr CW Haerpfer, Dr M Delibegovic, Dr X Lambin, Professor Robinson, Dr M Young, Dr A Carrington, Dr A Jack, Dr A Jenkinson, Dr I Greig, Dr D Scott, Dr N Vargesson, Professor de Bari, Dr LP Erwig, Dr S Fielding, Ms K Harrild, Dr H Wallace, Professor Newton, Dr S Semple, 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, Dr M Reed, Dr R Wells, Professor Grebogi, Dr G Coghill, Professors Fynsk and Robinson, Mr R Parker, Miss M McHaney, Miss L Sivula, Mr K Kaushik, Miss J Paton, Mr D McCroskie, Miss C Paraschiuescu, Mr A Gilinsky, Mr E Pereira and Miss J Batty.

Apologies: Professors Logan, Morgan, Ingold, Secombes, McCaig, Greaves, Wallace, Grant, Nelson, Mr C Munro, Dr A Pillai, Dr P Bernhagen, Dr J Cleland, Dr A Denison, Professor Smith, Watson, Dr TJF Norman, Dr J Skakle and Miss L Jones

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1.   The minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2010 were approved.

STATEMENT BY PRINCIPAL

2.1   The Principal, in opening the meeting, updated the Senate on the financial challenges facing the higher education sector. He informed the Senate that in England there was to be a 40% reduction in teaching funding for higher education and that this shortfall would be replaced by a student-funded model in response to the Browne report. He noted that the Browne report had not been accepted in full by the Government but rather a number of elements from the proposals were being taken forward. The cap on fees in England would be lifted to £9000 as long as there was clear support for widening participation on fees above £6000. The cap on student numbers was being retained. An English White Paper was expected to be published early in the New Year. In regard to research funding, he highlighted that funding to Research Councils would remain at a flat rate but they would be expected to make significant back-office savings. There would be a major reduction in capital funding.

2.2   The changes in England would have knock-on consequences for Scotland. The Scottish budget was expected to be for only one year given the forthcoming Scottish elections in May. Universities Scotland had been working proactively to put pressure on the government to limit the impact of budget cuts on higher education. The Principal anticipated that there would be significant cuts in cash terms and that the University would need to prepared to manage such funding reductions whilst maintaining high standards.

        There followed a short discussion, the main points of which are summarised below:

        • The President of the Students' Association sought reassurance in regard to the approach being taken in regard to Universities Scotland lobbying on funding. In response, it was noted that the line being taken was that if the country emerges from recession then a strengthening economy would require a strong higher education system to meet its

economic needs. If funding is decreased, it would be important in order to maintain the quality of higher education that this be managed through (i) efficiency savings and (ii) working across the education spectrum to look at ways to decrease the length of the learning journey. If any system for graduate contribution is introduced, this should be free at the point of entry, should ensure parity for Scottish students with those from elsewhere in the EU and should be repaid when the student earns above a threshold.

- It was queried whether there was any distinction in terms of funding for STEM areas. In response it was noted that the government response to Browne suggests no support for band B and C subjects but the SFC had not provided any comment to date on this matter.

QUESTION FROM THE STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION

3.1   The Principal informed the Senate that the President of the Students' Association had submitted a question in advance of the meeting. He invited the President of the Students' Association to outline his question. The President informed the Senate that the Students' Association sought reassurance from the Principal that, despite various changes resulting from Curriculum Reform and despite a reduced staffing complement, that, across the University, the same number of hours, in the form of contact time, are being taught compared to the same period last year.

3.2   In response, the Principal noted that there had not been time in advance of the Senate to provide the information requested but he gave assurance that this would be provided as soon as possible.

PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE POLICIES ON STUDENT APPEALS & COMPLAINTS

4.1   The Vice-Principal (Research & Commercialisation) gave a short presentation to the Senate on proposed changes to the policies on student appeals and complaints (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In doing so, he highlighted that it was intended that the new policy would significantly streamline the procedures for dealing with student appeals and complaints and would be more user-friendly for all parties. The new policy would place a greater focus on informal resolution. The revised procedure had been developed using Kaizen methodology and the new policy was in the process of being drafted with a view to it being brought to the February meeting for approval following detailed consideration by the UCTL. It was intended that, once approved, the new policy would be implemented as soon as possible thereafter, ideally in time for any cases arising from the first half-session exam diet. Training would be provided on the new procedures.

