

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2012

Present: Principal, Professors Logan, Hannaford, McGeorge, Morgan, Rodger, Wallace, Greaves, MacGregor and Ross, Ms AM Slater, Professors Craig, Coyle, Zalewski, Skakle and Lumsden, Dr S Davies, Dr R Wells, Professors Schaper and Naphy, Dr B Connolly, Dr J Masthoff, Dr D Hendry, Dr M Ehrenschwendtner, Dr K Shennan, Dr Bunduchi, Dr J Lamb, Dr WD McCausland, Dr C Brittain, Dr K Friedrich, Dr D Robson, Dr Y Bain, Dr E Curtis, Ms S Cornelius, Dr J Stewart, Dr G Sharman, Dr K Groo, Dr T Burns, Professor Duff, Dr A Simpson, Dr J Sternberg, Dr A Jenkinson, Dr I Greig, Dr D Scott, Dr J Barrow, Dr A Rajnicek, Dr P Teismann, Dr H Galley, Dr S Semple, Professor Schwarzbauer, Dr K Khalaf, Dr M Cruickshank, Dr L Aucott, Dr R MacKenzie, Professor Newton, Dr D Pearson, Dr D Martin, Dr S Duthie, Dr L Williams, Dr M Kashtalyan, Dr D Pokrajac, Professor Chandler, Dr J Keifer, Dr A Akisanya, Dr L Philip, Dr A McLaughlin, Dr F Guerin. Dr N Oren, Dr N Vargesson, Professor Hutchison, Miss AC Deseillingy, Miss J Bjorkqvist, Miss M Dunn, Mr M Kania, Mr R Henthorn, Miss HL Smith, Miss CC Hunter, Miss L Reid, Mr HD Naio, Miss R Munday, Mr P Bond, Mr J Douglas, Miss G Maerker, Miss Z McKellar, Mr M Burke and Mr G Maloney

Apologies: Professor Haites, Dr Morrison, Professors Buckland, Baggs, McCaig, Macrae, Reid, Soulsby, O'Donoghue, Gow and Nelson, Mr M Radford, Dr Lawrie, Mrs M Beaton, Professor Ritchie, Ms C Banks, Professor Dawson, Dr R O'Connor, Dr A Dilley, Dr A Bryzgel, Dr P Mealor, Dr DJ Smith, Dr T Wills, Dr A Pillai, Dr P Bernhagen, Dr R Vij, Dr M Mills, Dr L Bennie, Professor Lambin, Dr A Carrington, Dr J Cleland, Dr A Denison, Dr LP Erwig, Dr S Fielding, Professor J Francis, Professor S Heys, Dr M Reed, Professor D MacDonald, Dr TFJ Norman, Dr AD King and Professor Edwards

In opening the meeting, the Principal welcomed members to the first Senate of 2012–2013 and those members attending their first meeting in particular.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 1.1 The Senate was invited to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2012.

STATEMENT BY PRINCIPAL

- 2.1 The Principal welcomed the Senate to the first meeting of the academic year with a particular welcome to the new Senators. On behalf of Senate the Principal thanked all those who had been involved in the British Science Festival, which had been a great success and an event that did much to enhance the profile of the University. The Principal informed the Senate of his recent trip to East Asia with the University Secretary where they had attended the signing ceremony for the Aberdeen Confucius Institute and added that the Secretary would be attending the Confucius Institute Conference later in 2012. During the visit to East Asia, a special tartan was presented to the University of Hong Kong as part of its centenary celebrations and in recognition of Aberdeen's involvement in the founding of the University. The Principal thanked all those who had been involved in the 'Scotland in China' week of events. The Principal informed Senate that the Prime Minister and President of Brazil had recently signed the 'Science Without Borders' understanding and that this would provide opportunities for students to come to Aberdeen with funding from the Brazilian Government.

