

## UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

### SENATUS ACADEMICUS

#### **Minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2017**

*Present:* Professor M Greaves, Professor P McGeorge, Professor M Ross, Professor BD MacGregor, Professor P Hannaford, Dr P Sweeney, Professor E Welch, Mr M Whittington, Professor G Paton, Professor A Sahraie, Professor S Heys, Professor J Skakle, Professor D Jolley, Professor A Jenkinson, Professor C Kee, Professor E Pavlovskaja, Professor J Masthoff, Dr R Neilson, Professor K Shennan, Dr M Ehrenschtendner, Dr P Bishop, Professor R Wells, 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 D R Smith, Dr H Martin, Mrs M Stephen, Dr T Rist, Dr A Lewis, Dr Z Yihdego, Mr S Styles, Dr M Mills, Dr A Oelsner, Dr A McKinnon, Dr D Lusseau, Professor M Pinard, Dr M Barker, Dr J Baird, Dr A Rajnicek, Dr K Kiezebrink, Dr M Delibegović, Professor G Macfarlane, Dr N Vargesson, Dr J Hislop, Dr G Jones, Dr N Mody, Dr K Foster, Professor A Lee, Dr F Thies, Professor H Wallace, Dr E Nordmann, Dr M Jackson, 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 B Martin, Professor C Brittain, Dr C Black, Dr N Oren, Mr L Ogubie, Miss D Connelly, Miss M Leskovska, Miss K Metcalfe, Miss M Jensen, Mr N Johansson, Miss I Ewart, Mr L Budrass, Miss I Donaldson, Miss A McSeveney, Mr Y Dmitrov and Miss K Smith

*Apologies:* Professor I Diamond, Professor J Paterson, Professor A Glover, Professor N Haites, Dr G Gordon, Professor R Irwin, Dr M Bain, Professor I Guz, Professor H Hutchison, Professor M Brown, Professor M Campbell, Dr M Beaton, Dr M Hole, Professor A Akisanya, Mr E Usenmez, Dr T Fahey Palma, Dr R Shanks, Dr A Bryzgel, Dr B Tribout, Professor P Mealor, Dr P Glover, Dr A Simpson, Dr T Argounova-Low, Professor D Anderson, Professor J Jayasinghe, Dr J Macdiarmid, Dr M Brazzelli, Dr D Scott, Dr D MacCallum, Dr A Jack, Dr P Murchie, Dr A Venkatesh, Professor R Barker, Dr S Fielding, Dr I Cameron, Professor G Nixon, Dr D Ray, Dr K Pilz, Professor D Jovcic, Professor M Kashtalyan, Dr N Schofield, Dr M da Silva Baptista, Dr W Vasconcelos, Mr K Thomson-Duncan, Mr J Brown, Miss K Paterson-Hunter and Mr K Rzetelski

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

- 9.1 The Senior Vice-Principal opened the meeting, welcoming members of the Senate to the meeting, noting that the Principal was currently away on University business and therefore unable to Chair the meeting.
- 9.2 The Senior Vice-Principal reminded Senators that the meeting was audio recorded and encouraged Senators to give their name when they spoke to allow the minute to appropriately reflect contributors to discussions.
- 9.3 The Senior Vice-Principal reminded Senators of their remit and their appointment to represent the views of their constituency to the Senate, to provide a mechanism for feedback to their constituency and to act for the good of the entire University Community. The Senior Vice-Principal further noted the importance of Senators recognising that their constituency will have some more vociferous members and some quieter members and the importance of the reflection of all views at Senate.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- 10.1 The Senior Vice-Principal invited members to confirm that they were content with the minutes of the meetings of the Senate held on 7 June and 11 September 2017.
- 10.2 Professor Martin proposed an amendment to minute point 57.11 of the minute of the meeting held on 7 2017 as follows:

*The Principal proposed, with the agreement of the Senate, that Professor Ross, Professor Martin and Dr Nordmann work together to redraft the appropriate section of the Terms and Conditions, with the revised wording to be submitted to the Partnership Negotiating and Consultative Committee (PNCC) for discussion with the Unions.*

No objections to the proposed amendment were raised. The Senior Vice-Principal noted no further amendments to either minute had been proposed and the meeting continued.

## **UPDATE FROM THE SENIOR VICE-PRINCIPAL**

- 11.1 The Senior Vice-Principal, in providing an update to the Senate, began by noting his appreciation that it had been a very busy time for staff as a consequence of the start of the new term and congratulated colleagues on all their efforts in welcoming new and returning students. He noted the rewarding nature of the smooth running of registration, testament to the considerable efforts made by all staff. He also congratulated the Students' Association Sabbatical Officers on their efforts in the successes of Fresher's Week.
- 11.2 The Senior Vice-Principal stated that it had been his privilege to meet with students at recent events including at the School of Law matriculation dinner, the Sports Captains Event and the Principal's Scholars Awards. He noted that their manifest enthusiasm, energy and academic determination was both refreshing and humbling and a reminder to us why we are all here.
- 11.3 The Senior Vice-Principal congratulated the student body on their recent Health and Wellbeing Day and its demonstration of how much there is we can do to improve our diet and exercise. He further noted the University's excellent Mental Health Strategy for both staff and students and the importance of looking out for each other in that regard, and acting accordingly.
- 11.4 He noted the forthcoming Undergraduate Open Day on the 21 October 2017, extending his gratitude to colleagues for their continuing support of and contribution to the event.
- 11.5 Senators were updated on positive news regarding league tables, including the University's climb of 3 places in the Times Higher Education (THE) world rankings. The Senior Vice-Principal noted the importance of the THE sub-categories and the considerable increase in the University's International Outlook score. He also noted that the University's reputation for high quality research continues to grow, with the University's Research Citation Impact Rank rising 25 places. The Senior Vice-Principal noted the Improved Student Experience Scores and acknowledged the input of many colleagues in this improvement. He stated, however, that the Court has been expectant that league table positions should improve further. He noted retention rates, NSS scores specifically as still requiring improvement.