4.2   There followed a short discussion, the main points of which are noted below:

- There was support expressed for the proposed streamlining. It was suggested that it would be helpful to ensure that the new policy includes a clear feedback loop at the end to all those involved.
- It was queried what would happen should the Head of School be unable to resolve a student's case. In response, it was noted that the student would have the opportunity to take their case to a formal hearing.
- It was noted that the Students' Association had been participants in the Kaizen process to develop the new policy and were supportive of the approach being taken.
- It was suggested it would be important to ensure that the vocabulary used in the new policy was easily understandable and the inclusion of a glossary of terms was felt to be important.

STRATEGIC PLAN 2010-2015

5.1   The Principal introduced the draft Strategic Plan (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). He informed the Senate that this was a high-level plan and that work was ongoing to develop operational plans to support the Strategic Plan. He informed the Senate that the Court had seen the draft plan and would receive an updated version at their December meeting. He further advised the Senate that the Plan would also be informed by the developing financial context and would not be finally signed off until some greater clarity in regard to the future financial position was known.

5.2   He further informed the Senate that the University has the correct structures in place to ensure the successful delivery of the Plan and, with that in mind, he would also be launching a consultation to seek feedback from the community in regard to structures within the University.

5.3   He invited the Senate to discuss the draft Plan. There followed a short discussion, the main points of which are summarised below:

- It was commented that the plan was somewhat cautious and legalistic rather than being visionary. In response, it was noted that the wording would be revised to make it more inspirational.
- It was noted that the University was moving from being an admitting to a selecting institution. In that regard, it was queried whether this would impact on the number of home students. In response, it was noted that there would be no discrimination against local students. It was stressed that it was important that the University provides an opportunity for north-east students to mix with international students.
- The impact of increasing postgraduate student numbers was queried. It was noted that the postgraduate population was currently lower than would be expected.
- The role of themes was queried. It was noted that these would cross boundaries of expertise. A number of themes had been identified to date. A small fund would be established to support the development of new interdisciplinary research with a view to ensuring the ongoing development of the themes.
- The relationship going forward with RGU was queried. In response it was noted that in England the HE reforms could be seen to be encouraging a move towards partnerships rather than competition. It was likely a similar pattern might emerge in Scotland.
- It was suggested that it would be helpful to include specific reference to the archives and museum collections and their ongoing support within the Plan.
- It was suggested that there should be emphasis on encouraging greater cohesion across the University community building on the Partnership Agreement.
- It was proposed that greater emphasis in regard to the overall student experience should be placed on aspects such as sports facilities, accommodation etc.
- It was queried whether Senate would have the opportunity to comment on the operational plans. In response it was noted that it was hoped that there would be an opportunity for staff input for example to College plans.
- The Students' Association sought assurance that teaching would remain a priority. In response it was noted that the positioning of Learning & Teaching as Strategic Objective 1 was a signal of the importance given to this area of the University's work.

RESEARCH EXCELLENCE AGENDA: UPDATE

6.1   The Vice-Principal (Research & Commercialisation) presented the paper on the Research Excellence Agenda (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). He informed the Senate that the paper provided an update on progress in regard to the Research Excellence Agenda since the approval of proposals by the Senate in May 2009. In particular, he highlighted the establishment of the research leave scheme, the commitment to the concordat to support the career development of early career researchers and PhD and postdoctoral training. He highlighted that the progress in regard to the introduction of the publication database (Pure) had been successful with much positive feedback. He informed the Senate that, in order to further progress this work, it would be important to move to extend the inclusion of publications to 1 January 2005 and with this in mind sought the Senate's support to making this a mandatory requirement. He further informed the Senate that a proposal on moving towards the mandatory deposit of full text items in Pure for display in the Aberdeen University Research Archive (AURA), the University's open access repository, would be brought forward in the coming year. He also informed the Senate that the mid-term review had been positive and had provided a good gauge on how the University's research had progressed since the last RAE.

