SENATUS ACADEMICUS

Minutes of the meeting held on 3 May 2006

Present: Principal, Professors Logan, Houlihan, Macaslan, Gane, Haite, Rodger, MacGregor, Hubbuck, Bruce, Racey, Buckland, Chandler, Fraser, Booth, MacDonald, Howe, McCaig, Saunders, Carey Miller, Frost, Fynsk, Secombes, Dr P McGeorge, Professors Hughes, Imrie, Dr P Schlicke, Mrs L Stephen, Professors Burgess, Archbold, Dr P Benson, Professor Blaikie, Mr WTC Brotherstone, Ms L Clark, Dr J Cleland, Dr G Coghill, Professor Duff, Dr S Lawrie, Professors Lurie, Salmon, Dr P Edwards, Dr J Geddes, Dr D Hay, Dr MR Masson, Dr P Mealor, Dr WG Naphy, Dr D Pearson, Dr LJ Philip, Mrs ML Ross, Dr H Sinclair, Dr J Skakle, Dr M Syrotinski, Dr SP Townsend, Dr E van Teijlungen, Professor Wiercigroch, Mr P Richards, Ms F Keefe, Mr A Mack and Mr R Miller.

Apologies: Professors Forrester, Sleeman, Baker, Ritchie, Killham, Flin, Ms M Pearson, Dr WF Long, Dr JC Forbes, Dr J Liversidge, Dr X Lambin, Dr WD McCausland, Dr H McKenzie and Mr J Dunphy.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

102. The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2006 were approved.

STATEMENT BY PRINCIPAL

103.1 The Principal reported that he had received several questions from Senators in regard to the current industrial action, which had been collated and tabled at the meeting (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The majority related to arrangements for the forthcoming examination diet and the Principal indicated that he would ask the Senior Vice-Principal to respond to these questions. Before doing so, however, the Principal responded to two general questions concerning the industrial action.

103.2 In response to a question about the University's representations to UCEA, the Principal reported that it would not be appropriate to discuss the University Managements' communications with UCEA while the University was involved in an industrial dispute with members of the AUT.

103.3 The Principal had also received a question concerning the decision of the University Court to release funding to support the next phase of the development of the proposed new library. While this matter was technically not competent to be discussed at Senate, as it was a Court matter, the Principal indicated that he believed it incumbent on institutions constantly to invest in their staff but also in the environment in which they worked. It was also noted that the Senate Assessors had been at the Court meeting when this decision had been taken.

103.4 In asking Professor Logan to respond to questions concerning assessment, the Principal indicated that the University's Management was determined to take action as appropriate to ensure that students were not disadvantaged by the current dispute.

103.5 Professor Logan acknowledged the recent, excellent, relationships with the campus trade unions, particularly in regard to negotiations on the new Framework Agreement. His recent letters to the University community had highlighted the very positive impact that the Framework Agreement would have on starting salaries for some groups of staff, including academic staff new to the profession. In regard to the current dispute, he had tried to reach a local settlement with the AUT two months ago but had respected their wishes for a national settlement. He reported that the University of St Andrews' AUT Executive had recommended a local settlement to its members. Professor Logan had therefore, on the morning of Senate, informed staff that the University was prepared to make an offer of a pay award over three years as a starting point for discussions to resolve the dispute locally, on condition that the AUT agreed to suspend its industrial action. The AAUT Executive's response was awaited.

103.6 Professor Logan informed Senate that he had been working closely with the Heads of College over the past two months and had met with Heads of School the previous week to discuss student assessment, graduation and progression in light of the current dispute. A number of possible contingency arrangements had been identified, which would be actioned as and when appropriate. The Management's primary concern was that students should graduate and progress on schedule while ensuring that any contingency arrangements maintained the standards of the University's awards. It was apparent that the impact of industrial action would
be variable across the University and that, wherever possible, Heads of School would ask staff who were not involved in the dispute to cover for those who were.

103.7 The Senior Vice-Principal then asked the Vice-Principal (Learning and Teaching) to describe the various contingency measures in more detail, in order to address the questions that had been raised by members of the Senate.

