

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2018

Present: Professor I Diamond, Professor M Greaves, Professor P McGeorge, Professor J Paterson, Professor M Ross, Professor BD MacGregor, Dr G Gordon, Dr P Sweeney, Professor E Welch, Dr D R Smith, Dr M Bain, Mr M Whittington, Professor G Paton, Professor S Heys, Professor D Jolley, Professor I Guz, Professor A Jenkinson, Professor E Pavlovskaia, Professor C Kee, Professor J Masthoff, Professor M Brown, Professor K Shennan, Mr D Auchie, Dr M Ehrenschwendtner, Dr P Bishop, Professor R Wells, Mr E Usenmez, Mrs D Bruxvoort, Mrs L Tibbetts, Dr J Lamb, Dr L McCann, Professor N Hutchison, Dr A Sim, Professor P Nimmo, Professor J Schaper, Dr G Hough, Dr H Pierce, Dr P Ziegler, Dr H Martin, Mrs M Stephen, Dr A Bryzgel, Dr T Rist, Dr A Simpson, Dr Z Yihdego, Mr S Styles, Dr M Mills, Dr A McKinnon, Dr T Argounova-Low, Professor D Anderson, Professor D Lusseau, Professor M Pinard, Dr J Baird, Dr M Barker, Professor J Jayasinghe, Dr A Rajnicek, Dr K Kiezebrink, Dr J Macdiarmid, Dr M Delibegović, Dr M Brazzelli, Dr N Vargesson, Dr D MacCallum, Dr J Hislop, Dr N Mody, Dr S Fielding, Professor A Lee, Dr F Thies, Professor G Nixon, Professor H Wallace, Dr E Nordmann, Dr M Jackson, Dr K Pilz, Professor D Jovicic, Professor A Akisanya, Professor M Kashtalyan, Dr O Menshykov, Dr B Rea, Dr J Oliver, Dr A Ebinghaus, Dr C North, Professor J Feldmann, Professor G Coghill, Professor C Grebogi, Dr M da Silva Baptista, Dr B Martin, Dr W Vasconcelos, Dr N Oren, Mr L Ogubie, Mr O Kucerak, Miss D Connelly, Miss K Metcalfe, Mr J Brown, Miss M Jensen, Mr N Johansson, Mr L Budrass, Mr Y Dmitrov and Miss K Smith

Apologies: Professor M Campbell, Professor N Haites, Professor P Hannaford, Professor A Sahraie, Professor J Skakle, Professor H Hutchison, Professor G Macfarlane, Dr R Neilson, Dr M Hole, Professor W Naphy, Dr T Fahey Palma, Dr R Shanks, Dr A Lewis, Dr B Tribut, Professor P Mealar, Dr P Glover, Dr D Scott, Dr A Jack, Dr G Jones, Dr P Murchie, Dr A Venkatesh, Professor R Barker, Dr I Cameron, Dr K Foster, Dr D Ray, Dr N Schofield, Miss M Leskovska, Mr K Thomson-Duncan, Miss K Paterson-Hunter, Miss I Ewart, Miss I Donaldson, Mr J Short, Miss A McSeveney and Mr L Fuller

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- 51.1 The Principal opened the meeting, welcoming members of the Senate to the meeting.
- 51.2 The Principal invited members to approve the agenda. No objections or comments were raised and the meeting proceeded.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 52.1 The Principal invited members to confirm that they were content with the minutes of the meetings of the Senate held on 13 December 2017 and 24 January 2018.
- 52.2 Mr Styles requested an amendment to future Senate minutes. Mr Styles proposed:

“The full text of all motions debated in Senate at the December and January meetings of Senate should be included in the minutes of the appropriate meeting of Senate. The text should clearly show all amendments to motions and clearly indicate the text of the motion as finally passed.”

To this end I would propose the following typographical conventions: text which has been deleted because it was rejected by Senate should be shown struck through. The text of amendments which were adopted should be shown in bold.”

Mr Styles noted that this would help aid understanding of motions considered and those approved by the Senate. The Principal noted that the Clerk to the Senate agreed that the proposal was a sensible course of action. No objections to the proposal were raised.

- 52.3 Professor Anderson asked a question regarding the circulation of minutes, noting that the Senate had agreed the draft minute be circulated to members within 10 working days. He noted that this had not happened for the last two meetings of the Senate. He asked whether this would be followed up. Dr Bernard confirmed that this had been affected by the Christmas break and that future drafts would be circulated within 10 working days. Dr Bernard noted that members had received the minute of the January meeting within 14 days as a consequence of the date of circulation of the papers in full.
- 52.4 Professor Anderson further noted the motion passed by the Senate that recordings of the Senate would be made available on the Senate webpages.
- 52.5 Professor Anderson posed a question in relation to minute point 36.7 from 13 December 2017.

On 13 December 2017, Senate nearly unanimously passed resolution 17:14 concerning the changes to the USS pension Scheme. In particular, the motion stated:

Senate respectfully calls upon the Principal Sir Ian Diamond, University management and the University Court to reiterate their very welcome opposition to the proposed changes to the USS pension scheme in the following ways:

- (a) To write again to Universities UK reiterating Aberdeen University’s reasoned opposition to the changes.*
- (b) To write again to USS reiterating Aberdeen University’s reasoned opposition to the changes.*
- (c) After the above letters have been sent to make these letters public by means of a press release and statement on the University webpage.*

Could the Principal please guide us to the websites where these two letters are published?

- 52.6 The Principal informed Professor Anderson and all Senators that following the last meeting of the Senate he engaged extremely vigorously in discussions through both the Employers Pensions Forum and through informal channels. He noted things were moving extremely quickly and that he gone into the Christmas period believing that there was a deal which could be put together. However, as colleagues would be aware, he noted that the meeting of the Joint Negotiating Committee (JNCC) on the 23 January 2018, had resulted in a decision leading to industrial action (the update from the Principal further refers). The Principal informed the Senate that following that decision, it had been agreed that a joint letter on behalf of the University and the UCU would be sent. He noted that a draft had been agreed and signed. He noted once sent, it would be made available on the University’s webpages.
- 52.7 Professor Martin noted that Professor Anderson’s question regarding Senate recordings had gone unanswered. Professor Martin asked whether these were

available, as agreed, on the Senate webpages. The Clerk, responding, stated that they would be made available within 10 working days, along with the draft minutes.

- 52.8 Dr North noted a correction to minute point 33.2 of the 13 December 2017 meeting. Dr North noted that he had stated the University website implied a two week wait and not four as stated in the minute. Dr North also informed the Senate that the Counselling webpages had since been changed and were much improved.
- 52.9 The Principal invited members to raise any further points in regards to the minutes. No objections or comments were raised, and the meeting proceeded.