6.2   He invited comment from the Senate, particularly in regard to the proposal for making upload of publications to Pure mandatory and the proposed move to full open access for publications through AURA. There followed a short discussion, the main points of which are summarised below:

•   The form of the publications held in AURA was queried. In response it was noted that each journal has different rules on what is published and when it is made available (e.g. pre-print, immediate access to full text). It was further noted that Wellcome and the Research Councils insist that all publications are made available via open access. While it was noted that the current number of publications in Pure was relatively small at present, it was stressed that since the launch of Pure, the number in AURA had effectively doubled. It was further noted that the process of transferring documents from Pure to AURA was relatively easy to do and was supported by the Library.

•   One member of the Senate commented that Pure was a good tool but that there had been some problems in adding and removing publications. It was noted that feedback had been generally positive and that such difficulties were rare.

•   It was noted that in moving from previous research databases to Pure, the data held in past databases had been merged into Pure and therefore the proposal to make it a mandatory requirement to include all publications since 1 January 2005 should not be a significant task as most publications would already be included in Pure.

•   In regard to open access, it was queried whether this would only be provided where there is no associated cost. In response, it was noted that this cost is included in Research Council overhead costs.

•   It was queried whether there would be any scope for non-text based work (e.g. music) to be included. In response, it was hoped that this would be possible.

6.3   In drawing the discussion to a close, it was noted that proposals in regard to open access would be brought to a future meeting.

NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY

7.1   The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) presented the paper on the National Student Survey (NSS) (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In doing so, he reminded the Senate that the report summarised the results of the NSS survey conducted in spring 2010. The paper provided a summary of the results together with responses from each of the Colleges and the Students' Association to the outcome of the survey. He highlighted that the University

had retained an 89% overall satisfaction (as compared to an 83% sector average and an 86% Scottish average).

7.2 He drew Senate's attention to the issue of assessment and feedback which was the main area of concern arising from the survey. While this lower satisfaction in this area is in line with the pattern seen in the sector overall he stressed to the Senate that it was important that the University take action to address this issue. In this regard, he informed the Senate that following discussion at UCTL, a meeting of College representatives and the SA was to be held to explore the relative expectations of students and staff in regard to feedback and how to better manage these going forward.

7.3 There followed a short discussion, the main points of which are summarised below:
- It was noted that the Students' Association response had been very helpful and proactive. It was agreed it would be valuable for the University to work actively with the SA, as outlined above, to seek to identify ways to enhance feedback and manage student expectations.
- The statistical significance of the results was queried. In response it was noted that while the results may not be statistically significant, the trends and absolute figures are important and cannot be ignored.
- One member of the Senate queried the alignment of figures with the actual student numbers in the discipline. In response it was noted that colleagues in Policy, Planning & Governance would look into this.
- It was suggested that the results indicated a need to improve not only assessment and feedback but also personal development opportunities for students. In that regard, it was proposed that it may be worthwhile exploring the establishment of paid competitive summer studentships in laboratories as a development opportunity for students.
- A student member of the Senate commented that some staff in the College of Physical Sciences do not seem aware of the Feedback Framework and do not take the outcome of the NSS survey seriously. In response, it was stressed that the survey is taken very seriously but is only one of a number of ways in which the student experience is monitored. It was noted that virtually all programmes in the College are professionally accredited and that one aspect of such accreditation includes feedback. It was further commented that the College was keen to work with the SA to address the issues arising from the survey.
- It was noted that the low response to feedback may, in part, be due to the wording of the questions themselves and student/staff expectations not being aligned. With that in mind, it was suggested that it would be helpful to include in all handbooks a section setting out clear expectations for both staff and students. It was agreed that the UCTL should be asked to ensure that all Schools are aware of the Feedback Framework and to seek assurance that the framework is working effectively.
- The Students' Association further drew the Senate's attention to other areas of SA activity, in particular the promoting of best practice in regard to teaching & learning. In this regard it was agreed that the UCTL should work with the SA to further enhance the dissemination of good practice across the University.