103.8 Ms Macaslan indicated that questions had been received about who would set and invigilate examinations and mark scripts, and whether the University’s assessment policies would be implemented. She reported on a helpful, open, meeting with students the previous day, at which she and the Senior Vice-Principal had been invited by the President of the Students’ Association to answer students’ questions. In confirming that Heads of School were ensuring that standards would be maintained, Ms Macaslan highlighted the key role of External Examiners in approving examination questions and marks, and moderating marks as appropriate. The Colleges were working closely with their Heads of School, and with the central administration, to ensure that examinations were invigilated appropriately, and any invigilators new to the role would receive appropriate induction. And in order to ensure that students graduated on time, Heads of School would ensure that priority in marking scripts was given to final year students (honours and non-honours) and those who would be leaving the University at the end of the academic year (e.g. non-graduating students who would be returning to their home institution): thereafter, marking would be undertaken in the order of levels three, two and one.

103.9 In the discussion that ensued, the following principal points of record were noted:

(i) confirmation from Heads of Schools that they would ensure that those setting and marking examinations had the appropriate experience, and reiteration of the role of External Examiners in maintaining the quality and standards of our assessment processes and awards;
(ii) that Senate (in 1990 and 1993) had agreed that, for example, Teaching Assistants and Teaching Fellows could serve as internal examiners where Heads of Department (now School) were satisfied that the persons concerned were sufficiently experienced to be a competent marker;
(iii) recognition that double internal marking (of honours and postgraduate taught scripts) might not be possible for all courses, and that, in such cases, Heads of School would seek permission for single marking, with a sample being double marked internally wherever possible, but with standards being assured by the usual practice of sending scripts to the External Examiner, as described in the Academic Quality Handbook;
(iv) confirmation that Heads of School would be pleased to hold open meetings for students within their School, with the Students’ Association, to answer students’ concerns;
(v) recognition that the contingency arrangements would not compromise the accreditation of the University’s various degrees by Professional and Statutory Bodies;
(vi) acceptance that general communications to students should also be made available to staff;
(vii) acknowledgement that Examiners might need to consider awarding overall course marks based on a percentage of the total assessment if, for example, an amount of in-course assessment had not taken place: this would be a matter for the Examiners for the courses concerned. A number of scenarios were being considered and would be discussed with Heads of School and External Examiners as appropriate;
(viii) agreement that a “Questions and Answers” document be prepared and made available to students and staff;
(ix) confirmation from Heads of School that the vast majority of examination papers had already been set; and that arrangements were well in hand to set the remaining papers and have them approved by External Examiners, as normal;
(x) a comment that the dispute had resulted in damaging relationships between staff and Management and a view that national, rather than local, negotiation was preferable;
(xi) recognition that at some future date the University Court would be invited to consider what action it wished to take in respect of those members of staff who were engaged in partial performance. Noting that such action might involve the deduction of full pay from those members of staff who continued to refuse to fulfil their contractual obligations.
(xii) an expression of hope from the Students’ Associations that the AAUT would accept the local offer made by the University as a means of ending the dispute quickly and ensuring that students’ graduated and progressed on schedule.

SECOND (FINAL) REPORT OF THE SENATE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW WORKING GROUP

104.1 The Senior Vice-Principal, as Convener of the Senate Effectiveness Review Working Group, presented the Group’s second (and final) report to the Senate (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In doing so, he drew particular attention to Recommendation 17 concerning whether or not holders of Established Chairs should retain their right of membership to the Senate ex officio. During discussion, three members of Senate
supported the retention of such rights. However, a greater number of Senators spoke against Established Chair holders retaining a right of *ex officio* membership. The Principal indicated that the consensus of the meeting was that current holders of Established Chairs should not retain their right of membership of Senate *ex officio*. The Senate therefore approved the following recommendations (the Recommendation numbers continuing in sequence from those approved by the Senate at its meeting on 25 January 2006 (Minute 993 refers):

**Recommendation 16:**

That the student membership of Senate should, in future, include the duly elected post-holders of the Students’ Association, as listed below:

- President of the Students’ Association
- Vice-President (Education & Employability)
- Junior Vice-President (Education & Employability)
- The (currently seven) Area of Study Conveners
- One postgraduate representative from each of the three Colleges

In addition, the Vice-President (Advice & Support) would continue to be in attendance at the Senate.