UPDATE FROM THE PRINCIPAL

- 53.1 The Principal, in providing an update to the Senate, began by acknowledging the discussions regarding the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) and the decision taken following a meeting led by the JNCC to proceed with industrial action. He stated that he felt, in the context of affordability, of benefits and of risk, there is the possibility of a deal which would require that there be movement from both Universities UK (UUK) and the Universities and Colleges Union (UCU). He noted that the key player, in his view, was the Pensions Regulator as the Regulator is insisting that the actuarial valuation is addressed and that therefore, if the benefits were to stay the same, this would require an increase in contributions of over 5% on the part of the University and over 3% on the part of the individual. The Principal stated that across the UK there exists no view that that kind of increase could be taken on board. With regards the issue of affordability, he noted that the current situation of employers contributing 18%, was approximately the figure at which Universities would be content to remain. He stressed that there was no algorithm to suggest 18% was correct, however, he observed that there was no consistent view across the UK that this could be realistically increased.
- 53.2 However, he informed the Senate that if there was a change in the risk, he stated his belief that there was a real possibility to achieve a package broadly similar to the current position in terms of benefits and cost. He noted that the situation required the engagement of all parties in serious discussions in which everybody is prepared to move. He informed the Senate of his view that meaningful negotiations must start immediately and stated the valuable role the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) could play in bringing parties together. He further stated the importance of having the Pensions Regulator present.
- 53.3 The Principal stated how pleased he was that the University had been able to engage with local UCU colleagues to agree to sign a letter asking both UUK and UCU to engage in discussion quickly and to do so with ACAS and the Pensions Regulator present. He stated the importance of recognising why it is the Pensions Regulator is insisting the deficit for USS be addressed. He expressed his view that it was not about reductions or inefficiencies in the way the scheme had been managed, but in the way in which one conducts an actuarial valuation, due to historically low levels of interest on gilts. He informed the Senate that he accepted fully the issue of how long does something go on for it to move from being historically low to becoming the norm, however, he also stated the importance of ensuring the rules, under which a return to current benefits could be made, should be made transparent, if there is to be any change in benefits.
- 53.4 The Principal stated his acceptance of the democratic right to industrial action, however, expressed his regret that it was going ahead on this occasion as a consequence of the fact a deal had not been reached. He noted that the University

would do everything it could to minimise the impact of the action on students. He informed the Senate that he, the Senior Vice-Principal and the University Secretary had invited the UCU to a meeting to continue helpful discussions regarding terms around issues such as payment of pensions.

- 53.5 The Principal stated he had been privileged to attend the launch of the new pre-Medical programme in Sri Lanka. He noted he was incredibly impressed with the University's Sri Lankan partners and that he was impressed with professionalism and work of the University's team in marketing and launching the programme and in working with the General Medical Council (GMC) and Sri Lankan regulators in relation to the planned Medical programme.
- 53.6 The Principal noted that on the 22nd February 2018 at Buckingham Palace the Health Services Research Unit (HSRU) and the Health Economics Research Unit (HERU) would receive their Queen's Prize for Higher Education. He expressed his understanding that the Senate would wish to congratulate HSRU and HERU on their awards.
- 53.7 The Principal highlighted the University's forthcoming International Women's Day programme. He noted the impressive nature of the programme arranged by colleagues and urged all members of staff to engage with it.
- 53.8 In concluding, the Principal confirmed that the University and local UCU jointly signed letters, had now been issued to UUK and UCU.
- 53.9 Professor Anderson stated that he was happy that the joint letter had been issued. He asked the Principal to comment on reports in the media that UUK is not a single unified front, but there are members pushing for a higher valuation of increased risk. He noted that the media had suggested that individual Oxbridge Colleges, who are not USS institutions, were pushing on this agenda. He stated that, if this were the case, a public stance on this issue may be appropriate to ensure there was an awareness of the fact it is a minority of institutions influencing this decision and distorting the landscape of Higher Education within the UK. Responding, the Principal noted that from all that he heard that there was a range of views. He stated that responses received to the survey put out by UUK expressed that range and that there had been a statistically significant move away from where people were in the last valuation to where they were in this valuation. He noted that this was largely as a consequence of the issue of affordability. With regards to the points around the issue as picked up by a colleague from the London School of Economics (LSE) with regards to the number of particular votes from Oxbridge Colleges, the Principal stated he had been unaware of this until very recently. He expressed the importance of this being unpicked and stated that he would contact the Chief Executive of UUK to seek clarification.
- 53.10 Mr Styles noted the Principal's comments with regards to historical norm. He stated his understanding that the nominal losses of pension funds has decreased by 50% over the last month or two, as a consequence of rising interest rates etc. He expressed his hope that the USS and UUK would take this on board. The Principal stated his agreement with Mr Styles and emphasised that these points had been made strongly by a number of people and stated the importance of the involvement of the Pensions Regulator. He expressed his personal view that global macroeconomics are moving and therefore we should look to the future positively rather than negatively.
- 53.11 Finally, the Principal expressed his clear view that communications around the USS position should be maximised and urged colleagues to raise any issues they may have.

QUESTIONS TO THE PRINCIPAL

54.1 The Principal invited Mr Scott Styles to pose his question on plastics on campus:

“What steps, if any, is the University planning to take to minimise the use of non-degradable plastic products on Campus? In particular are there any plans to ban the use of plastic straws, plastic cups, plastic plates and plastic cutlery?”

54.2 The Principal welcomed the question and responded to Mr Styles noting the following:

- Plastic cutlery was removed from use in October 2017 and substituted with a compostable single use cutlery product.
- ‘Take out’ food containers used, since October 2017, are mostly now made from a compostable product, either recycled sugar cane fibre or sustainably sourced wood pulp lined with PLA. Lids too are made from renewable, compostable materials. Where a compostable alternative is not available, a biodegradable product made from renewable resources is used. ‘Plastic’ glasses used by water fountains, are made from compostable materials.
- By July 2018, all plastic introduced by Campus Services Catering in the delivery of services, will be removed or substituted by products which are made from renewable resources and are recyclable, biodegradable or compostable. E.g. plastic stirrers replaced with wooden stirrers, removal of plastic bowls, cling film, plastic sandwich platters etc.
- Plastic straws will be removed from service fully by the end of February 2018 and in their place, paper straws will be used.

54.3 Mr Styles thanked the Principal for his response. He asked regarding franchises and their commitment to these changes. The Principal stated that he was unable to answer this, but committed to take the issue away for discussion with the franchises. He noted that he felt the University should do all they could to ask them to move in the same direction.

54.4 Professor Lusseau noted the question and answer. He noted, however, the unintended consequences of the issue of the move to the make greater use of biodegradable and wood based products. He noted that the issue was not solely one for the University but one to be considered more widely. The Principal stated that he would ensure the University’s Sustainability Group engages with this issue and that they consult with Professor Lusseau, one of the leading experts in biodiversity.

HEALTH SAFETY AND WELLBEING

55.1 The opportunity for Senators to raise any issues regarding health, safety and wellbeing was provided.

55.2 The Principal informed the Senate that following the meeting of 13 December 2017, a shorter version of the University’s mental health training was being piloted.

55.3 Dr Rea asked a question about University policy with regards to defibrillators. Dr Rea expressed concern that there were only four across the Old Aberdeen campus. The Principal acknowledged the question and committed to take the question away for further research. Dr Rea proposed that one per building would be more appropriate.