DELIVERING A HIGH QUALITY ON STUDENT EXPERIENCE 2012

- 3.1 The Vice-Principal (Learning and Teaching) outlined the report on Delivering a High Quality on Student Experience 2012 (copy filed with principal copy of the minutes). The Vice-Principal emphasized that this was the first time all of these data had been brought together in this way and said Senate's comments on whether or not the style of the paper was right and whether or not it delivered the correct level of detail would be welcome. He reported that the data from the institutional survey indicate that a high number of students report having a positive experience, particularly in relation to the quality of teaching, resources (e.g. the library) and personal development. The areas that were reported as needing improvement were feedback, academic and pastoral support and timetabling. The Vice-Principal added that the issues relating to timetabling were complex and made so by the very high numbers of courses that the University ran. The University is continuing to improve retention and the numbers of students failing to progress was now lower than at any point since retention data had begun to be collected. The numbers of students in graduate employment 6 months after graduation is continuing to improve in spite of the very competitive external environment. Though there was a positive response from students to the NSS questions regarding personal development, the annual graduate attribute survey indicated that students were often not able to articulate examples of these skills at interview, for example, so more work does need to be done.
- 3.2 The Principal then asked Senate whether there were points of fact they wished to question in each of the five areas of the report, namely, Feedback, Academic and Pastoral Support, Timetabling, Retention, and Employability.
- It was asked how representative the figures were and how the surveys were conducted. The Vice-Principal responded to say that the National Student Survey (NSS) was conducted online across the UK and that the questions were set centrally. A subset of the data was published as part of the Key Information Set (KIS). In order to count, the numbers of respondents in each area had to reach a certain level. The Institutional Survey was run using the same tool as the Student Course Evaluation Form (SCEF) exercise. The Vice-Principal reported that the response rate this year had been ~40%, which represented 3300 students.
 - In relation to Employability, a member informed Senate of the Level 1 course run by the School of Education 'Learning from Work' which prepared students in the skills they would need for the workplace.
 - The style and format of the report were confirmed as being appropriate.

REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR

- 4.1 The Vice-Principal (Learning and Teaching) updated the Senate on the Review of the Academic Year (copy filed with principal copy of the minutes). He informed Senate that the Review had been undertaken for three reasons: (i) pedagogic – what would work best for the delivery of teaching and learning, (ii) introducing similarity to other Scottish universities, and (iii) at the request of the previous President of the Aberdeen University Students' Association (AUSA) who had a mandate to seek the move of the first half session examinations to before the Christmas break. A working group had been convened chaired by the College of Physical Sciences (CoPS) Director of Teaching and Learning (DoTL). The membership included staff from across the University, student representatives and the AUSA President and President Education and Employability. The Group had a considerable number of meetings and conducted extensive consultations. The Vice-Principal reported that the proposed new structure for the academic year has a number of advantages over the existing structure. The first was that having examinations before Christmas may improve retention figures in that students would not have to fear coming back to examinations that they thought they might not do well in. The second advantage was that December examinations would eliminate the clash between teaching and marking in the second half session. It was emphasized that time was put aside for marking and staff would not be expected to mark over the Christmas break. The third advantage is that students would have more meaningful advising sessions as the

outcome of the examinations would be known before they began their second half session courses. Fourth, there would now be time for a second half session induction. The fifth advantage was that overseas visiting students would be able to take their examinations alongside the other students and would not need to fly back to Aberdeen after Christmas just for the examination or would not need special arrangements to take the examination elsewhere. Sixth, the earlier resit diet would mean that students had better preparatory support as staff would be on campus after the main examination diet and leading up to the resit diet and, seventh, resit students would have more time between resits and the start of the new session to relax and prepare. The eighth advantage was that the new model brought Aberdeen in line with Scotland's other universities.

4.2 The Vice-Principal then invited the Convener of the Working Group to add further comment. The Convener stated that the Working Group had had extensive and lively debate in the process of redesigning the academic year and that the group accepted that no model would suit everyone; however, the Group believed that the proposed model was the optimum model and the one that best supported and enhanced the student experience.