**Recommendation 17:**

That a draft Ordinance (Appendix A to the Second Report of the Working Group) be approved, for Senate’s part, and forwarded to the University Court (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

**Recommendation 18:**

That a draft Resolution (Appendix B to the Second Report of the Working Group) concerning the Election of Readers and Lecturers to the Senatus Academicus be approved (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). [Minute 107.1 also refers].

**Recommendation 19:**

That the Standing Orders of the Senatus Academicus be revised, as highlighted in Appendix C to the Second Report of the Working Group (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

**Recommendation 20:**

That the University Committee on Teaching and Learning and the Academic Standards Committees operated effectively and that the reporting arrangements that Senate had approved on 25 January 2006 would allow the Senate effectively to monitor and evaluate the performance of these Committees.

**Recommendation 21:**

That the Senate Students’ Progress and Academic Appeals Committees operated effectively and that the current reporting mechanisms for these Committees were appropriate and allowed the Senate effectively to monitor and evaluate the performance of these committees.

**Recommendation 22:**

That the current remits of the Postgraduate Strategy Advisory Group, the Student Recruitment & Admissions Committee and the Academic Standards Committee (Postgraduate) should be reviewed, to ensure that it was clear which committees were responsible for academic governance and oversight of strategic (including policy) direction and development, and where institutional responsibility should be placed for management and executive action, particularly in regard to postgraduate recruitment.

**Recommendation 23:**

That the Honorary Degrees Committee operated effectively and that the current procedures for the consideration and approval of nominations and the reporting mechanisms were appropriate and allowed the Senate effectively to monitor and evaluate the performance of this Committee.
Recommendation 24:

That the Student Disciplinary Committee operated effectively and that the current reporting mechanisms for student disciplinary cases, including those considered by the Student Disciplinary Committee, were appropriate and allowed the Senate effectively to monitor and evaluate the performance of the University's student disciplinary processes.

Recommendation 25:

That it should be for the Conveners of relevant committees, working with Officers and the Senate Business Committee, as appropriate, to determine the items that should be referred to the Senate (via the Senate website, where appropriate) from committees of the Senate and joint committees of the Senate and Court.

Recommendation 26:

That the Senate Business Committee be given delegated authority to approve nominations (by Heads of College, where appropriate) for membership of Committees of the Senate, Joint Committees of the Senate and Court, and Committees of the Court with Senate representatives.


105. The Senior Vice-Principal invited members of Senate to email Mrs Schofield in the Policy, Planning and Governance Office with any comments on the first draft of the Strategic Plan. The Plan would then be updated and considered by various committees before being brought back to the Senate at its next meeting.

**SENATE MEETING: 1 MARCH 2006**

106.1 The Senate noted that, due to the cancellation of the meeting on 1 March 2006 and in view of the need to progress certain matters, the Principal, acting on behalf of the Senate, had taken Convener's Action to approve the following:

1. **Draft Resolution No 1 of 2006**  
   [Sixth Amendment to Schedule A to the University Court Ordinance No. 111 (Election of Readers and Lecturers to the Senatus Academicus)]

107.1 The Principal approved, on behalf of the Senate and on the recommendation of the Senate Effectiveness Review Working Group, the draft Resolution concerning the Election of Readers and Lecturers to the Senatus Academicus, which the University Court, at its meeting on 7 February 2006, had made generally available for consultation. (Appendix B to the Second Report of the Senate Effectiveness Review Working Group refers: see Minute 104.1).

2. **Validation Agreement with the International Christian College**

107.2 The Principal approved, for Senate's part and on the recommendation of the two Academic Standards Committees, a draft Validation Agreement between the University and the International Christian College (ICC) in regard to the delivery of undergraduate and postgraduate taught and research programmes in Divinity and Religious Studies, and authorised Officers to approve any minor changes that may be proposed by ICC, after consultation with the Convener of the Validation Panel.