- 55.4 Professor Lusseau expressed concern that it had come to his attention that the University's Health and Safety Committee was currently considering banning pets from campus. Professor Lusseau expressed his surprise at the perceived lack of evidence gathering around this proposed policy. He stated that, as the programme coordinator of the Undergraduate programme in Animal Behaviour, the fact that animals are allowed on the campus, is attractive to students and potential students. He also noted the use of University gardens by members of the public and their pets and to access some of these gardens, they must access University buildings. He therefore noted the difficulty of policing the proposed policy without discrimination. The Principal thanked Professor Lusseau for his question and noted discussions within the Health and Safety Committee regarding pets in buildings. The Principal acknowledged the importance of wide consultation and committed to ensure Professor Lusseau be invited to input into discussions.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT EXPERIENCE 2017

- 56.1 Professor McGeorge, Vice Principal (Teaching and Learning), introduced the paper on the Undergraduate Student Experience 2017. He acknowledged that the paper, summarising the various data metrics around the student experience, was originally included for discussion at Senate on 13 December 2017, however, its consideration was postponed to allow enough time to discuss it fully. Professor McGeorge reminded the Senate that the report was submitted on an annual basis to provide the Senate with an update on the Student Experience. He informed the Senate that the Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Student Experience would now be reported on separately to allow the two cohorts of students be treated equally in terms of attention to their experience and that a report in this regard would follow in the autumn of 2018. He noted that a working group from within the Postgraduate Taught Committee (PGTC) was looking at developing a set of evidence relevant to the PGT experience.
- 56.2 Professor McGeorge stated that the data and evidence around the Undergraduate (UG) experience provided in the paper is, overall, a good news story, with lots of positive aspects, testament to the hard work of the University's staff and students. Before moving to invite discussion amongst Senators, Professor McGeorge drew the following points to Senate's attention:
- As highlighted in the paper, the National Student Survey (NSS) has changed and therefore it is not currently easily comparable with previous surveys. Even allowing for this, however, there are many positives which can be drawn from the NSS. Professor McGeorge specifically drew the attention of the Senate to the University's performance in the new section on Learning Community, where the University has outperformed the UK and Scottish sector averages. He congratulated everybody for their work in this regard.
 - With regards to retention, Professor McGeorge recognised the work of the University as a whole in improving these data and the recognition of the University to the importance of supporting students who may be considering leaving. He stated that a fall of this size in non-continuation rates, had not been seen by the University before. He noted that it does not mean that there is not more to be done, but that it does indicate that the hard work of staff and students is paying off. He again expressed his thanks to colleagues for this.
 - Professor McGeorge noted the issue of employability and stated that the data shows that Aberdeen graduates compete extremely well in the job market, in terms of obtaining high level employment and salaries. He noted that this was testament to the hard work of students and staff engagement with them.

- He acknowledged that there would always be areas in which the University could improve and specifically highlighted certain aspects of feedback in this regard. The Senate were informed that, generally speaking, the data demonstrates that students feel their opinions are valued and that there are opportunities for them to provide feedback. He noted, however, that work is still required on 'closing the loop' and ensuring staff are feeding back to students where, as a result of their feedback, things have or haven't changed and explaining, if something hasn't changed, why not.
- Professor McGeorge also noted that issues of feedback include feedback from academic staff to students around their work. He noted his understanding that academic staff are unclear as to how students are using the feedback they receive.
- He also drew the attention of the Senate to issues to be aware of including; (i) the consistency in terms of outcomes at degree level and the need for the appropriate analysis of this and (ii) the support of students entering University from deprived backgrounds.

56.3 Concluding, Professor McGeorge noted the importance of acknowledging the successes of the University with regards to the Undergraduate Student Experience. Following Professor McGeorge's comments, a short discussion ensued, the main tenets of which were as follows:

- Professor Shennan stated her agreement with Professor McGeorge that the paper contained good news. With regards to sector wide issues surrounding closing the feedback loop, she informed the Senate that as part of the current Enhancement Theme, a student-led Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Scotland group would be looking at this issue. Professor Shennan confirmed that a student representative from the University would act as part of this group.
- Professor Akisanya noted it is difficult for Schools to ensure appropriate support is provided to students from deprived backgrounds for two key reasons, firstly, as it is difficult to identify these students and, secondly, because of the resourcing challenges this presents. The Principal, responding, confirmed that previous discussions at Senate had agreed the release of 'At Risk' data to Personal Tutors. With regards to resourcing, the Principal stated that this should be distributed appropriately. Professor McGeorge acknowledged the tension of labelling students. He acknowledged resourcing as an issue but stated the importance of this work and the sharing of good practice amongst the institution within the constraints of available resource. With reference to the ELIR contextualisation paper (minute point 60 refers) he stated that the University community was only likely to get more diverse and therefore highlighted the importance of supporting students from a variety of backgrounds and sharing the good practice of doing so amongst all areas of the University.
- Professor Jovcic acknowledged the improved non-continuation rates. He noted the resourcing allocated to improving and maintaining low non-continuation data and asked what the targets for this were, particularly as achieving a result of nil non-continuation would be impossible and that withdrawing from study may be the most appropriate course of action for a student, for a number of reasons. Responding, Professor McGeorge stated that, as part of the School planning process there are targets for this, however, agreed that nil is not an achievable rate of non-continuation. He acknowledged that it may be the right course of action for a student at that point in time, however, noted the importance of the University ensuring that that student can return to study when they are ready to do so. Professor McGeorge highlighted the importance of the commitment the University makes to a student on their registration to support them to the best of our ability.

- 56.4 The Principal thanked Professor McGeorge and all colleagues for their work in seeking to improve the Undergraduate Student Experience and specifically thanked those colleagues engaged in initiatives leading to the fall in rates. He acknowledged that the University had previously been a big outlier in terms of non-continuation and that improvements had been remarkable.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT

- 57.1 The Senate received an update from Professor Schaper on behalf of the Senate Assessors on the meetings of the University Court held on 12 December 2017 on (copy filed with the principal copy of the minute) and 16 February 2018.

- 57.2 Firstly Professor Schaper provided an update on the key points arising from discussions at the meeting of Court on 12 December 2017 as follows:

- Regarding the process for the appointment of The Principal:
 - The Court were informed that the shortlisting meeting would take place on 5 March 2018, with final interviews being held in the week following Easter Monday (Monday 2 April 2018).
- The Court received a paper, presented by the Senior Vice-Principal on Financial Sustainability. Professor Schaper noted the view of the Court that a meeting should be convened separately to discuss matters of Financial Sustainability (the meeting held of 16 February 2018 refers).
- The Court also discussed the USS and discussed the potential course of action for staff to move their pension away from the USS to the Scottish Teachers' Superannuation Scheme (STSS) or an equivalent scheme. The Court agreed that this should be further explored.
- The court discussed the University of Aberdeen Superannuation and Life Assurance Scheme (UASLAS) for non-academic staff in regards to its future structure.
- Regarding Transnational Education (TNE) the Court received detailed updates.
- The Rectorial Election was discussed, in the absence of the Rector. Professor Schaper noted that the situation had moved on since its discussion at the December meeting of the Court and that a second Rectorial Election was now underway.

- 57.3 Professor Schaper moved to provide an update on the key points arising from discussions at the meeting of Court on 16 February 2018. Professor Schaper noted that there was, as yet, no draft minute of the meeting. He noted that the meeting was dedicated to the consideration of the following items:

- Issues of Financial Sustainability
 - A paper was received from Senior Management, providing suggestions as to what could be done to improve the University's financial position.
 - Professor Schaper noted the complexity of the matter. He stated the agreement of Court that something must be done to address the financial position of the University and that this should happen quickly in order to ensure a break even position by the end of the 2019/20 academic year.
 - In order to achieve this and to ensure growth, the Court discussed a proposal for additional borrowing via the launch of a multi-million pound bond (likely to be a minimum of £50M) to support capital investment in new world class facilities, capable of attracting more students and staff to Aberdeen and accelerating growth in income.