4.3 There then followed a discussion, the main points of which are summarised below.

4.3.1 Of the members that were against the proposal, the comments were as follows:

- The AUSA President reported that the student body had undertaken a referendum about the change to the academic year. Of the nine Schools that returned a quorate vote, seven Schools voted against the proposal. The main reasons were (i) the loss of a teaching week, (ii) the length of the first half-session, and (iii) the difficulty for those whose assessment was 100% exam and who could no longer revise over the Christmas break. Whilst the student body had previously wanted examinations before Christmas, in seeing the implications for the rest of the academic year the student body no longer supported the change. Another member added concerns that even though there was a reduction in the number of teaching weeks, there should not be a reduction in the number of contact hours. The member added that this was a particular concern of students in the College of Arts and Social Science (CASS) where it was felt that the number of contact hours was already too low.
- One member commented that while the pedagogic arguments for change were good, the new model posed resourcing difficulties for those Schools that taught six-week threaded courses and that the timescale for implementation would have to take account of the significant changes that would have to be made in those Schools. The Convener of the Working Group reassured Senate that the issues around six-week courses had been considered at some length and that many Schools had already made the transition.
- Another member voiced the view that staff morale was at an all-time low and that the increased pressure on staff with the implementation of CRef and need for new SENAS forms meant that yet another change and longer half-sessions would be too much.
- Another member commented that students would be required to be on campus for 15 weeks without a break and that this was far too long and would lead to an increase in stress-related illness. It was added that as the first half session would end later it might be difficult for students to get home if bad weather caused disruption to travel. In addition, it was thought that students who felt they had not done well in the December examinations would not come back in January, thus making retention figures worse.
- A member commented that the change could impact on students' finances given that they would not be able to work in the lead up to Christmas because they would be revising for and sitting examinations. It was added that travel in the week before Christmas is more expensive and this would impact on overseas students.
- One member commented that in areas where the students had to acquire a great deal of knowledge in the first half session the students would not have time to do this if the examinations were in December. It was considered that more time should be given so that all of the issues that might arise as a result were considered fully. Another member added that in addition to the pressure before Christmas there would be less support for students running up to the May examinations also, though added that it was better that there was a longer break between the end of resits and the start of the new session.

4.3.2 Of the members that supported the proposal, the comments were as follows:

- One member who supported the new model commented that it laid out very good reasons for why the University should change. The proposal was far better than the model that had been put to Senate two years previously.
- A member stated that while generally supportive of the model, it was wondered why the new model still included a resit diet and why the University had not opted to do what many other universities do, namely to have the resits along with the main examination diets in January and May. The Working Group Convener responded to say that that option had been discussed and that the option would not be excluded. Another member agreed that there could be no simple model that would please everyone and that they were generally supportive of the proposed model, but wondered why there had been no inclusion of an improved turnaround time for marking.
- In response to the comment about the loss of a teaching week, a member commented that there would not be a loss of a teaching week because in reality many courses currently did not run for the full twelve weeks. The member added other universities in Scotland had moved to such a model and the student bodies in those universities were happy with the new model. Another member confirmed that their School did not teach the full twelve weeks.
- In response to the comment about the difficulties for Schools running six-week courses, a member commented that with creative thought the existing six-week courses could be remodeled without significant impact on the staff resource. The member added that the new model should be seen as an opportunity to look at the structure of courses and forms of assessment used, which could only be a good thing. Another member added that their School was supportive of the new model and saw the required review of assessment and teaching to be a positive thing. Another member agreed with this, adding that this should not be seen as a change but as an improvement, and that the improvement was being made for student-oriented reasons. The member added that without such improvements the University would become ossified and that could never be desirable.
- One member commented that their School had some concerns about how the shorter teaching session might impact on workload but that most colleagues supported the new model as many aspects of the existing structure are seen as dysfunctional. As an Adviser the new model was particularly appealing as it allowed for informed advising and an induction at the start of the second half session. It was also stated that while the concerns of the students must be taken seriously, it was noted by many Schools that student attendance at the end of the first half session is often very poor and the new model would encourage students to take better advantage of the revision week. The other great advantage would be that all teaching in the second half session finished before the Easter break. The member added that the issues surrounding six-week courses and assessment based on 100% examination were separate to any debate about a change in the academic year and should not prohibit the implementation of the new model. Another member seconded this opinion, stating that there were many problems created for advising with the existing structure.
- Another member commented that having examinations in December and therefore having results in January would mean that Aberdeen students wanting to get internships would now be better placed to compete with their peers at Glasgow, St Andrew's and Edinburgh. Another member added that while Senate should be sensitive to the intensity of the first half session, the ability to properly relax over the Christmas break would be invaluable. For students it would mean that they could spend quality time with their friends and family rather than having to revise. And in response to the comment about the expense of travel before Christmas, a member commented that travel could be less expensive as overseas students would not have to pack books for revision. It was added that this model worked for other universities without problem.