3. **Information Strategy Committee**

107.3 The Principal, on behalf of the Senate, approved a recommendation from the Joint Information Strategy Committee (JISC) that its title be changed to “Information Strategy Committee” (ISC) in order to avoid confusion with the national “Joint Information Systems Committee” (JISC); and, at the suggestion of the Senate, agreed an amendment to the remit of the Information Strategy Committee, to provide it with powers to co-opt members.

4. **Graduations In Absentia**

107.4 The Principal, on behalf of the Senate, conferred degrees on, and awarded diplomas and other qualifications to, those eligible for such awards who had applied to have them conferred in absentia (see appendix to Minutes of June 2006).
REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT
(7 February 2006)

1. Draft Resolution No < > of 2006
[Changes in Regulations for Various Degrees]

108.1 The Senate noted that the Court had received the draft Resolution, from the Senate, and agreed to forward it to the General Council and to make it generally available in terms of Section 6 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966.

2. Policy on Student Complaints

108.2 The Senate noted that the Court, for its part, had approved the changes to the University's Policy on Student Complaints.

3. Progression and Articulation Agreement with Aberdeen College

108.3 The Senate noted that the Court, for its part, had approved a revised Progression and Articulation Agreement with Aberdeen College.

4. Draft Resolution No < > of 2006
[Sixth Amendment to Schedule A to University Court Ordinance No 111
(Election of Readers and Lecturers to the Senatus Academicus)]

108.4 The Senate noted that the Court had received the draft Resolution, from the Senate, and had agreed to forward it to the General Council and to make it generally available in terms of Section 6 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966.

5. Established Chair Holders and Membership of Senate

108.5 The Senate noted that the Court, for its part, had approved the recommendation from Senate, arising from its Effectiveness Review that those appointed to Established Chairs (either new or vacant) in the future would no longer have automatic right of membership of the Senate ex officio (but would be eligible to stand for election to Senate).

6. Senate Assessors on Joint Planning, Finance & Estates Committee

108.6 The Senate noted that the Court had received the recommendation from Senate, arising from its Effectiveness Review, that in order to secure representation from each of the three Colleges, the number of Senate Assessors on the Joint Planning, Finance & Estates Committee be increased from two to three.

108.7 The Senate noted that the Court had agreed to refer this change to the Joint Planning Finance and Estates Committee to be considered by it in the first instance.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT
(21 March 2006)

1. Library Project

109.1 The Senate noted that the Court had received proposals for the development of a new University Library. The Court had approved:

(i) Expenditure of £55.5 million for the construction of a new library as part of the University's 10-year infrastructure plan for capital developments.

(ii) The immediate release of £2.25 million to enable the library project to be taken to the submission of a planning application (Royal Institute of British Architects Stage D Detailed Proposals).
2. Progress of Resolutions No 244 & No 245

109.2 The Senate noted that the Court had approved the following Resolutions which had previously been approved by the General Council and the Senate:

Resolution No 244 of 2006 [Changes in Regulations for Various Degrees]

Resolution No 245 of 2006
[Sixth Amendment to Schedule A to University Court Ordinance No.111 (Election of Readers and Lecturers to the Senatus Academicus)]

3. Progress of Ordinances No 135 & 136

109.3 The Senate noted that the Court had noted that the following Ordinances, which had previously been approved by the General Council and Senate, had been passed by Her Majesty in Council on 14 February 2006.

Ordinance No 135 [Power to Extend the University of Aberdeen by Affiliating Colleges and Other Educational Bodies] and Ordinance No 136 [Power to Incorporate into the University of Aberdeen Other Universities, Colleges and Other Educational bodies]

4. Joint Information Strategy Committee/Information Strategy Committee

109.4 The Senate noted that the Court had approved a recommendation from the Senate and the Joint Information Strategy Committee that:

(i) the Committee be renamed the “Information Strategy Committee”

(ii) the Committee should have the power to co-opt members.

REPORT FROM THE JOINT PLANNING, FINANCE AND ESTATES COMMITTEE

109.5 The Senate noted the actions taken by the Joint Planning, Finance and Estates Committee at its meeting of 25 January 2006, as under:

1. Admissions Targets for Entry 2006/07

109.6 The Committee received and considered a paper on the 2005/06 student population and approved admissions targets for entry in the academic year 2006/07.