- 11.6 The Senior Vice-Principal congratulated colleagues on the University's recent successes with regards Athena Swan and the award of 4 further bronze awards to the Schools of Biological Sciences, Education Social Science and the Institute of Education for Medical and Dental Research. He informed the Senate that 11 of the University's Schools and institutes now hold bronze awards, to compliment the Institution's bronze award. He recognised the contribution of Professor Ross, Vice Principal for People Strategy, as well as many other colleagues in achieving these awards.
- 11.7 The Senate were updated on the position regarding Government funding and acknowledged that the position remains challenging with a Government spending review expected in December. The Senior Vice-Principal note that it was as yet unclear whether the review would be for one year or two. He stated that it was difficult to imagine a scenario where there would be extra funding for Higher Education. Senators were reminded of the Prime Minister's announcement of a freeze in tuition fees post 2017/2018 and a review of tuition fees, the details of which were as yet unknown, which may also impact upon Scotland.
- 11.8 The Senior Vice-Principal noted there was little to update the Senate of in the way of Brexit, however, acknowledged the Prime Minister's Florence speech and its references to residency for EU Nationals and the UK welcoming talent. He noted there was no definitive action in this regard so far. Senators were reminded that these and several other issues would likely present significant challenges to the University's finances.
- 11.9 In concluding, the Senior Vice-Principal noted the sporting and academic achievements of staff and students. Firstly, following on from 2017 Engineering graduate Zoe Clark's silver in the World Athletics Championships in August 2017, he noted the successes of another Engineering student, Kim Beattie, who won the double mini trampolining gold medal at the European trampolining championships in Portugal last week and will compete at the World championships in Bulgaria in 4 weeks' time. He also noted that Kim is the daughter of David Beattie, the University's Finance Director, and issued his congratulations.
- 11.10 Secondly, the Senior Vice-Principal highlighted the successes of Professor Pete Smith from Plant and Soil Science who has become an Honorary Fellow of the Indian National Science Academy and Professor Harry Flint of the Rowett Institute, international expert in Anaerobic Gut Bacteria, who has been awarded the ultimate accolade by two research groups in Germany in recognition of his global contribution and, as is tradition, the naming of two bacteria after him. The Senior Vice-Principal noted his great appreciation to Professors Smith and Flint for their contributions and outstanding achievements.

#### **QUESTIONS FOR THE SENIOR VICE-PRINCIPAL**

- 12.1 The Senior Vice-Principal Invited Dr Oren to ask his question. Dr Oren, asked his question regarding staff satisfaction surveys as follows:

*The 5th October edition of the Times Higher Education reported the results of a UK-wide [survey on staff satisfaction](#). Aberdeen came 67th out of 78 with regards to "staff satisfaction with the way their university is being managed", with only 3.6% of staff being satisfied; 72nd out of 78 with regards to the (positive) impact senior management had on staff wellbeing; and 41st out of 78 with regards to management impact on student wellbeing and staff dignity.*

*Given that people lie at the heart of our strategy, these results are - to say the least - disappointing. Critically, the University does not appear to have any information to show whether these results are, or are not valid. Our last staff satisfaction survey took place in 2014, and its results have not been made public. Could senior management's comment on these issues, and would they be willing to:*

- (i) Commit themselves to running an annual staff satisfaction survey;*
- (ii) Make the survey's results public; and*
- (iii) Make staff satisfaction survey results part of the institution's core KPIs*

12.2 The Senior Vice-Principal thanked Dr Oren for his question and for raising an important issue. He informed the Senate he had viewed a summary of the survey referenced by Dr Oren, and stated the importance of noting that the response rates to the survey were extremely low, the highest number of responses for a University being 235, a likely less than 10% response rate. While stating that he was not dismissive of the issue raised, he urged caution in the interpretation of the data provided by such a survey, likely to be heavily at risk of response bias.