4.4 The President of the Aberdeen University Student Association then asked if Senate could vote on the proposal and the Principal then called the Senate to vote on the adoption of the academic year as proposed in the paper. The outcome was: 58 For; 25 Against; 8 Abstain.

REPORT FROM THE WORKING GROUP ON COMMON ASSESSMENT SCALE AND HONOURS DEGREE CLASSIFICATION

5.1 The Vice-Principal (Learning and Teaching) updated Senate on the Report from the Working Group on the Common Assessment Scale and Honours Degree Classification (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes). He reported that the main reasons for the review were the lack of transparency with the existing system, that the University was out of step with the assessment scales used in other universities and that external examiners generally criticized the system in their reports. Moreover, the 2010 Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR) had highlighted CAS and the Grade Spectrum as requiring review. In relation to the lack of transparency, the Vice-Principal stated that the main issue was that CAS used a scale that looked like numbers but that could not be treated as such and that Schools or students might 'average', 'round up' or 'round down' component CAS marks to obtain course or element of assessment marks – which was inappropriate. Another issue was that marks for elements of assessment were awarded on a 20-point scale, but in calculating classification these marks were collapsed into bands (e.g. First: 18,19,20; 2i: 15,16,17; 2ii:12,13,14; 3rd: 9, 10, 11), which tended to have greater impact on classification for students with borderline marks. There are added anomalies with classification by way of the caveats in the regulations that penalise candidates with just one low mark. The Vice-Principal reported that the Working Group had rigorous discussion about the various models that might be used, and the resulting proposed model has now been through various of the University Committees several times. The Vice-Principal asked Senate to endorse the four principles of the new model and stated that any additional detail would be reported at the February Senate. The four principles of the new model were as follows. (i) Replace CAS with an alpha-numeric scale (e.g. A1, A2, B1, B2, etc.). (ii) Have associated level descriptors by grade and year of study. (iii) Have consistent and transparent mapping from an underlying numeric scale to the alpha-numeric scale. (iv) Capture the 'grade point average' across all four years of study and report this on the transcript.

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

- A member commented that students were very happy that the University had decided to move away from CAS to a system that would have clear descriptors. However, it was wondered why the University had not chosen to do what most other universities do, namely use a straightforward percentage scale. It was thought that the proposed alpha-numeric scale and conversion from one scale to another was too complicated and could still lead to a lack of transparency.
- Another member agreed that transparency was not guaranteed with the new model because all students do not see the marks given to all students and they would therefore not be able to tell whether or not the conversion had been used consistently for all students. This lack of transparency would be eliminated with a sole percentage scale.
- Another member supported the move away from CAS as many interpreted the current scale as meaning that students needed to achieve 45% to pass. It was added, though, that if students were not given the percentage mark as well as the alpha-numeric mark then it would still not be clear what percentage one needed in order to pass.
- A member in support of the new model stressed the advantages of having a mechanism where numbers could be aggregated over the current mechanism that used a median score for classification. It was also emphasized that the current use of the word 'normally' in the regulations was open to interpretation and that it would be much better to have a system that was absolute.
- One member considered the descriptors (e.g., excellent, very good) not to be appropriate for degree-level programmes. The member agreed that a single aggregation scale should be used as the proposed model still allowed manipulation of the figures between the percentage and alpha-numeric scale.
- One member commented that students should be able to make mistakes and have time to get the balance right between academic study, work and social life in their first year, in particular, and it was therefore a concern that the 'grade point average' was to be calculated across all four years. Another member agreed, adding that in his first and