2. Going Rates for Admission 2007/08

109.7 The Committee approved the recommendation of the Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee for minor changes to the going rates for entry to the BSc and MBChB.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

1. Monitoring of Students’ Progress

110.1 The Senate received a report from the University Committee on Teaching and Learning (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) and approved the following recommendations in regard to the system for monitoring students’ progress:

(i) that the sanction of class certificate refusal by Schools be reinstated with effect from session 2006/07 with a requirement that students who were ‘at risk’ of losing a class certificate must first be reported through the system for monitoring students’ progress before a class certificate was refused. This system would apply to all courses at all levels of study at undergraduate level.

(ii) that the timing of commencement of student monitoring be brought forward to the start of week 4 of teaching in each half-session with the unauthorised change of curriculum exercise no longer operating.

(iii) that the following revisions be made to the General Regulations:
Regulation 1.2

For the existing regulation substitute the following:

‘Notwithstanding the definition of ‘class certificate’ in 1.1 above, a student who is in Academic Years 2003/04 to 2005/06 was validly registered by their Adviser of Studies for a course, and who had not withdrawn from the course before the last day of teaching (or deemed to have withdrawn, in accordance with Regulation 1.3 below), was normally regarded as having obtained a Class Certificate for that course. This applied automatically unless, exceptionally, the Academic Standards Committee (Undergraduate), on application from the Head of the School concerned, had decided that it would be impossible to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes for the course concerned without re-attendance.

Regulation 1.3

In the second sentence of the existing regulation for ‘Adviser of Studies’ replace ‘Head of School or the Director of Undergraduate programmes for their Area of Study, as appropriate.’.

Regulation 7

To the existing regulation add a final sentence to read as follows:

‘The provisions of this Regulation apply equally to students deemed withdrawn from a course under Regulation 1.3, above.

In approving the above, the Senate agreed to refer to the University Committee on Teaching and Learning proposals that consideration be given to (a) the feedback that was provided to Schools before they decided to refuse Class Certificates and (b) the criteria under which appeals against Class Certificate refusal might be upheld in order to assist Heads of School in reaching decisions to withhold Class Certificates.

2. Resits at Level 4 and above

110.2 The Senate noted that the UCTL had approved a Guidance Note for Schools in regard to resit arrangements for courses at Level 4 and above.

110.3 With effect from 2004/05, candidates admitted to an Honours programme had been required to meet the credit requirements set out in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) for the award of an Honours degree. This brought in a new requirement for resits in courses at Level 4 or above. In addressing this change, it had been acknowledged that it would be important in implementing the new resit requirement to avoid unnecessary delay in graduation for students.

110.4 Accordingly, provision was included in General Regulation 21 to allow a Head of School in consultation with the External Examiner and the Convener of the Academic Standards Committee to agree an alternative timing and format for the resit examination. In the light of queries raised in regard to the possible acceptable alternative resit arrangements, it had been agreed that a Guidance Note would be helpful for Schools.

3. Equality and Diversity

110.5 The Senate noted that the UCTL had approved, for its part, the Equality and Diversity Policy and the Policy on Age Diversity.

4. Rules for the Conduct of Prescribed Assessments and Written Examinations for Degrees or Diplomas

110.6 The Senate noted that the UCTL had approved a revision to Section 4.10 of Appendix 7.1 of the Academic Quality Handbook “Rules for the Conduct of Prescribed Assessments and Written Examinations for Degrees or Diplomas”. This revision introduced provision to permit students to bring bottled water into examinations. Currently the rules do not permit candidates to consume any food or drink in examinations. However, anecdotal evidence suggested that invigilators did not take drinks away from students who brought them into examinations. In addition, there was thought to be a relationship between hydration and concentration.
1. Validation Agreement with the Highland Theological College

111.1 The Senate approved, for its part, on the recommendation of the two Academic Standards Committees, and agreed to forward to the University Court, a Validation Agreement between the University and the Highland Theological College (HTC) in regard to the delivery of the Degree of Master of Theology (MTh) (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Senate noted that the Validation Panel's report was available at: http://www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal/documents/htcvalreport_090306.doc. As the Agreement was currently also being considered by HTC, the Senate agreed to authorise Officers to approve any minor changes that might be proposed by HTC, after consultation with the Convener of the Validation Panel.