12.3 Professor Ross, Vice Principal for People Strategy, responding to Dr Oren, informed the Senate that the survey discussed was a new survey conducted by a small group of academics within the UK, asking questions of responders about their satisfaction with Senior Management within their Institution. Professor Ross noted that there appeared to be only 4 questions on which there was reporting. She further noted comments on the survey's website regarding response bias and, acknowledged that if students were being advised on the use of such a survey, they would be advised not to rely on this type of data. Despite this warning, however, Professor Ross echoed Dr Oren's disappointment in the results of any survey which appear to reflect negatively on the University. Professor Ross highlighted a number of innovations over the last few months which are intended to try to improve satisfaction amongst staff generally. With regards to the University's overall staff satisfaction data, Professor Ross confirmed the last survey was indeed conducted in 2014, by way of an extensive survey compiled over several years with the addition of various topics. Professor Ross noted that the results of the survey had been available since 2015 and during 2015 were disseminated by way of College Executives and as available data for Schools to obtain by way of consultation with HR.

12.4 Professor Ross acknowledged work was ongoing to establish how the University makes the survey process more meaningful and less extensive. Professor Ross confirmed the University was in consultation with benchmark organisations and other Universities to establish practice elsewhere. Professor Ross noted that normal practice is for a survey to take place every two years and for it to be conducted through an external organisation. She acknowledged that this was not something the University had done before, but hoped that a survey in collaboration with an external organisation could be launched in 2018. Professor Ross confirmed that smaller, subject specific, surveys had been undertaken since 2014, including the survey of staff in regards communication, IT and Athena Swan. Professor Ross noted that impacts of these surveys could already be seen and that the staff communications survey had resulted in changes in the ways the University communicates with members of the University community.

12.5 In answering Dr Oren's three specific questions, Professor Ross stated:

- (i) Her commitment to normal practice and therefore undertaking staff surveys every two years;

- (ii) Her commitment to the publication of the survey result data internally within the institution and;
  - (iii) Referring the consideration of the inclusion of staff surveys in the University's KPIs to the Court and the Senate's Working Group on KPIs for consideration.
- 12.6 Dr Oren thanked Professor Ross for her response. Dr Oren expressed his concerns that as an institution, the University is unaware of how staff perceive Senior Management and that it had been 3 years since any useful data has been obtained in this regard. With regards to the availability of survey results, Dr Oren noted he was unaware of the dissemination of data to Schools and stated that this may be a matter of a lack of an appropriate communication strategy. Dr Oren also noted if academics have a framework placed on them, Senior Management must also meet certain expectations from staff.
- 12.7 Professor Ross again noted the points as raised and acknowledged her own desire to see a Staff Satisfaction Survey as soon as possible. Professor Ross directed Dr Oren to HR should he wish access to the 2014 survey data.
- 12.8 Mr Styles welcomed Professor Ross' assurances that data would be made public, especially given his understanding that this had not been the case to date. Mr Styles stated that UCU had submitted a Freedom of Information (FOI) request to obtain the data and received it in an indecipherable format. Mr Styles proposed the general release of the historic 2014 data. Professor Ross confirmed that her College Executive received a clear presentation on the data in 2015 at which point it was indicated Heads of School could obtain data for their own School.
- 12.9 Professor Schaper echoed Mr Styles' proposal for the publication of the 2014 data and suggested that the data be made available to all staff on the University website, protected by University username and password. Professor Ross stated that the proposal would be taken up with the University's Data Protection Officer, however, noted that there were groups within the survey who were declaring characteristics which could make them easily identifiable. Professor Ross agreed to take the issue away for appropriate discussion.
- 12.10 Dr Oelsner, noted that while the survey return was low, this was likely comparable with low returns for each University included in the rankings. She therefore noted that the University had still performed badly when compared to other Universities and stated that the issue should not be diminished. The Senior Vice-Principal reiterated that he was not dismissive of the issue raised by the survey, however, with regards to the survey itself, noted that tabulation of invalid data created an invalid table.
- 12.11 Professor Schaper suggested that the survey could represent responses from the most likely to moan at any Institution and therefore represented a valid comparison by way of a table of 'moaners'.
- 12.12 Dr Oren noted, despite low response rates, should the survey take off, the importance academic staff may place on the survey could not be underestimated and to attract talent to the University, the issues arising from the survey must be addressed.
- 12.13 The Senior Vice-Principal thanked Senators for the discussion. Professor Martin, was then invited to ask his question, regarding the current status of discussions relating to the revisions to the clauses on working abroad in the Employee Agreement as follows:
- (i) *At the June Senate meeting, it was agreed that a small working party would be set up to revise the clauses on working abroad in the Employee Agreement in*

*view of the concerns expressed by Senators, and that Senior Management would take the revised wording to the Partnership Negotiating and Consultative Committee for discussion with the Unions (point 57.11 of the June Minutes and the June Senate Digest refers). Why did this not happen?*

*It is also noted that a University Management representative at the PNCC meeting told Union negotiators that they didn't feel it was necessary to discuss the wording because there was a Union representative on the working group, even though that representative had no official status as a union negotiator.*

- (ii) Given the assurances made several times by Senior Management that if staff decide not to work overseas then it will not impact on their progression, promotion or anything else at the institution (see 57.3 of the June Minutes, for example), why is the university not willing to include clauses in the working abroad wording saying that if staff choose not to work overseas then:  
(a) it will not affect their employment; (b) it will not lead to an unreasonably heavy teaching or administrative workload?*
- (iii) What is the current status of the revised clauses concerning working abroad, and how does Senior Management intend to proceed given UCU's decision to register a formal Failure to Agree over this wording?*

12.14 Professor Ross thanked Professor Martin for his question. Professor Ross noted that she would cover each the issues in the order raised, as she did at a recent meeting of the University Court in response to the UCU representative.