UPDATE ON CURRICULUM REFORM

8. The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) gave a short update on Curriculum Reform (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In opening, he expressed his thanks to Advisers of Studies and support staff for their work during advising week in providing guidance to new entrants on the new curriculum. He highlighted to Senate that the uptake on the Sixth Century courses had been good with a wide diversity of students taking the courses. A similarly strong interest in the Sustained Study courses had also been seen. The first Sixth Century Staff-Student Liaison Committee had been held with very positive feedback being received from students in regard to these courses.

ADMISSIONS REPORT

9.1   The University Secretary presented the report on Admissions (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In doing so, he highlighted that at the closing date in January 2010, the University had seen a 32% increase in applications. This was significantly higher than that seen nationally and as a consequence no additional applicants had been taken after this closing date. He informed the Senate that while undergraduate recruitment was very buoyant, postgraduate recruitment had not been so successful and active efforts were being made to secure January entrants. In part, he noted that the Tier 4 visa changes may have impacted on international student numbers. Going forward, he noted that undergraduate recruitment was continuing to see increased popularity and, with this in mind, the University would be moving from being an admitting to a selecting institution and would be adopting a gathered-field approach for consideration of applications.

9.2   There followed a short discussion in which the following points were raised:

- Assurance was sought that if an increase in postgraduate numbers was achieved appropriate levels of support would be provided. It was agreed that this would be essential.
- It was queried whether the introduction of any form of graduate contribution might deter applications in future. In response it was noted that there would be a 20% demographic downturn in the next few years which would pose recruitment challenges. With this in mind, it would be essential that the University continues to deliver a high quality curriculum.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senate approved and noted the actions taken by the University Court at its meetings on 29 June and 29 September 2010, as under:

1. Draft Ordinance No 141 [Amendment of Powers of the University Court]

10.1   The Court considered a paper proposing draft Ordinance No 141 [Amendment of Powers of the University Court] and invited the Senate, for its part, to approve, the draft Ordinance [Amendment of Powers of the University Court]. It also highlighted that the related Ordinance No 142 (Revised Employment Statute) had been considered by the Senate at its meeting in February 2010, since when it has been informally reviewed by the Privy Council Office, and subject to minor amendments to its presentation style (now revised) had been endorsed for formal submission.

2. Resolution No 264 of 2010
[Amendments to the Code of Practice on Student Discipline]

10.2   The Court approved, on the recommendation of the Senate, the draft Resolution [Amendments to the Code of Practice on Student Discipline]. The Court further agreed that, in accordance with the provisions of Section 6(2) of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, that the draft Resolution be passed forthwith, so that the amended provisions may be applied with effect from the date on which they are passed by the University Court.

3. Ordinance No 140 [Amendment to the Composition of the Senatus Academicus]

10.3   The Court noted that Draft Ordinance No 140 [Amendment to Student Membership of the Senatus Academicus] previously approved by the Court and Senate had now been given approval by the Privy Council.**)**

4. Remit and Composition of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning and Student Affairs Committee

10.4   The Court approved, on the recommendation of the Senate, changes to the remit and composition of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning and associated consequential changes to the composition of the Student Affairs Committee.

REPORT FROM THE UCTL

The Senate approved and noted the actions taken by the University Committee on Teaching & Learning at its meeting on 3 November 2010, as under:

1. Amendments to the *Postgraduate Grade Spectrum*

11.1   At its meeting on 10 February 2010, Senate approved changes to the *Postgraduate Grade Spectrum*. Subsequent to this the University Committee on Teaching and Learning (UCTL) had further reviewed the *Postgraduate Grade Spectrum* to ensure that there was consistency between the approach taken for programmes starting in September and those starting in January. At its meeting on 3 November the Committee had approved amendments to the *Postgraduate Grade Spectrum* to the effect that the terminology used to refer to the different sections of taught postgraduate programmes be changes to refer to 'Stages'. The Committee were of the view that this terminology would be consistent with the structure suggested by the current *Postgraduate Grade Spectrum* and could be applied to both September and January start programmes, whilst also allowing for flexibility in the structure of taught Postgraduate programmes.