second years he had been told by his lecturers that all he had to do was pass – it would not be fair for such students to get the enhanced transcript when they had been led to believe that their first and second year marks were not important. In addition, the member agreed that the enhanced transcript put far greater stress on students in their first and second years. In response, another member stated that this could be a positive incentive for students to start out as they intended to continue, by motivating them to do well in their first and second years.

- In response to the member who asked whether or not it was correct that current third year students would be the first to get the grade-point average in their transcripts, the Vice-Principal clarified that this was not the case.

One member commented that although supportive of the change, to introduce this alongside the implementation of the personal tutor system and the change in the academic year would be too much.

- 5.3 The Principal thanked Senate for the very useful discussion and asked the Group in its deliberations to consider the comments and suggestions made, particularly those regarding the benefits of using a simple system that was completely transparent.

UPDATE ON RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK

- 6.1 The Vice-Principal (Research and Knowledge Exchange) updated Senate on the Research Excellence Framework (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes). He reported that the University code of practice on equality and diversity policy in the REF2014 submission process had now been agreed and that selection of staff would be taking place over the next two months. The University would use the process as an opportunity to reduce, where appropriate staff circumstances apply, the overall number of outputs per individual and increase the overall quality profile of the submission. It was reported that a mock review had been undertaken in September and this had been very useful in providing information regarding the shape of the units of assessment, with the shape for all but one of the units of assessment now being known. The Senior Vice-Principal then concluded the update by reporting that the overall likely size of the submission will be known by the next meeting of Senate.

STUDENT REGISTRATIONS 2012/13

- 7.1 The University Secretary updated Senate on Student Registrations 2012/13 (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes). He reported that the target for RUK students (450) had not been met, with only ~300 having registered. This number was higher than last year but still short of the target figure set as a consequence of changing government policy. The University had over-recruited Home and EU students and entry targets for 2013–14 would be adjusted accordingly.
- 7.2 There then followed a discussion, the main points of which are summarised below:
- One member commented that the figures for postgraduate research students were confusing in that the decrease of ~15% in just one year suggested that registrations must be down by ~40%. The member also asked whether the numbers indicated a blip or a trend. The University Secretary clarified that the ~15% drop reflected a very large cohort that had graduated in addition to a smaller intake of registrations.
 - Another member commented that raised tariff together with the £9k fee for RUK students would discourage those students even more. The University Secretary clarified that the tariff referred to the Higher/A level grades not to the fees, but acknowledged these factors would have to be considered. It was considered important that the University attracted the best students.
 - A member asked how this would affect widening access and how the University would ensure that the best students from all backgrounds would gain access to the University,

particularly those identified in the Scottish Index of Material Deprivation (SIMD) areas. The University Secretary confirmed that widening access was considered and that procedures were already in place to take account of School background and the affect this might have on grades.