- The Court also considered options for how the financial strategy for a break-even position might be achieved. Professor Schaper noted a discussion was held in regards the options presented by the paper and a vote was taken and passed as follows:
 - *The Court agrees first that option C as set out in the Financial Sustainability paper (item 3.1 of the paper refers) be taken forward under consultation to support the delivery of a financial strategy to achieve a break-even position by 2019/20 which also explores opportunities for additional revenue growth.*
 - *To approve the approach to borrowing and that it be progressed by the working group as set out at 7.8 of the paper (the Financial Sustainability refers) and confirm such borrowing is contingent upon a strategy to achieve a break-even position by 2019/20.*
- Professor Schaper informed the Senate that a working group (as referred to above) would be convened to progress matters and to discuss all options with a special view to new income streams. The composition of the group was discussed and the Senior Governor committed to consult with the Senior Vice-Principal and the Senate Assessors in this regard.
- Professor Schaper noted that the group would consider issues including how money obtained by way of a bond issue would be spent (i.e. entirely on capital projects, direct investment into people).
- He noted that the group would report to the Court.
- A motion, as proposed by the Senate, to convene a working group comprised of Members of the Court and the Senate to discuss financial matters.
 - Professor Schaper noted the discussion of this matter, however, that the Court considered it had since been superseded by the decision to convene the working group referred to above.
- The consideration of a paper, from the elected academic staff member of Court on Options for Growth.
 - Professor Schaper noted that the paper, which focused on the potential to grow income streams outside of teaching and research, was well-received. He stated that it was decided to advertise for a new Vice-Principal for External Relations who would develop new income streams. He noted it was also discussed that a working group would be convened in this regard.

57.4 Professor Anderson stated that the Financial Sustainability paper would have a great impact on the planning of academic teaching a research over the next decades. He asked that Senate be allowed to read the paper. The Principal agreed to this proposal.

57.5 The Senior Vice-Principal informed the Senate that the paper to Court had been principally about growth. He recognised a lack of growth at the Old Aberdeen campus and that the Court had discussed how to begin that growth again and to improve income as well. He noted that in order to be able to borrow, the University must be in a financially stable position which led to the discussion on achieving a break-even position and the passing of 'Option C' as laid out by the paper. The Senior Vice-Principal noted that staff savings may have to be considered in order to reach this position. He stated his understanding of the Court meeting, that it had been openly discussed that to use the bond (to be repaid over 40 to 50 years) to invest in staff would be inappropriate. He clarified that the agreement was that the bond would be for capital development and that a group was to be set up to look at achieving the bond and how it should be best used to the benefit of students and staff.

57.6 With reference to the motion, as proposed by the Senate, to convene a working group comprised of Members of the Court and the Senate to discuss financial matters, the

Senior Vice-Principal stated that as two working groups will now be set up as a consequence of the Financial Sustainability paper, the second motion was redundant.

- 57.7 The Senior Vice-Principal further noted that while the potential appointment of a Vice-Principal for External Affairs was discussed, it was not his recollection that such an appointment was agreed. Professor Schaper stated that he recalled the Senior Governor had stated this.
- 57.8 With regards to the bond, Dr Oren noted his recollection from the Court that the money previously identified for capital expenditure could now be invested in staff. He stated that there was no point in capital expenditure without staff to teach within it. Regarding finance groups to be established, Dr Oren stated that his recollection that this would include a joint working group of the Senate and the Court.
- 57.9 Dr Bryzgel expressed concern that the strands as identified by the Development Trust with regards income generation were all outwith the Humanities. She stated the importance of the development of the Old Aberdeen campus. Dr Bryzgel noted that the Humanities and Social Sciences did not have a contact within the Development Trust. The Principal stated that the Development Trust, an external group, had determined not to progress income strands outwith Medicine.
- 57.10 Professor Anderson noted the composition of the proposed working group on financial matters and the impact this group would have on the future of the University. Professor Anderson referenced the motion passed by the Senate that the Senate be better engaged in financial matters. He noted concern that the wide representation requested by the Senate would not be applied to this group. If not, he asked that Senate Assessors hold hearings with staff at which concerns could be voiced and fed back to the group and/or Court as appropriate. He asked that the Senate Assessors be supported by the University in doing so. The Principal agreed with this proposal.
- 57.11 Professor Lusseau asked for further detail on the issue of the Institutional Brexit Strategy. He acknowledged that within the papers there was a clear understanding of a focus on students and recruitment. Noting the recent developments within Government, he noted increased risks for staff post-March 2019 in continuing their work within the UK, potential deportment and being unable to re-enter the UK if they were to leave. Responding, the Principal stated that the Brexit Strategy would go to the next meeting of the Operating Board. He noted the fluidity of the situation. Regarding EU nationals in the transition period, the Home Office had reassured in this regard. He noted that the University was continuing to lobby. He stated the importance of freedom of movement for academic staff. The Principal expressed concern for staff such as language assistants and technicians. He emphasised his commitment to lobbying in this regard. The Principal did not underestimate the importance of the issues raised by Professor Lusseau. The Principal informed the Senate that the Minister for Universities and Education in Scotland had announced that University entrants from the EU to Scotland in 2019 would be treated as home students. Professor Lusseau reiterated concern that the deadline was fast approaching and sought assurance that Management was planning in this regard. The Principal emphasised the national impact of the situation and committed to continue to lobby and to keep staff up to date with information.
- 57.12 Dr North asked for clarification on the new Science Teaching Building and if funding had already been identified. The Senior Vice-Principal confirmed it had, but that the opportunity may arise to bring the project forward.

57.13

Dr Rist noted that while each speaker was no doubt in good faith, there were nevertheless significant discrepancies in the accounts received from Professor Schaper, the Senior Vice-Principal and Dr Oren regarding their reports of the Court agreements. He expressed concern about this and wondered if his concern should extend to the minutes taken at Court. He therefore asked if there was an audio record from Court that would confirm the correct account. The Principal confirmed that there was not an audio record but a minute would be produced, and could be challenged by members in the right and proper manner if required. He added that the Court meeting had set in train some very important groups to discuss issues in further detail. Professor Schaper noted the disagreement between the accounts of Court decisions provided to Senate, but stated the Court minutes would be crystal clear in regard to what was voted on.

57.14 Mr Styles noted the important nature of the meeting and expressed regret that the date and agenda of the meeting was not publically communicated. He noted the motion requesting the availability of the Court agenda and sought reassurance that this would go to the Court. The Principal assured the Senate the motion would be considered at the next formal meeting of the Court.

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

58.1 Mr Beattie, Director of Finance, gave a presentation to Senate on the University's Finances, a copy of which is filed with the Principal copy of the minute.

58.2 Following Mr Beattie's presentation, a short discussion ensued, the main tenets of which were as follows:

- Dr Rea noted that by 2019/20 Transnational Education (TNE) is projected to generate income of £2.3 million. With reference to papers previously received by the Senate regarding TNE, he noted disparity in the successes of these projects in this short time frame and their proposed income generation. Professor Wells, responding, noted that Dr Rea may be referring to the Rwandan TNE project and the considerable loss lead period within it. Professor Wells informed the Senate that other projects, such as those of Qatar and Sri Lanka, would generate income immediately.
- Professor Delibigovic acknowledged growth at other Institutions, including that experienced by Dundee and Strathclyde, and proposed seeking consultation with them in order to assist in gathering information and advice on their successes. Mr Beattie acknowledged that some information is shared amongst Directors of Finance and noted that Dundee has seen an increase in its research funding, and Strathclyde has generated income through its recruitment of international students. Professor Delibigovic further expressed the need for improved marketing for the North East, noting that geographically, those Universities within the central belt are more successful. The Principal noted the importance of the activities of other Universities but also highlighted the severe impact of the decline in oil price for the University and RGU. The Principal stated the need to think more broadly around the opportunities for PGT programmes. He stated the importance of the work of Schools in thinking imaginatively of what these programmes could be.
- Professor Anderson thanked Mr Beattie for his presentation and the sharing of the Monthly Management Report (MMR). Noting the cash balance the University holds and the implication that Aberdeen was unusual in the amount of cash it holds, Professor Anderson asked whether this difference could be explained by the fact

that the University provides a majority of its own internal services, where other Universities may outsource these. Mr Beattie, responding, acknowledged that the University does provide a number of its own services, which can affect other indicators such as staff cost %, however, the cash figure simply represents the amount of cash the University holds in the bank at the time.