11.2   In regard to the proposed revisions, the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) highlighted to the Senate that following the UCTL a further revision to section 9.2 of the *Grade Spectrum* had been proposed removing 'level 5' from this paragraph. This change was approved.

2. Articulation Agreement with Aberdeen College

11.3   On behalf of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, the Quality Assurance Committee had approved the Articulation Agreement with Aberdeen College. The full agreement could be accessed at http://www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal/

3. Graduation Dates

11.4   The Committee noted the dates and allocation for the November Ceremonies as summarised below, approved by the Convener of the University Committee on Teaching & Learning during the summer:

Thursday 25 November 2010 at 11.00 am	Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Biological Sciences, Medical Sciences and Medicine.
Thursday 25 November at 3.00 pm	Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Engineering, Geosciences and Natural & Computing Sciences.
Thursday 25 November at 6.30 pm	Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Education, Language & Literature and Social Science.
Friday 26 November at 11.00 am	Higher and First Degrees in the Business School.

Friday 26 November at 3.00 pm   Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Divinity, History & Philosophy, Law and Psychology.

2.   Enhancement-led Institutional Review

11.5   The report following the University's Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) which was conducted in March and May 2010 had been published. The report is in two forms: (i) a summary report largely aimed at the lay-reader and (ii) a full report which is more intended for institutional use.   Both   versions   of   the   report   are   available   at: http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/reports/instReports.asp?ukprn=10007783

11.6   The Committee noted that the ELIR report was very positive and there are relatively few specific areas identified for consideration. The Committee further noted that issues requiring further consideration would be brought to future meetings of the UCTL. It was also noted that the University will be asked to provide a one-year follow-up report to the QAA in September 2011.

3.   Amendments to the Feedback Framework

11.7   The Institutional Framework for the Provision of Feedback on Assessment was approved by the University Committee on Teaching and Learning in November 2009. Feedback received from students, and in the course of academic appeals and complaints, has highlighted that feedback is not always provided within a timescale which is useful and meaningful in relation to subsequent assessments.

11.8   In order to ensure that feedback is not only provided in a timely way, but also within a timescale which permits students to make use of the feedback received before submitting subsequent assessments, the Committee approved amendments to the framework requiring this.

4.   Amendments to the External Examiner Report form

11.9   The Committee approved amendments to the External Examiner Report form. It was anticipated that the amendments made will facilitate more effective collection information highlighting examples of effective teaching practice.

5   Higher Education Achievement Record

11.10   Following recommendations made by the Burgess Group as part of their work on 'Measuring and Recording Student Achievement', work has been carried out across the sector to progress towards development of a Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) which it is intended will, in due course, be a replacement for transcripts.

11.11   It is intended that the HEAR will provide a single comprehensive record of a learner's achievement. It will be an electronic document which provided a record of a student's achievements during their time at the University. It will adhere to a template and in its paper form will be no longer than six pages. It will incorporate the requirements of the European Diploma Supplement. It is intended that it serves two functions: (i) as a formative document which may be used from the student's point of entry to the University and (ii) as a formal, exit document made available at the point of graduation. Initially it is intended the HEAR be solely provided for undergraduate students (SCQF 7-10).

11.12   The work in the sector in developing the HEAR has been led by steering group which is being co-ordinated by the Higher Education Academy. The committee noted that an initial group of institutions participated in the phase one trial of the HEAR with a further group being brought

on board earlier this year as part of the phase two trial. It was further noted that the University is one of the institutions participating in the second phase of the trial. One of the reasons for agreeing to take part in this trial was the close alignment of the HEAR proposals with the recommendation made by the Curriculum Reform Commission that the University should develop an Enhanced Graduate Transcript.

11.13 The views of the Committee were sought in connection with a number of issues which had arisen from drafting the HEAR. It was noted that further information on progress with the HEAR would be brought to future meetings of the Committee.