12.15 Responding, Professor Ross stated that following the June 2017 meeting of the Senate she had opened up discussions with Professor Martin and Dr Nordmann, the group identified at the meeting, charged with moving the issue forward. Professor Ross noted that she had proposed amended wording by way of email and over the period of the summer responses followed from Dr Nordmann, Mr Robotham and Professor Martin. The wording was amended following discussions and taken to the University Management Group (UMG). Professor Ross noted that a meeting of the small Group was not held as the issue was discussed by way of correspondence, nor was a meeting of the larger Working Group that had been in existence since 2015 and met on 6 or 7 occasions to discuss this clause, convened. The revised wording proposed the reference to 'the ability of staff to refuse to go abroad without giving a reason', 'no detriment to career progression' and the two additional points on which the group came back regarding 'no effect on terms and conditions of employment' and 'nor leading to an unreasonably heavy teaching or administrative load'. When the UMG considered this revised wording it took the view that the clause regarding no reason having to be given was acceptable and also the lack of impact on career progression. In relation to the two additional points proposed, the UMG felt these were already protected by other terms and conditions of employment and that the workload allocation is a matter to be determined in Schools, according to the needs of a School at any given time. Professor Ross referenced her comments at the June meeting of the Senate (minute point 57.10 refers) that the more words used in a contract clause, the more complicated it becomes. Professor Ross noted the concern that it could appear, should all the words be used in the clause, that those who refuse to work abroad have enhanced rights over those who don't.

12.16 Professor Ross further noted the purpose of the terms around working abroad is to ensure if the University does have business abroad, staff are given the option to participate. She noted that the option had, in the Business School, been taken up in relation to the Qatar campus. Professor Ross provided an example that, if it were to be stated that there would be no detriment to any member of staff by refusing to go abroad, then it could be implicit that that member of staff has security as an employee of the University that cannot be guaranteed to anyone. She continued to state, if, for

example, the Business School was so successful in its ventures abroad that it needs less staff in Aberdeen, that it something that must be handled appropriately and in the normal way. The UMG chose to approve the shorter wording and the paper proposing this went to the meeting of the PNCC.

- 12.17 Professor Ross confirmed that she was the Senior Management member to whom Professor Martin referred as having told Union negotiators that they didn't feel it was necessary to discuss the wording because there was a Union representative on the working group, even though that representative had no official status as a union negotiator. Professor Ross stated that she felt Professor Martin was airing points that the Union was concerned about. Professor Ross apologised if this was not the case. Professor Ross confirmed agreement could not be reached at the PNCC and the UCU have now taken out a failure to agree process. Professor Ross confirmed the process with regards failure to agree, is to follow the Partnership Agreement with regards how it should be dealt with. Professor Ross apologised if there was any confusion in regards the communication issued.
- 12.18 Professor Ross referred to the statement made in the minute of June meeting of the Senate which states 'the Principal unequivocally stated his commitment to ensuring that no member of staff is forced to work overseas' (minute point 57.3 refers). She noted that the commitment had been reiterated on several occasions yet at the Court meeting, a Senator indicated staff had been forced to work overseas. Professor Ross repeated that this is absolutely not the intention and if there is any instance of this practice it be reported to HR or to her, in order that it might be appropriately dealt with.
- 12.19 Professor Martin thanked Professor Ross for the long and detailed response. He noted his disappointment there was not more discussion in the working group and stated that discussion may have been helpful in teasing out some of the issues raised. On behalf of his constituency, Professor Martin noted concerns held by his constituents regarding being pressured to go abroad. Professor Martin acknowledged Professor Ross' statement regarding making a clause too long, however, stated that as academics, staff are used to reading long and complicated documentation. In this case, he stated, longer and more detailed terms and conditions would be helpful rather than a hindrance to help provide clarification. Professor Martin also raised the experiences of staff in Geosciences with regards to the Transnational Education (TNE) project in Rwanda, he noted staff had experienced pressure to take part in the project and that the School as a whole had felt pressure. Professor Martin expressed that staff remained very concerned. Professor Martin stated that he felt everyone wanted the same thing, for the University to be successful overseas and for staff who wished to be engaged, to do so. To set people's minds at rest is to have full and detailed discussions. Professor Martin strongly encouraged the University to return to talks with the UCU to try to find an appropriate form of wording.
- 12.20 Professor Ross reiterated that the University would follow the processes as laid out in the Partnership Agreement with regards to the failure to agree. Professor Ross noted that the length of clauses is not about whether they are understandable but about interpretation when a conflict arises. She agreed that the University would only wish those who wanted to work abroad to do so and expressed that she was unsure what more the University could do with regards to a feeling of pressure amongst staff where reassurances have been repeated that there is no such pressure for any individual to work abroad. Professor Ross reminded the Senate that attempts to agree the terms and conditions had been ongoing for the last two years and that the other unions were in agreement and until an agreement is reached, the pre-existing terms and conditions remain in place.