- Mr Simpson asked a question regarding the underlying deficit of approximately £2 million in 16/17 and the increase in this figure to £9.9 million in 17/18. Mr Simpson sought clarity on the relationship between the two figures. Mr Beattie noted several factors for the increase, include the cut in SFC funding, the introduction of apprenticeship levies, pay awards and incremental drift.
- Dr Oren, with reference to the graphs on PGT numbers and cumulative income growth, noted that the drop occurred during the time of voluntary severance. Dr Oren emphasised the relationship between staff recruitment and the recruitment of students.
- Dr McKinnon acknowledged the projected data provided and noted that it was not provided with regards to cash held and sought trajectory in this regard. Mr Beattie informed the Senate that on his arrival to the role 3 years ago, the University had held £6 million in the bank. He acknowledged that this had been steadily increasing to a more sustainable figure. Mr Beattie stated the importance of achieving an appropriate balance of cash to help in times of emergency or downturn, however, noted the negative aspect of holding too much, as there is no return on it.
- Professor Akisanya noted the target of approximately £15 million for growth in international student fees. He expressed concern as to where this growth may come from in the current climate. In terms of growth, Mr Beattie acknowledged a significant amount of the growth would come through the Business School and the investment in it. Mr Beattie noted that approximately 38% of international students coming to the UK do so to study Business and the University's investment in the School will allow them to tap into that market. Mr Beattie also noted School plans with regards to the delivery of international growth.
- Professor Wallace, with reference to the international PGT figures, noted a lack of comparison to other Institutions. The Principal, responding, noted that many Universities have experienced growth. He referenced Glasgow's work in this regard. The Principal noted the enormous potential for Aberdeen, if appropriate marketing and programmes can be achieved. Professor Wells expressed his agreement with the proposal. He stated there were good plans for the future and that plans within the Business School allow for the delivery of a significant part of the growth sought. He referenced change across the University in the nature of programmes being delivered, i.e. the School of Engineering moving away from Oil and Gas focussed programmes, and their delivery method, i.e. a move to online, as encouraging.
- Dr Rea expressed concern regarding growth being routed in the Business School. He stated that it was wrong to focus growth on one area. The Principal stated that hopes were not entirely on the Business School. He stated that, across the University, there was engagement with the potential for PGT and UG International offerings. The Principal emphasised that the University cannot afford to rely on one programme or to approach one nation only and must diversify. With that in mind, however, he noted that a significant number of students do come to the UK from overseas to study Business and, as such, it is important to recognise the opportunities in for the Business School. Professor Wells added, that with regards the Chinese market, there exists significant opportunity for the Business School but also for others. The Principal noted the opportunity for the School of Law in this regard.
- Dr Vargesson asked for an update on the University's TNE project in Korea. Responding, the Principal stated that two weeks earlier, Professor Paterson and

Dr Hill had visited Korea and met with the delivery partners and the Ministry of Education. The Principal acknowledged this as a step forward following a previous update to the Senate which had reported that the partners were focussed on a group of programmes the University did not believe to be marketable. He noted that, following these meetings, the Ministry of Education may well support a wider portfolio of programmes and, as such, the University is moving forward to launch and to market those programmes. The Principal stated the strength of the University's relationship with the Korean partners.

LECTURE CAPTURE

- 59.1 Professor McGeorge, Vice Principal (Teaching and Learning) presented the proposed policy on Lecture Capture, in addition to a supporting evidence paper and comments received following the paper being discussed for an academic view at the 13 December 2017 meeting of the Senate. He stated that these comments, in addition to those received at the various Teaching and Learning Committees, had been incorporated where possible. He further stated that the paper drew on the experiences of other Institutions and from discussions with colleagues across the sector, many of whom have just introduced, or are in the process of introducing, Lecture Capture policies in their own Institutions.
- 59.2 Professor McGeorge stated that the policy, at its heart, was about the Student Experience and how the University seeks to support an increasingly diverse community with a growing range of learning support needs. He noted that this links to the paper on the Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) contextualisation paper (minute point 60.1 below refers) and that the evidence provided supports the widespread use of lecture recordings, with the caveats as specified within the paper. Professor McGeorge informed the Senate that the policy was very different from the policy which came before them in December and some of the comments received perhaps related to the earlier version. He provided an example, noting that the earlier version had referred to the automatic recording of lectures, while the revised version for approval, made reference to the control to stop, start, pause and release a recording lying with academic staff. He stated the policy contained two key points with regards to transparency, as follows:
- Where material is not recorded, it is reasonable students are informed in advance and provided with the reason as to why and;
 - The decision not to be recorded be taken in consultation and/or discussion with someone else.
- 59.3 Professor McGeorge acknowledged that a previous suggestion that a Head of School must approve instances where an individual does not wish to record had been removed, but that this had been replaced with the need to discuss the matter with an individual identified by the Head of School. Professor McGeorge stated that it was for the School to determine who was best placed to undertake this role, however, he might propose those School members with responsibility for Quality Assurance act in this regard. He noted this step as important in ensuring transparency and consistency and in allowing the University as a whole to provide more support, such as training or technical information, if required. Professor McGeorge also confirmed discussions with the Centre for Academic Development (CAD) and the imminent production of guides on the technical aspects of recording.
- 59.4 Concluding, Professor McGeorge reiterated that the policy has, at its heart, the Student Experience. In this vein, the Principal invited discussion on the paper, beginning with the Students' Association. The main tenets of discussion were as follows:

- Ms Connolly, Education Officer, stated that she had previously spoken in favour of compulsory lecture recording and that she had again sought the views of the students and some staff on the proposed policy. Ms Connolly read the following statements:
 - *'I strongly encourage the Education Officer to really push for the recording of lectures to become compulsory for all departments and for these to be uploaded after lectures. This is not just an issue if you miss a class for personal reasons, it is also an issue if students do attend lectures but can't remember something that is not in the slides or if they do not have time to write something down. This does not reduce the number of students who attend lectures. Engineering, English and other departments generally record and upload lectures and students still attend their classes. Regardless, we are adults and should not be patronised into attending a non-compulsory lecture by actively making it harder for those who miss classes. Staff should aim to make our access to education easier and not harder.'*
 - *'Even when being in lectures, it is incredibly beneficial to have a lecture recording to come back to later on. Not everyone is learning at the same pace and having the opportunity to repeat concepts you don't really understand is what learning is about.'*
 - *'The other groups of students who commented positively when I first started recording were those with disabilities, those for whom English was a second language and high level athletes. With the knowledge I now have you can now add those with caring responsibilities to the list.'*
 - *'I think the people who are missing the lectures just because won't be looking at the lecture slides or recordings regardless. Its students with disabilities, athletes, parents and anyone outside of the traditional student model who are going to benefit from it.'*
 - *'My medical issues mess up my memory so recordings are vital for me. My medication forces me to miss a lot of lectures it's not fair that I still have to pay tuition yet I am missing out because of my medical issues. Yet this University claims to be considerate and supportive of medical needs but allows its lecturers to ignore them.'*
- Ms Connolly confirmed this as some of the feedback from students on the issue. She noted that overwhelmingly students support the recording of lectures and the paper has provided ample evidence that it does not affect lecture attendance. She stated that, going forward, the University will have an increasingly diverse demographic and the University should lead the way by catering for all. Ms Connolly further referenced an incident with a student who was in crisis and in no fit state to attend a lecture, having to attend as what was being taught comprised a large part of the assessment. Although the lecture was recorded it was not released until the revision period. She stated that to watch a student leave in that state was not something she wishes to repeat. Ms Connolly noted that over 50% of lectures are recorded and emphasised that all lectures should all be.
- Dr Nordmann began by informing the senate that the recording of lectures is one of her research areas and that she undertook her Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert) in eLearning on the topic and is the lead author of a paper on the subject and co-author of a systematic review currently in progress and co-author of a theoretical review. Dr Nordmann argued for the policy strongly, stating it as excellent and progressive and had taken on board the comments received from colleagues. She noted that by voting for the policy, Aberdeen would be leading the push rather than just following behind others. She informed the Senate that there is no systematic evidence that lecture capture reduces attendance. While noting