2. Regulation 24 for Research Degrees: Possible Outcome of Thesis Examination

111.2 The Senate received a paper outlining the rationale for changing Regulation 24 for Research Degrees (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) and agreed to approve, for its part, revisions to Regulation 24 for Research Degrees, as under:

Regulation 24

For the existing regulation, substitute the following:

‘The Academic Standards Committee (Postgraduate), having considered the reports of all the Examiners appointed, may on first examination: (i) decide that the thesis be sustained, if appropriate subject to minor corrections; (ii) decide that, though they are unable to recommend that the thesis be sustained, a candidate may re-submit the thesis in a revised form, for the same degree, within a stated period, which shall not exceed twelve months; (iii) decide that a candidate, whose thesis does not meet the standards for the degree as specified in Regulation 23 but which does meet the standards specified in Regulation 23 for a lower degree appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate is registered, be awarded the latter degree without further examination; (iv) decide that they are unable to recommend that the thesis be sustained and that the candidate may re-submit the thesis in a revised form for a lower degree, within a stated period which shall not exceed twelve months; or (v) decide that the thesis be not sustained.

When the thesis is re-submitted (see (ii) and (iv) above), the Examiners, who shall normally be those appointed to examine the original submission, may: (vi) decide that the thesis be sustained, if appropriate subject to minor corrections; (vii) decide that a candidate, whose thesis does not meet the standards for the degree as specified in Regulation 23 but which does meet the standards specified in Regulation 23 for another degree appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate is registered, be awarded the latter degree without further examination; or (viii) decide that the thesis be not sustained.

Only one re-submission of a thesis will be permitted, irrespective of the degree being considered.

Where a candidate has failed to meet the standards required for award of any degree but has produced work that, in the opinion of the Examiners, is of sufficient merit to warrant formal recognition, it shall be in the power of the Examiners to recommend the award of a Certificate of Postgraduate Research Studies in the discipline concerned.

Where the examiners decide that, though they are unable to recommend that the thesis be sustained, a candidate may re-submit the thesis in a revised form, for the same degree, within a stated period which shall not exceed twelve months (see (ii) above), but where the candidate indicates that they do not wish to resubmit, the examiners may decide that a candidate, whose thesis does not meet the standards for the degree as specified in Regulation 23 but which does meet the standards specified in Regulation 23 for another degree appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate is registered, be awarded the latter degree without further examination (see (iii) above).’

3. New and Discontinued Courses and Programmes

111.3 The Senate noted that the Academic Standards Committees, on the recommendation of the relevant Colleges, had approved changes to the list of courses and programmes available as under:
(A) INDIVIDUAL DEGREE AND DIPLOMA COURSES (UNDERGRADUATE)

Agriculture and Forestry
Withdrawal of courses: AG3814, OA4001, LM3007, LM3801 and LM4001

Anthropology
Introduction of new level 2 course: ‘Understanding Social Relations (for medical students)’

Centre for Lifelong Learning

Cultural History
Introduction of new level 3 course: ‘Civilisation?’
Withdrawal of course: CU3006

Divinity
Introduction of new level 1 course: ‘Introduction to the History of Ancient Israel’
Introduction of new level 2 courses: ‘Old Testament Theology (with texts in English)’, ‘Old Testament Theology (with texts in Hebrew)’ ‘Psalms and Wisdom (with texts in English)’; ‘Psalms and Wisdom (with texts in Hebrew)’.
Withdrawal of courses: DR1526 and DR3065.

Education

French
Introduction of new level 4 course: ‘Dissertation’

Geography and Environment
Withdrawal of courses: GG3018, GG3033, GG3522, GG3538, GG4034, GG4012, GG4522, GG4534, LE3020, LE4030 and LE4521

Geology
Introduction of new level 3 course: ‘Petroleum Geology Dissertation’

German
Introduction of new Level 3 course: ‘Filming German History A’
Introduction of new Level 4 course: ‘Filming German History B’

History
Introduction of new level 1 courses: ‘The End Of The Roman Empire: Post Colonial Approaches’, ‘Vikings!’