- 12.21 The Senior Vice-Principal expressed his agreement that it would not be in anyone's interest for duress to be applied, with the University as a whole wishing for the courses concerned to be successful and they would not be under those circumstances.
- 12.22 Mr Styles noted his agreement with Professor Ross that terms and conditions shouldn't be too long, however, if the clause 'no-one shall be compelled to work abroad' should be entered people would be content. Mr Styles stated his surprise at the last meeting of the PNCC at the contrast between the willingness to negotiate and compromise heard at Senate and the stonewalling that occurred at PNCC where management wouldn't move an inch. Mr Styles noted, if as stated repeatedly, there is no desire to compel people to work abroad, why can't a sentence be inserted to that effect. Mr Styles stated there exists a disconnect between what is being said at Senate and what is happening with negotiations. Mr Styles requested assurances from management that a clause to this effect be entered.
- 12.23 The Senior Vice-Principal expressed that it was inappropriate to discuss the wording of terms and conditions at a meeting of Senate and that assurances had been given that the University would engage with the processes as laid out in the Partnership Agreement with regards to the failure to agree.
- 12.24 Mr Styles reiterated the disconnect between the assurances made by management at Senate to those made at PNCC and asked for reassurance that what Senators are told at Senate is made manifest at the negotiations with the UCU.
- 12.25 Dr Rea, by way of providing an example of pressure placed on staff, noted with regards the Rwanda project, the project was brought to Senate with rollout approximately 8 to 9 months later. Dr Rea noted that the people tasked with delivery had not been spoken to, nor could the recruitment of new staff be guaranteed in the timeframe. Dr Rea noted the pressure placed on staff by the hurried approval of a project of this nature.

### **HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING**

- 13.1 The Senior Vice-Principal moved to the agenda item of Health, Safety and Wellbeing.
- 13.2 The Senior Vice-Principal invited any questions or comments on Health, Safety and Wellbeing. None were raised and the meeting proceeded.

### **REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT**

- 14.1 The Senate received an update from Professor Delibigovic on behalf of the Senate Assessors on the meeting of the University Court held on 27 June 2017 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minute).
- 14.2 Firstly, however, Professor Delibigovic provided an update on the key points arising from discussions at the meeting of Court on 4 October 2017 as follows:
- Regarding the process for the appointment of The Principal:
    - That head-hunters would be invited to bid for the recruitment process;
    - Any nominations from Staff for internal or external candidates would be welcomed by the Selection Committee;
    - The makeup of the Selection Committee was agreed, comprised of 11 members as follows: The Convener (an independent member, The Convener of the Governance and Nominations Committee), the Senior

Governor, two independent members of the Court (who should be female in the interest of gender balance), President of the Students' Association, the four Senate Assessors and the two elected staff members on Court.

- Regarding Transnational Education (TNE):
  - The go ahead for further development with regards to projects in Qatar and Sri Lanka;
  - Agreement that projects in Uganda and Korea should not progress. [Clerks note: subsequent to the meeting it was noted that the statement with regard to Korea had been erroneous. Minutes 32-34 of the Court meeting held on 4 October 2017 correctly record that discussions with Korean partners were continuing]

14.3 Professor Delibigovic specifically noted that the June meeting of the Court had discussed the following:

- Regarding financial planning and budgets, the Court received papers from Schools with targets for a break even situation by 2019/20. To achieve this there are targets to increase income by £20 million through an increase in overseas tuition fees, online education and enrolment in TNE projects over the next 3 years. Schools have also identified savings of £5.6 million through natural staff turnover, planned or flexible retirement, restructuring and operational savings.
- Institutional KPIs were agreed upon, Court wished to receive bi-annual reports on Institutional KPIs in order to receive a clear overview of academic and financial performance. Court wish to ensure the KPIs are used to monitor performance against budget income growth areas such as online education.
- Court agreed the importance of online education and digital marketing and Institutional profile in ensuring the success of the strategy.
- League tables were discussed, with a report provided on different league tables and how Aberdeen had fared. The importance of league tables, particularly in regards to student recruitment, was agreed.
- Finally, TNE projects were discussed, with discussion now superseded by the meeting held in October 2017.

14.4 Mrs Tibbetts asked a question with regards minute point 224. Noting the information provided regarding very stretching targets, she suggested there is silence in terms of investment and where areas of investment will be. Mrs Tibbetts suggested this was an imbalance. The Senior Vice-Principal noted the point raised and referred (i) overseas tuition fees, online education and enrolment in TNE projects as detailed in the papers and (ii) acknowledged recent School Planning Meetings where such issues were being discussed.

14.5 Dr Yidhego asked, regarding the scope of TNE, whether this only covered campuses abroad or whether this also included joint degrees, such as that to be proposed in Sri Lanka. The Senior Vice-Principal confirmed that TNE encompasses a range of activities including overseas campuses, single speciality campuses and alliances with other Universities. Dr Yidhego noted confusion amongst colleagues as to the definition of TNE.

14.6 Mr Styles asked, with reference to the figures provided regarding cuts and growth, if it would be possible to receive a presentation at the next Senate regarding the University's general financial position and what's been happening with spending in the

last year or two, in order that Senators can understand the basis on which these decisions are being made. The Senior Vice-Principal welcomed Mr Styles' suggestion.