the odd paper which makes the claim, looking at the literature on the subject holistically, reveals that there is a null effect with regards to attendance. Dr Nordmann stated that those students who now say they aren't attending as a consequence of the availability of a recording would have been those who said the same of the availability of PowerPoint and/or a reading list. Dr Nordmann noted a linkage between the highest ever recording use and the lowest ever non-continuation rates. With regards learning and performance, Dr Nordmann informed the Senate that the evidence suggests there is with no impact on learning, or the impact is positive. She further stated that the use of lecture capture is found amongst the populations where you would want to see it. Referencing internal data, Dr Nordmann noted that within Psychology, first year non-native speakers had most commonly used recordings, with the use disappearing over subsequent years. Other research, she noted, suggests the use of recordings by those with disabilities or other issues, students transitioning from School to University and in the development of skills in attending and taking notes at a lecture. Dr Nordmann stated that students are using the material in a responsible way. With reference to Cognitive Psychology, Dr Nordmann noted that there is a link between lecture capture and deep processing and, if a student is taught to use recordings more effectively, they can use it in a supplemental way. Dr Nordmann stated that supplemental use (i.e. attending a lecture and using the recording) is proven to be the best approach. Dr Nordmann expressed the need to enhance guidance for staff and students. She acknowledged the existing diverse student population and the likely increase in this in future years and the positive role lecture capture could play in supporting these students. She stated that she sought more faith in the student population who want to learn and want to attend. She echoed Ms Connolly's point that students are adults and should be treated as such. Dr Nordmann noted that lecture attendance is more likely to fall as a consequence of poor lectures. In concluding, Dr Nordmann stated the benefits of the proposed policy to staff. She noted that they can be used as an improvement tool. She acknowledged the desire of staff to have meetings such as Senate recorded and argued that students be given the same opportunity, and introduce an evidence-based policy desired by the students.

- Mr Ogubie, Student President, echoed his support of Ms Connolly and Dr Nordmann and expressed his agreement with their statements. He referenced his own interaction with students and their desire to have the policy realised, to improve their academic experience.
- Dr Oliver noted the evidence based nature of the discussion. He expressed concern that the paper did not address the diverse range of teaching methods within the University, such as small group teaching. He noted that some senior courses are entirely seminar based. Dr Oliver acknowledged the aspect of the policy allowing for a 'get out of jail free card' for recording, but that very good pedagogic reasons exist for small group teaching. Responding, Professor McGeorge, stated that the policy relates only to lectures and those sessions, such as seminars, which are highly interactive, do not need to be recorded. With regard to lectures, he stated the importance of providing the reasoning why something is not being recorded to students, and in collecting this information. This may be a consequence of the highly interactive nature of a lecture.
- Ms Jensen, Convener for the School of Social Science, stated the importance of the use of recordings for supplemental purposes. She noted that lecturers can often speak quickly and trying to take notes and follow a PowerPoint, can prove difficult and information provided, such as statistics, can be missed. She acknowledged that the opportunity to return to lecture content would be incredibly beneficial.

- Professor Anderson thanked Professor McGeorge for the evidence and citation provided. He stated that he had consulted widely in his constituency on the issue. He noted that the vast majority of staff were positive about lecture recording but each of them had objected to the obligatory nature of the paper. While acknowledging that exemptions were available, the paper is contradictory and lends a feeling of disrespect, not trusting a lecturer to determine for themselves, whether or not recording is a useful tool. Professor Anderson noted that this was the unanimous statement of colleagues within his constituency. He noted that despite the detail provided regarding attendance, not one response he received was concerned about this. Professor Anderson informed the Senate of their concerns being with regard to: sensitive topics; the lack of trust in a lecturer; being confined to a podium and not being able to walk around to provide their lecture; not being able to raise or lower their voice; and about not being able to provide an entertaining and engaging lecture. He stated he had received three submissions which stated that if the policy were to be approved, they would likely have to cancel their courses. He acknowledged that these were lecturers lecturing on highly sensitive issues of Islamic politics and that they were concerned that snippets of their lectures may be posted on YouTube and they may find themselves in a compromised situation. Professor Anderson asserted that recording being obligatory may make a lecture less engaging, less interesting and less pedagogically valuable. He expressed that, while the paper may permit exceptions, asking staff to do so was time consuming. He noted that he would never prevent a student from recording. He asked the Senate to vote for a sense of respect in lecturers and the ability for them to determine themselves whether or not to do so.
- Dr Oliver proposed that the Senate may wish to consider encouraging a more successful uptake, by instead of a top down approach, promoting a nudging from below strategy. The Principal sought clarification as to whether the nudging from below strategy Dr Oliver was referring to was the student led desire for the introduction of the policy. Dr Oliver referenced good practice initiated through training seminars, courses and in reaching out to those engaging in online learning.
- Dr Yihdego noted the clarification provided with regards to the extent to which lecturers have control of the recording of their lecture. He expressed the wide ranging views of School staff. He noted that some were in favour, noting that it would promote equality and the enhancement of the Student Experience. He noted that approximately 80% of lecturers within the School of Law record their lectures. However, he noted a number of colleagues are against recording, for reasons including that it is not good for the teaching and learning experience, for the development of note taking skills in students, the importance of engaging in discussions and the concern of the misuse of lecture recordings. Dr Yihdego further expressed concern regarding the drafting of the proposed policy.
- Mr Budrass, Convener for the School of Medicine, Medical Science and Nutrition, with reference to point 4 of the policy, noted that it stated that *'recordings should normally be released prior to the next related teaching event'*. He asked why recordings should not be released to a timeframe after the teaching event has taken place. Responding, Professor McGeorge acknowledged several suggestions had been made as to an appropriate timeframe for the release of a recording. He stated that this approach was designed to ensure the release of the material in time for a student to have had access to it in advance of the next lecture on related material. Mr Budrass stated students would benefit from the recording in a timely manner to allow them to use it in a supplemental manner.
- Dr Sim expressed the concerns of constituents, particularly in regards to the misuse of recordings. While acknowledging that point 9 makes reference to misuse, Dr Sim noted that it does not say what would happen in such an instance, to protect the individual. Dr Sim stated that the issue of disabled students was a

red herring because they already had permission to record lectures through disability provision. He further stated that a great deal had been said at the previous senate regarding the importance of trust. He expressed that the paper does not fundamentally trust academics to make decisions about teaching and learning techniques.