Introduction of new level 3 course: ‘Interwar Europe: Comparative Aspects Of Domestic Policies In Germany, France And Britain’.

Withdrawal of course: HI1013.

History of Art

Introduction of new level 3 course: ‘From Barbizon To Impressionism: Painting In France’.

International Relations

Withdrawal of course: IR3002.

Land Economy


Law


Marine Resource Management


Molecular and Cell Biology

Introduction of new level 2 course: ‘Foundations of Microbiology and Immunology’

Withdrawal of course: BI25M3.

Philosophy


Plant and Soil Science

Withdrawal of course: FY4004

School of Medical Sciences


Sociology

Introduction of new level 4 courses: ‘International Migration’; ‘Immigrants, Refugees And Expatriates, Political Sociology’.

Zoology


Withdrawal of courses: BI4001, BI4004, BI4005
(B) UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE AND DEGREE PROGRAMMES

Arts


Bachelor of Science

Introduction of new single honours programme: ‘Developmental Biology (Embryos, Stem Cells and Birth Defects)’

Introduction of new single honours programme: ‘Biomedical Sciences (Developmental Biology)’

(C) POSTGRADUATE COURSES

School of Biological Sciences


Business School


School of Divinity, History and Philosophy


Withdrawal of courses: DR5065/5565; DR5517; HA 5901 and HI5039/5539.

School of Education

Introduction of new level 5 course: ‘Mentoring’

School of Geosciences


Withdrawal of courses: GG 5012; GG 5015; GG 5016; GG 5301; GG 5504; GG 5703 and GG 5802.

School of Language and Literature


Withdrawal of course: EL5515
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School of Law


School of Medical Sciences

Introduction of new level 5 courses: ‘Bio-business Stage 2’; ‘International Health’; ‘International Health Thesis’. ‘Mechanisms that Regulate Adaptation to Exercise, Molecular Exercise Physiology Methods’; ‘Molecular Exercise Physiology Topics’; ‘Literature Review in Molecular Exercise Physiology’; ‘Research Proposal in Molecular Exercise Physiology’

School of Social Science


(D) POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

Business School

Introduction of new programmes: MSc/PgDip/PgCert in International Real Estate Markets; MBA/PgDip/PgCert in International Health Care Management and Leadership, MSc/PgDip/PgCert in Corporate Finance; MSc/PgDip/PgCert in Accounting and Finance

School of Divinity, History and Philosophy

Introduction of new programmes: MLitt/PgDip/PgCert in Jewish Studies; MTh in Practical Theology and Christian Ethics; MSc/PgDip in Himalayan Ethnobotany; MRes/PgDip in Himalayan Studies

Withdrawal of programme: Mth in Ministry and Mission

School of Language and Literature

Introduction of new programmes: MLitt/PgDip in Celtic Studies; MLitt/PgDip in The Novel.

School of Medical Sciences

Introduction of new programme: MSc/PgDip/PgCert in Molecular Exercise Physiology

School of Medicine

Introduction of new programme: ‘MSc/PgDip in International Health and Management’.

School of Medical Sciences and School of Medicine

Introduction of new programme: MSc/PgDip/PgCert in Research Technologies

School of Social Science

Introduction of new programmes: MLitt/PgDip/PgCert in Advanced Qualitative Methods; MLitt/PgDip/PgCert in Globalization; MLitt/PgDip in International Relations; MLitt/PgDip/PgCert in Religion and Society
112. In view of the interest in the development of degree programmes in collaboration with other Higher Education Institutions, the Senate noted that the University was in discussion with the Privy Council in regard to extending the University’s powers to allow the conferral of degrees with other institutions that had such powers themselves.

DATES OF SENATE MEETINGS

113. The Senate noted that meetings would be held at 2.00 p.m. on the following Wednesdays in the academic year 2006-2007:


GRADUATIONS IN ABSENTIA

114.1 The Senate noted that details of those qualified to receive degrees, diplomas and other awards who had applied to have them conferred in absentia could be viewed in the Registry (see appendix to Minutes of June 2006).

114.2 The Senate agreed to confer the degrees on, and award the diplomas and other qualifications to, the persons stated.