### **PROPOSED MEDICINE TNE PROJECT IN SRI LANKA**

- 15.1 Professor Heys, accompanied by Professor Patey, presented the proposal for a TNE project in Sri Lanka (copy filed with the principal copy of the minute). Following the presentation, Dr Rist was invited to ask his question, as posed in advance of the meeting, as follows:

*At 5.3.6, the University of Aberdeen document Delivery Partners – Principles and Procedures states that before Senate's approval for 'any new delivery partnerships' is sought, Senate should normally receive a paper and/or presentation on the 'nature and source of Due Diligence carried out'. Can the Senior Vice-Principal explain why no such due diligence on the Sri Lanka project has come to Senate; and confirm that in future the due diligence on delivery partnerships will always come to Senate before Senate's approval is sought?*

- 15.2 Responding to Dr Rist, the Senior Vice-Principal stated if there had been a procedural irregularity he would be content to apologise, however, in this case he did not feel there had been, confirming that the topic was on the agenda prior to receipt of the question and that the presentation included information on the due diligence completed. The Senior Vice-Principal noted that from his comments it appears that the due diligence component of the presentation had not gone far enough to reassure Dr Rist and proposed that may form part of the debate. The Senior Vice-Principal confirmed that due diligence on delivery would always come to Senate for approval as it was today, for the proposed project in Sri Lanka.

- 15.3 Following the Senior Vice-Principal's comments, discussion ensued, the main tenets of which were as follows:

- Dr Oliver noted his support for the Sri Lankan proposal and his appreciation of the project as an important opportunity to seize upon, however, stated his agreement with Dr Rist and his assessment with respect to ensuring issues of due diligence are appropriately addressed. Dr Oliver stated that ideally, this should be reflected in the paperwork provided to the Senate to allow for appropriate preparation. Dr Oliver stressed the importance of ensure process is not erratic, as it has been in this instance.
- Responding, the Senior Vice-Principal again acknowledged the issue of being unable to present due diligence before a project is presented and the balance that must be struck in this regard.
- Professor Masthoff acknowledged the Human Rights situation in Sri Lanka and, while noting the improvements made in this regard, stressed that the situation was still far from ideal. Professor Masthoff referenced Amnesty International and the World Health Organisation (WHO) reports and expressed concern regarding reported incidents of torture by police, instances of violence against women and discrimination against specific sections of the population. Professor Masthoff asked how the safety of staff students is assured when they go on placement in their final years.
- Professor Heys referenced interactions with students in Sri Lanka, none of whom had reported any experiences such as those referred to. Professor Heys assured Senators that he met with the Chief Executive of the private hospital

group where clinical training would take place specifically to try and understand what was happening. Professor Heys confirmed that nobody with whom the team from Aberdeen had spoken had experienced torture. Staff and student feedback was strongly supportive of the training environment and other partners involved with Sri Lanka, such as Coventry, had not expressed any issues. In terms of the opportunity to help support change (in Sri Lanka), Professor Heys expressed the importance of Aberdeen's role in this. Professor Heys noted that he and Professor Patey met with several female nurses, none of whom had reported any issues. Furthermore, Professor Heys assured Senators that staff would be on hand and should any such issue be discovered, the response to withdraw would be swift.

- Professor Masthoff asked whether the staff and patients of the private hospital appropriately represented the Sri Lankan population.
- Professor Heys confirmed this wasn't a question he could answer. Professor Heys confirmed that he had focussed on the breadth of disease treated in the private hospital, to ensure students would receive appropriate exposure. In terms of equality and diversity, Professors Heys and Patey confirmed that the issue features heavily in the medical programme and the exposure of all students to issues of equality diversity and to understanding the principles of justice and fairness is embedded within the medical degree. Professor Heys noted the importance of influencing practice by teaching the students the key principles of equality and diversity.
- Professor Patey added the importance of understanding the context of a medical education in the UK, which requires the understanding in students of situations where there is abuse, situations of inequality and challenge and the University is tasked and required to demonstrate to the General Medical Council (GMC) that that is a core part of the curriculum. Professor Patey further noted that the existing curriculum includes opportunities for students to undertake elective projects across the world to be engaged in Global Health. Professor Patey acknowledged the importance of this aspect of a healthcare education in the UK and whilst understanding of the challenges associated with Sri Lanka, she stated the desire of the School to engage in Sri Lanka's journey.
- Professor Heys highlighted the work of students in Africa in addressing challenges, particularly in the treatment of women.
- Professor Patey confirmed that she had met with Tamil students and patients. She reiterated that 55% of healthcare was provided by the private sector, with the public/private model of healthcare differing significantly from the UK model.
- Dr Rist, referring to section 3.2 of the papers, noted the existence of a due diligence report. Dr Rist requested the report be made available to Senators. The University Secretary confirmed that two external companies undertook due diligence for the project. The Secretary noted that at the briefing for the trade unions ahead of the recent Court meeting, reports were requested and, as such, both organisations have been approached for their approval to release the summary due diligence reports. On receipt of approval from both organisations (one had agreed to date), the University Secretary stated her willingness to make the reports available to the Senate.
- Mr Ogubie, Student President, noted concerns from the student perspective including (i) the quality of education and teaching provided by way of the partnership and (ii) issues relating to the welfare of the Students in Sri Lanka.
- Responding, Professor Heys assured Mr Ogubie that the quality of education and teaching must be of the same quality as that provided in Aberdeen as a consequence of internal University Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and external GMC oversight. Professor Heys further assured Mr Ogubie and all Senators that a significant part of the proposal would focus on teaching quality,