- Dr Oren noted the appropriateness of trust. He acknowledged the paper and the evidence supporting lecture capture, however, noted the unintended consequences of the policy. He stated that having to go and seek approval not to record in order to try an innovative teaching technique, this serves as another barrier to putting such a technique in place. Dr Oren stated the importance of being trusted and permitted to teach in the way a lecturer considers to be best. He proposed that a bottom up, non-prescriptive approach would be more appropriate.
- Dr Da Silva Baptista noted that constituents within the School of Natural and Computing Science were supportive of lecture recording but not of making it compulsory. He expressed concern that recording is distracting and that the software is not appropriate, or that they are not appropriately trained in using it. Dr Da Silva Baptista noted that equipment was often broken, lost or not working appropriately. He stated that it was the compulsory element of the policy which was concerning.
- Dr Mills asked whether lecture capture consistency would become an item of staff appraisal and discipline. Professor McGeorge confirmed that this was not the intention of the policy.
- Mrs Tibbetts reiterated the issue of trust and instead of making the recording of lectures compulsory, proposed the introduction of lecture recording champions within schools to assist colleagues and to share their expertise, to promote and encourage uptake.
- Professor Masthoff sympathised with technical difficulties, however, noted that some colleagues do not record because they don't want to or cannot be bothered. She noted the importance of voting for the most appropriate outcome for the students and that an opt-out policy seemed far more sensible.
- Professor Delibigovic stated that the majority of the colleagues within the School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition record their lectures, however, noted concern with regards the compulsory nature of the policy. She stated concern that note taking is very important, as is background reading to supplement a lecture.
- Mr Johansson, representing the School of Biological Sciences, summarised some student feedback. He began by referencing a situation where a student had been waiting for a particular lecture and to discover is not recorded. He noted that a student is then faced with a choice, to focus on the material, listen and enjoy the lecture or panic, focus on notetaking and try to get as much out of it as possible, for future reference. Mr Johansson stated that he was not arguing against good note taking skills but if forced to consider future reference and what may come up in an exam, rather than the thinking that can be done while learning. Mr Johansson stated that while those students who go the extra mile will benefit the most, those struggling as a consequence of personal circumstances also have the opportunity to get back on track. Mr Johansson referenced the discussions around trust and stated that the student plea did not come from a place of laziness but from a place of pedagogic need.
- Ms Jensen, also referencing trust, asked the academic community to trust students not to share sensitive information. She proposed that students sign a form prior to their lectures to state they will not do so.
- Mr Simpson noted that he records the majority of his lectures and believes in the value of them. He expressed conflict, however, as some lecturers do note dangers with the practice. Mr Simpson asked what would happen if the policy is passed and

a member of staff chooses not to record. Professor McGeorge, responding, noted the importance of transparency where such an instance occurs.

- Professor McGeorge, responding to some comments made by Senators, stated that a lot had been said of trust, yet mistrust of students remained a common theme. He noted that there was no evidence to suggest misuse of recorded material and that there was nothing to stop a student recording material now. As a consequence of the current lack of an approved policy, Professor McGeorge noted the University was not protected and that individuals were consequently exposed. He stated that note taking is a skill, to be learned and aided by a recording.
- Dr Baird, expressed the importance of listening to the students. He stated that he records lectures in his office in advance of delivering a lecture, removing the potential difficulties posed by recording 'live'.
- Dr Rea expressed concern that those in favour of the policy see it as the salvation, despite prior feelings in a similar regards for reading lists and PowerPoint slides. Within his constituency, Dr Rea stated that the majority of lectures, certainly in first year, are recorded and released at revision time. Dr Rea asked if students would be able to appeal a decision not to record a lecture and, if attendance was to be affected, how would this be addressed. Responding, Professor McGeorge noted that there was not a route of appeal open to students. He also noted that if there is a drop in attendance and not in performance in assessment or there is a drop in attendance and performance in assessment, either would represent a trigger to colleagues and there would be a call for investigation.
- Professor Kee challenged the suggestion that the circumstances of students with disabilities was a red herring. He noted that currently students are not being treated equally, and these students are being positively discriminated against.
- Dr Kiezebrink informed the Senate of her experience at another institution where a lecture recording was misused. She noted that the student made use of their own recording and, as such, there was a lot of trouble to remove content the University did not own. Dr Kiezebrink highlighted the risk which staff were already exposed to and the control the University could retain by providing a recording.
- Dr Glover noted reservations from within the School of Law and specifically stated the diversity of staff and staff rights. He acknowledged the University of Cambridge policy, which regards lecture capture as good practice, but autonomy remains with the member of staff. He noted the acknowledgement by Cambridge of performer's rights, copyright and data protection. He expressed concern that staff have the right to express they do not wish to be recorded. He noted it was less about trust and more about respect for the diversity of opinion held by staff.
- Professor Lee stated, on behalf of the Institute of Applied Health Sciences within the School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition that recording had begun as compulsory for lectures in statistics approximately 5 years ago. She noted that lecture recording had since been rolled out across the Institute, including for clinical staff. She stated that student and examiner feedback is very positive. She noted that students are not assessed on note taking, and that if steps can be taken to facilitate learning, they should be. Professor Lee noted that the University strives for excellence in Teaching and Learning and therefore the question should be why the University should not be doing this for its students.
- Mr Kucerak acknowledged and supported the policy's requirement for transparency where a lecturer elects not to record.
- Ms Paterson-Hunter, Convener for the School of Law, noted the concern of staff for the compulsory approach being taken. She stated there was student support for this as there had been continual requests for recordings, and without a compulsory approach, numbers in this regard had not increased. She stated that a gentle, non-compulsory approach had not worked in the past. With regards trust, Ms Paterson-Hunter expressed that students were not unreasonable people, and

would be mature enough to understand why courses such as Islamic Studies could not be recorded. Ms Paterson-Hunters expressed the need for staff to trust students too.

- Dr Pavlovskaja stated the importance of opt-out rather than opt-in to ensure staff are willing to learn and to understand what were valid reasons for not recording.
- Professor Coghill expressed concern that making a policy compulsory would anger academic staff and that moving to a position of best practice and to increase lectures captured would be more appropriate. Professor Coghill highlighted the importance of mutual trust.
- Dr Nordmann explicitly stated that the policy does not suggest that a lecture recording is equivalent to the experience of attendance at a live lecture. She expressed that a recorded lecture did not have to make the live version less engaging. Dr Nordmann noted that there were opt out options and that the adoption of this policy would allow for transparency.

59.5 Professor McGeorge acknowledged that an amendment had been prepared in consultation with Drs Lamb and Sim as follows:

‘There are certain exceptional circumstances where recording of the lecture session with the standard University capture software is not appropriate. In these cases the lecturer should consider other methods of lecture capture but, in discussion with an academic nominated by HoS, ultimately retains the right to decide what is appropriate.’

The Principal invited Senators to vote on the proposed amendment to the policy:

In favour of the proposed amendment:	64
Not in favour of the proposed amendment:	15
Abstaining from the vote:	2

A vote having been taken, the Principal confirmed that the amendment had been passed.

59.6 The Principal moved to undertake a vote on the proposed policy, as amended.

In favour of the proposed policy:	46
Not in favour of the proposed policy:	30
Abstaining from the vote:	2

A vote having been taken, the Principal confirmed that the policy had been approved.