6.   Course and Programme Proposals

11.14 The changes to the list of courses and programmes approved by the Academic Standards Committees at their recent meetings, available at http://www.abdn.ac.uk/senastracking/report/

PRIZES AWARDED 2009/10

12.   The Senate noted that the list of prizes awarded in 2009/2010 was available on the web at: http://www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/prizes.shtml

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

13.1   The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee, on behalf of the Senate, had approved the membership of the Senate Committees, Joint Committees of the Senate and Court and Committees of the Court with Senate representation for 2010/11 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

13.2   The Senate further noted that the Senate Business Committee, on behalf of the Senate had approved the following appointments:

Professor A Saunders as a Governor of the Dick Bequest Trust until 2012

College Postgraduate Officers

Dr A Clarke *vice* Dr J Schaper (with effect from 15 July 2010)
Dr D Duff *vice* Professor A Saunders (from 2010/11)

Directors of Undergraduate Programmes (for sessions 2010/11)
Dr M-L Ehrenschwendtner as Director of Undergraduate Programmes (Divinity)
Dr D Hendry as Director of Undergraduate Programmes (Engineering)
Mrs E Clarke as Director of Undergraduate Programmes (Education)

UHI Research Degrees Sub-Committee
Dr D Hay as the University's representative *vice* Professor G Burgess

Gifford Trust Committee
Dr P Ziegler as Convener *vice* Professor T Salmon
Dr R Plant as a member *vice* Dr P Ziegler

John Reid Board of Governors
Dr J Morrison *vice* Professor T Salmon

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

14.   The Senate noted the outcome of the election of non *ex officio* members to the Senate. All have been elected to serve until 30 September 2014 unless otherwise stated

School of Language & Literature Constituency
Dr M Durham (to 30 September 2012)
Dr J Stewart
Professor M Syrotinski (to 30 September 2012)
Dr T Wills

School of Social Science Constituency
Dr P Bernhagen
Dr A King (to 30 September 2012)
Dr R Vij

School of Medical Sciences Constituency
Dr A Carrington
Dr I Greig
Dr A Jenkinson
Dr D Scott

School of Natural & Computing Sciences Constituency
Dr G Coghill (to 30 September 2012)
Professor T Norman
Dr J Skakle
Dr R Wells

School of Education Constituency
Dr D Robson
Dr DJ Smith

School of Psychology Constituency
Dr R Bull (to 30 September 2012)
Dr D Martin
Dr D Pearson

School of Law Constituency
Mr T Burns
Dr A Pillai
Mr S Styles (to 30 September 2012)

School of Medicine & Dentistry Constituency
Dr J Cleland
Dr A Denison
Dr L-P Erwig
Dr S Fielding
Dr J Francis
Dr H Galley
Ms K Harrild
Professor J Newton (to 30 September 2012)
Dr S Semple

School of Divinity, History & Philosophy Constituency
Dr C Brittain
Dr M Brown (to 30 September 2012)
Dr B Marsden
Dr R O'Connor

Business School

Mr Alex Arthur

School of Geosciences

Dr L Philip
Dr M Reed

School of Biological Sciences

Professor X Lambin
Dr M Young

UPDATES TO THE CODE OF PRACTICE ON SUDENT DISCIPLINE

15.   The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee at its meeting on 9 September 2010 had approved, on behalf of the Senate, minor revisions to the Code of Practice on Student Discipline. These changes were proposed following experience of operating the revised Code approved in June 2009 and related specifically to aspects of the Code relating to non-academic discipline.

COMPOSITION OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

16.   The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee, at its meeting on 9 September 2010 had approved minor revisions to the composition of the Student Affairs Committee to reflect the changes associated with the review of the Teaching & Learning Committee Structure approved by the Senate in June 2010. The changes replaced the Conveners of the Academic Standards Committees with the Conveners of the new Undergraduate and Postgraduate Sub-Committees of UCTL.

RECTORIAL ELECTION

17.   The Senate noted that the Convener of the Senate Business Committee had approved, on behalf of the Committee, the arrangements for the forthcoming Rectorial Election (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).