teacher training and “training the trainer” in order to assure the GMC and to receive GMC accreditation. Professor Heys noted the importance of providing the same quality of education and the same opportunity to students in Sri Lanka as received by students in Aberdeen. Professor Patey added that the existing UK model saw students undertake clinical practice in their final two years, at a number of Scottish Hospitals, such as Raigmore in Inverness. Senators noted that the campus in Sri Lanka would mirror the same model and be required to adhere to the same standards. Professor Patey reiterated that two members of University of Aberdeen staff would be in Sri Lanka to ensure this is achieved. Professor Heys also noted the awareness of the Aberdeen team to ensure recreational facilities are available to students.

- Mr Budrass, on behalf of the Students’ Association asked whether there was likely to be opportunity in the future for other students from the School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition to benefit from the project. Professor Heys confirmed that the project was beginning with the MBChB, the immediate need, however, confirmed the opportunity for further development and his desire to develop the collaboration as soon as is realistically possible.
- Dr Yidego stated he felt the model was a good one. He asked whether in dealing with a developing a country, how fair is the tuition fee the students would be paying. Professor Heys confirmed that students would for their first three years pay the standard overseas tuition fee. In the final two years, it is expected that this will be matched to fees comparable to other Institutions in the region. Professor Heys expressed his desire to introduce bursaries, widen access and provide a funded place or places if at all possible.
- Professor Martin welcomed the news that it may be possible for Senate to have sight of the due diligence reports. He suggested that in future, it be written in to contracts that the report can be shared with appropriate bodies, such as the Senate. The Senior Vice-Principal confirmed it was the summary reports which would be released.
- Professor Martin noted that the paper made reference to short trips to Sri Lanka by Aberdeen staff for the purposes of examinations or staff training and asked Professor Heys to confirm there are staff in the School willing to travel. Professor Heys confirmed the number required was small and approximately 2-4 members of staff to support the project. He stated his confidence that several members of staff and NHS staff were keen to be involved. He stated his commitment that no member of staff was required to go, the project had been fully costed and there would be no additional work for staff to undertake.
- Professor Schaper stated the project was impressive, well thought through and that due diligence had been done. However, he stated that in advance of the presentation it appeared as though due diligence had not been done. He noted that a lack of communication had led to the questions regarding due diligence being posed.
- Dr Rist stated that a gloss on the issue of due diligence was not what Senate wanted and commented that the reports should be released with appropriate redaction. He suggested that it was not possible to approve or disapprove the project, without the due diligence reports.
- The University Secretary confirmed permission had been sought, and was being sought, with regards to the release of the summary of the due diligence undertaken. The Senior Vice-Principal confirmed this was their right.
- Mr Styles stated to the Senior Vice-Principal that it was within their rights only as a consequence of the contracts agreed. He echoed proposals that the automatic release of the reports be written in to their contracts. Mr Styles proposed the postponement of a vote, pending receipt of the due diligence reports.

- Dr Simpson asked Professor Heys if there would be consequences for the project, should the vote be delayed. Professor Heys expressed concern that a delay could present significant issues in the development of the project, particularly as other Universities have expressed their desire to work in the region.
- Mrs Tibbets proposed that moving forward, all due diligence reports accompany presentations of TNE projects, however, an exception be made in this case.
- Professor Wells clarified that under the existing procedures on TNE, it was committed that the Senate would receive information on the nature and source of the due diligence undertaken. He confirmed that due diligence has been seen and accepted by the project board, the Court and the Senior Management (SMT). He stated the need to be careful, when asking for due diligence the University does so on the basis that it will only be released to certain groups of individuals, usually senior members of Court.
- Dr Rist stated that the implication is that the Court and the project board have a right to see documentation and the Senate does not and, as such, is a slight to the Senate.

15.4 The Senior Vice-Principal invited Senators to vote to on the proposal to proceed with the development of this initiative with the intention of seeking full permission from the December meeting of the University Court to begin recruitment for a September 2019 start.

In favour of the proposal:	64
Not in favour of the proposal:	8
Abstaining from the vote:	8

A vote having been taken, the Senior Vice-Principal confirmed that the proposal to proceed with the development of this initiative had been accepted. He expressed his agreement with many of the comments made by way of discussion and stated that he felt things could be done better in the future.

15.5 Dr Rea asked the Senior Vice-Principal to confirm the assurances made with regards due diligence. The Senior Vice-Principal confirmed his commitment to (i) looking more closely at the timing of projects coming to the Senate, (ii) the amendment of contracts with company or individuals undertaking due diligence with regards what can be distributed and (ii) ensuring adequate warning to the Senate of the situation around a project to ensure appropriate discussion can be held.