[Clerk’s Note: Senate remained quorate as, despite many Senators leaving at this point, 54 members were still present]

ENHANCEMENT-LED INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW CONTEXTUALISATION

60.1 Professor McGeorge, Vice Principal (Teaching and Learning) presented the paper on contextualisation prepared in advance of the forthcoming Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR). He stated that contextualisation was a requirement of the ELIR documentation and sought the agreement of the Senate to use the context as proposed.

60.2 The Principal invited members to comment on the paper. Professor Pavlovskaja stated that the policy approved Lecture Capture Policy would help to address a number of the

issues laid out in the paper and specifically in ensuring the ability of the University to support of a more diverse population.

- 60.3 No further comments were raised and the Principal proceeded to undertake a vote. The Principal invited Senators to vote on the proposed ELIR contextualisation:

In favour of the proposed ELIR contextualisation:	39
Not in favour of the proposed ELIR contextualisation:	2
Abstaining from the vote:	5

A vote having been taken, the Principal confirmed that the paper had been approved.

REMIT AND COMPOSITION OF THE WORKING GROUP TO DEVELOP A SHARED UNDERSTANDING OF THE UNIVERSITY'S CORE PRINCIPLES

- 61.1 On behalf of Professor Hutchison, Professor Ross, Vice Principal (People Strategy), presented the proposed remit and composition of the Working Group to develop a Shared Understanding of the University's Core Principles. Beginning, Professor Ross noted that the Senate was now out with the core hours for Committee meetings.
- 61.2 Professor Ross stated that following the extraordinary meeting of the Senate, she had along with Professors Hutchison and Greaves met with various members of the Reclaim group and prepared the proposed remit and composition for Senate's approval. The Senate were informed that there was some debate as to whether the group should be a working group or a steering group and that it was proposed this be referred to the group for closer consideration. Professor Ross stated that it was not intended that this be a group only to talk, but to state objectives and proposals.

Following Professor Ross' introduction, a short discussion ensued. The main tenets of which were as follows:

- Dr Mills, supported by Professor Schaper, noted that there was an underrepresentation of members of reclaim.
- Professor Wells expressed concern that the proposed group was missing representatives of a large section of the University, being those who were not members of management or of reclaim.
- Professor Lusseau echoed his support for those who did not identify with either group.
- Professor Lee also voiced agreement with Professor Wells. She proposed at least two members of non-management, non-reclaim academic staff be added to the composition of the group.
- Professor Lusseau suggested that the Employee Engagement Group may provide membership in this regard.
- Dr Mills agreed with the proposal but expressed concern as to how these individuals would be identified.
- Dr Oliver stated that he was party to discussions in preparing the proposed remit. He further stated that the group was intended to be smaller and therefore more constructive, and aimed to talk to and engage with a wide group of people.
- The Principal invited Professor Lee to formalise her suggestion of two additional academic members and she therefore proposed an amendment to

the remit and composition that the group be supplemented by two members of non-aligned academic staff.

- 61.3 The Principal proceeded to undertake a vote on the amendment. The Principal invited Senators to vote on the proposed amendment, that the group be supplemented by two members of academic staff:

In favour of the proposed amendment:	44
Not in favour of the proposed amendment:	4
Abstaining from the vote:	2

A vote having been taken, the Principal confirmed that the amendment had been passed.

- 61.4 The Principal moved to undertake a vote on the proposed remit and composition, as amended. Mr Styles expressed concern as to who would determine who the academic representatives would be. The Principal stated his intention to invite the community to put themselves forward and, if a vote is required, Senate will do so.

In favour of the proposed remit and composition:	46
Not in favour of the proposed remit and composition:	1
Abstaining from the vote:	3

A vote having been taken, the Principal confirmed that the paper had been approved.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT PILOT

- 62.1 It was agreed that the outcome of the student engagement pilot would be considered at the next meeting of Senate (23 April 2018).

STUDENT PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT 2018-2020

- 63.1 Senators undertook to provide any feedback on the current draft agreement to the President of the Students' Association (ausapresident@abdn.ac.uk) by Friday 16 March. A revised version of the Agreement will be brought to a future meeting of Senate for formal approval.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Senate approved and noted the recommendations arising from the meeting of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning on 30 January 2018.

1. Online Education

- 64.1 The Senate considered, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, the following three papers in respect to Online Education.
- (i) Online Admission Process (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).
 - (ii) Short Course Approach and Maximum Period of Study (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).
 - (iii) Minimum Course Information (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

Dr North noted that papers (i) and (ii) were contradictory and sought clarity with regards the length of study permitted for CPD. It was agreed that Professor McGeorge and Dr

North would discuss this issue in further detail and report back to the next meeting of the Senate. Subject to clarification of this point, Senate approved these papers

2. Update to Code of Practice on Student Discipline (Academic)

- 64.2 Senate noted that members of the Committee had received a paper proposing changes to the Code of Practice on Student Discipline (Academic). The Committee asked that a revised Code of Practice be brought to the next meeting of the Committee for consideration and final approval, at which time it will be forwarded to the Senate for approval.

3. Lecture Capture Policy

- 64.3 The Committee approved, for its part, and agreed to forward to the Senate, the updated version of the proposed lecture capture policy and a draft supporting evidence paper.

4. ELIR Contextualisation

- 64.4 The Committee approved, for its part, and agreed to forward to the Senate, the proposed ELIR contextualisation.

5. Update on the Enhanced Transcript

- 64.5 Senate noted that the Committee had received an update on the Enhanced Transcript. The Enhanced Transcript is more detailed than a degree certificate and functions as a supplement to it, providing details of courses, marks and approved extra-curricular activities. Undergraduate and taught Postgraduate students, receive the Enhanced Transcript on graduation. The Committee approved the proposal that students recruited as Non-Medical Personal Assistants, who have met defined criteria (30 hours of support in any one academic year), should receive recognition for their role within the Enhanced Transcript under 'recognised activities' for the remainder of academic 2017/18, and continuing in academic year 2018-19.

6. Accessible and Inclusive Learning

- 64.6 Senate noted that the Committee had approved a proposed review of policies and practices for accessible and inclusive learning (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

7. Feedback Framework

- 64.7 Senate noted that the Committee approved a draft Institutional Framework for Feedback on Assessment prepared by the Feedback and Assessment Task Force (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

8. PGR Expectations

- 64.8 Senate noted that members of the Committee approved a paper on PGR Expectations (copy filed with principal copy of the minute)

UPDATE FROM THE TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE STUDENT EXPERIENCE WORKING GROUP

- 64.1 The Senate noted the update from the Taught Postgraduate Student Experience Working Group (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

ANNUAL SENATE SURVEY

- 66.1 As was noted at the meeting of Senate on 18 October 2017, the Annual Senate Survey for 2017-18 will be undertaken further into the academic year to enable new senators more time to experience the Senate process. Accordingly, the Survey will be circulated to senators following this, the February, meeting of Senate. As was agreed by Senate, this year's survey will be an exact replica of the first survey to enable the first survey outcomes to be used as a baseline for comparison.

ELECTION OF A RECTOR

- 67.1 The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee, on behalf of the Senate, approved the composition (below) of the Election Committee who are overseeing the Election process for the current Election of a Rector.

Professor Chris Kee
Professor Mirela Delibegović
Dr Emily Nordmann
Three student senators from AUSA.

As was agreed at the meeting of Senate on 24 January 2018, Professor Phil Hannaford is Returning Officer for the Election.