OUTCOME AGREEMENTS WITH SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL

- 8.1 The Senior Vice-Principal updated Senate on Outcome Agreements with Scottish Funding Council (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes). The Senior Vice-Principal reported that the SFC have accepted the outcome agreement and that the additional funding has been made available. Meetings for the next outcome agreement are already underway.
- 8.2 There then followed a discussion, the main points of which are summarised below:
- The President of AUSA stated that widening access was very important to students in the University and reported that AUSA believes the outcome agreement does not go far enough in encouraging widening access not in recognizing that widening access and excellence go hand-in-hand. The President believes that students from disadvantaged backgrounds do better than their peers from more affluent backgrounds at university, and that it would therefore be advantageous for the University to take more disadvantaged students as it would enhance excellence. The Senior Vice-Principal responded to say that the University engaged in many ways, for example the Summer School, working with low-progression schools and associate students, and that the outcome agreement provided bidding for additional funding under the widening access banner and that this would include students from SIMD40 postcodes.
 - It was discussed that the SIMD was not necessarily the best tool to measure deprivation and that various factors were taken into account by the University when considering wider access for local students who may not be identified on the SIMD.
- 8.3 The Principal thanked Senate for the very helpful discussions and concluded by thanking everyone in advance for their participation in the work that would be required for the Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR), which would be taking place in September 2013.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senate approved and noted the actions taken by the University Court at its meetings on 26 June 2012 and 25 September 2012.

1. Ordinance No of 2012 [Election of the Chancellor and Election of General Council Assessors to the University Court]

- 9.1 The Senate approved, for its part, the draft Ordinance No of 2012 (Election of the Chancellor and Election of General Council Assessors to the University Court).

2. Draft Resolution No 270 of 2012 [Amendments to the Code of Practice on Student Discipline]

- 9.2 The Court approved, on the recommendation of the Senate, the draft Resolution [Amendments to the Code of Practice on Student Discipline] 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.

3. Draft Resolution No 267 of 2012 [Supplementary Regulations for First Degrees in Education] and Draft Resolution No 268 of 2012 (Supplementary Regulations for First Degrees in Science]

- 9.3 The Court, having noted that the draft Resolution No 267 of 2012 [Supplementary Regulations for First Degrees in Education] and draft Resolution No 268 [Supplementary Regulations for First Degrees in Science] had been approved by the Senate, and had been considered by the Business Committee of the General Council, and that no other representations had been received, approved both Resolutions.

4. Draft Resolution No 269 of 2012 [Changes to Regulations for Various Degrees]

- 9.4 The Court, having noted that the draft Resolution No 269 of 2012 [Changes to Regulations for Various Degrees] had been approved by the Senate, and had been considered by the Business Committee of the General Council, and that no other representations had been received, approved the Resolution.

REPORT FROM THE UCTL

The Senate approved and noted the actions taken by the University Committee on Teaching & Learning at its meetings on 31 October 2012, as under:

1. Class Certificate Refusals on transcripts

- 10.1 The Senate approved, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, the proposal to include 'Class Certificate Refused' as a course outcome on University Transcripts.

2. Disclosure of marks for individual examination questions

- 10.2 The Senate approved, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, the proposal to routinely release component marks of end of course assessments.

3. Partnership Agreement

- 10.3 The Senate approved, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, the revisions to the Partnership Agreement (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes).

4. Annual Course Review

- 10.4 The Senate approved, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, the amended processes (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes) for reporting the outcome of annual course review.

5. Code of Practice on Student Discipline

- 10.5 On the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, the Senate approved and agreed to forward to Court the Draft Resolutions (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes).

6. Dates and allocations for November 2012 graduations

- 10.6 The Committee noted the dates and allocations for the November Graduation Ceremonies as summarised in below, approved by the Convenor during the summer.

Thursday 29 November at 11.00 a.m.

Higher and First Degrees in the Business School.

Thursday 29 November at 3.00 p.m.

Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Language & Literature, Education, Social Science, Law and Divinity, History & Philosophy.

Friday 30 November at 11.00 a.m.

Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Engineering and Geosciences.

Friday 30 November at 3.00 p.m.

Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Psychology, Medical Sciences, Medicine & Dentistry, Biological Sciences and Natural & Computing Sciences.

7. Latest Dates for the Return of Examination Results

- 10.7 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Committee had approved the latest dates for the return of examination results for 2012/13. These were now published at <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/examdeadline.shtml>.

8. Learning and Teaching Operational Plan

- 10.8 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Committee had approved the Learning and Teaching Operational Plan.

9. Amendment to Annex A of the Policy and Procedures on Student Appeals and Complaints

- 10.9 Further to the approval of the revised Policy and Procedures on Student Appeals and Complaints, the Committee approved the addition of the following statement to Annex A: Outline of Procedures: Meeting with a Head of School or Service. 'The Head of School/Service should address all points raised by a student within their appeal or complaint within Part B.' This change was proposed following feedback from the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO).

10. Personal Tutors Update

- 10.10 An implementation plan for introduction of Personal Tutors from September 2013 was considered and approved by Senate in June 2012. Work was ongoing to develop online training materials which it is planned will be rolled out in January 2013. In advance of that, meetings with all Schools are planned to inform staff about the new Personal Tutor system. These meetings would be led by the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) and will involve a representative from the Students' Association. UMG approved the establishment of a Steering Group to oversee the implementation of the Personal Tutor system. The group will hold its first meeting on 10 October and includes representatives from the Colleges and the Students' Association.

11. Guidance notes for students enrolled on the Postgraduate Diploma in Physician Assistant Studies who are being considered on the grounds that they are not 'Fit to Practise'

- 10.11 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Committee had approved the 'Guidance notes for students enrolled on the Postgraduate Diploma in Physician Assistant Studies who are being considered on the grounds that they are not 'Fit to Practise'. The Guidance Note will be included in the Academic Quality Handbook as Annex 5.17f.

12. Annual Report on the Identification and Dissemination of Good Practice in Learning and Teaching

- 10.12 The Committee had discussed the Annual Report on the Identification and Dissemination of Good Practice in Learning and Teaching prepared as part of the University's Strategy for the Identification and Dissemination of Good Practice. The Committee agreed that the Report should be made widely available and be included at college teaching committees in the first instance. The report is available at www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal.

13. Careers Service Report 2010 – 2012

- 10.13 The Committee discussed the Annual Report on the Identification and Dissemination of Good Practice in Learning and Teaching prepared as part of the University's Strategy for the Identification and Dissemination of Good Practice. The Committee agreed that the Report should be made widely available and be included at college teaching committees in the first instance. The report is available at www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal

ENHANCEMENT-LED INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW

- 11.1 The Senate noted the proposed approach to consultation (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes).

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP FOR 2012/13

- 12.1 In line with its delegated authority on behalf of the Senate, the Committee noted that the Senate Business Committee approved the membership of Committees of the Senate, Joint Committees of the Senate and the Court and Committees of the Court with Senate representation for session 2012/13 (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes).

APPOINTMENT OF SENATE ASSESSOR TO COURT

- 13.1 The Senate noted the appointment of Professor Stephen Heys as the professorial Senate Assessor from the College of Life Sciences & Medicine until 1 October 2016 and Dr Chris Brittain as the non-professorial Senate Assessor for the College of Arts & Social Sciences until September 2013.

ANNUAL REPORT ON INSTITUTIONAL-LED REVIEW FOR THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL

- 14.1 The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee had approved, on behalf of the Senate, the Annual Report on Institutional-Led Review which was submitted to the Scottish Funding Council on 30 September 2012 following approval by the University Court at its meeting on 25 October (copy filed with Principal copy of the minutes).

SENATE APPOINTMENTS

- 15.1 The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee had approved the following appointments:
- The re-appointment of Dr D McMurtry as a Trustee of the Aberdeen Endowment Trust until 15 October 2015;
 - The re-appointment of Professor A Saunders as a Senate appointed member of the Dick Bequest Trust until October 2017;
 - The appointment of Dr Tomas Bokedal as Divinity Admissions Selector (*vice* Dr Lena Tiemeyer);
 - The appointment of Mhairi Beaton as Director of Undergraduate Programmes (Education) (*vice* Jayne Bruce) until September 2013.