### **CAPPING RESIT GRADES TO D3, USE IN FINAL DEGREE CLASSIFICATION AND FORMAT OF RESIT**

16.1 The Senior Vice-Principal Invited Professor Shennan to present the paper on the capping of resit grades to D3, use in final degree classification and the format of resits.

16.2 Professor Shennan explained the proposal, arising from feedback from External Examiners, that marks for failed courses are no longer included in the calculation of a student's degree classification, to prevent students being penalised twice, and instead a 'resit pass' equivalent to a 'CGS D3' be included following a successful pass at resit. Professor Shennan stated the following five specific proposals as laid out in the paper:

- (i) That resits grades at all levels of study be capped at D3;

- (ii) That the resit grade of D3 be used in Honours or Master's degree classification;
- (iii) That this be applied retrospectively to ensure students currently in levels 4 or 5 can benefit from the change and;
- (iv) That the terminology 'RP' Resit Pass or 'RF' Resit Fail be used on transcripts, with the actual mark achieved in the resit available by way of MyAberdeen;
- (v) That course coordinators be encouraged to think of alternate formats of assessment, to ensure resit examinations are not relied upon so heavily.

16.3 Professor Shennan invited comments and/or questions from the floor and a discussion ensued. The main tenets of which were as follows:

- Dr North, on behalf of his constituency, noted several concerns with the proposal in its current format. Dr North stated that his constituency felt the paper was muddled, unclear in terms of the issue it was trying to address and would potentially incur unintended consequences. With regards to the issue to be fixed, Dr North stated that the need at level 3 for resit can often be in an attempt to encourage students to reengage and to catch up with their learning. He stated that to impose a cap of D3 provides these students with no incentive. Dr North acknowledged that the situation can differ at level 4, where resits can often be undertaken as a means of credit accumulation only. Dr North also noted that the document refers to cost and efficiency savings, however, asserted that the document is contradictory in that it also refers to a need for appropriate resit assessments for those unable to have taken the assessment at the initial diet as a consequence of good cause or medical circumstances. Dr North noted concerns that the document refers to whether examinations should be used as a means of assessment at all and expressed that his constituency felt students taking the resit should not be experiencing a different format of assessment to those taking the assessment at first sitting. Dr North stated that an exam is a meaningful part of a mix of assessment types. Dr North informed the Senate that the retrospective application of the proposal would be unfair to students and noted the proposal lacked clarity in terms of the consequences of this element of the proposal. Dr North stated the importance of being clear for the reasons for the proposal, identifying how big the problem of students being unable to return for the resit diet is and of ensuring alternate means are identified only if/when necessary.
- Responding, Professor Shennan reiterated that the problem being addressed was identified by External Examiners and concerned the requirement of students failing a course to resit it and while they may achieve a mark of A5, only the initial fail grade would count towards their degree classification. Professor Shennan noted that External Examiners had provided feedback that this practice was unfair and that the QAC, by the way of this paper, had sought to address this issue. Professor Shennan also noted the retrospective application of the proposal was to the benefit of students who would now have 'CGS D3' and not a fail grade included in the degree classification as current procedures dictate.
- Professor Masthoff stated that the proposal had been considered by several representative Committees in advance of its presentation to Senate. She noted the overall feeling of the Committees that the use of the fail grade in classification was unfair, however, that a capped grade of D3 should be used to prevent the tactical taking of assessments. Professor Masthoff noted that the proposed practice was already used at Postgraduate Taught level. She noted discussion surrounding whether the mark achieved, although not used in classification, should appear on the transcript.
- Professor Wells stated his support for the paper, noting that existing practice was unfair. He further noted that if students achieved learning outcomes by

way of resit, it should be reflected that they had done so.

- Professor Feldmann on behalf of his constituency noted support for the proposal, however, stated the feeling of constituents that the mark although achieved at resit, although counted as D3, should also appear on the transcript for the purposes of enhancing employability.
- Professor McGeorge, Vice Principal for Teaching and Learning, acknowledged the requirement of the University to look at feedback provided by External Examiners as has been done in this instance. He stated that the proposal was more likely to incentivise students in the resit process in order to achieve the pass they require. He informed the Senate that new policies will only ever be introduced retrospectively where they are advantageous to students, as it would be in this case. Professor McGeorge noted that assessments are designed to assess learning outcomes, it is possible to have several means of assessing learning outcomes and the nature, as long as it does so and is appropriately quality assured, does not matter.
- Dr North agreed with proposals that the mark achieved at resit should be made available more widely.
- Professor Shennan noted that if the resit grade was to appear on the transcript, this may be confusing to students and employers. To make the mark available on MyAberdeen may alleviate this issue.
- Professor Akinsanya expressed his support for allowing a 'CGS D3' to be used in degree classification. He stated that to allow the mark achieved to be included on the transcript would be beneficial, and reflect practice elsewhere including at the University of Glasgow.
- Professor McGeorge noted the importance of ensuring consistency across Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught.
- Professor Kee noted, on behalf of the Postgraduate Taught Committee, differing practice across Schools with regards resit assessment and in some instances Schools may seek to assess only learning outcomes and not award a mark. Professor Kee stated a requirement to award marks across the board would necessitate some Schools to change their resit processes.
- Professor Coghill expressed it was common to see resit marks on a transcript and that it was helpful to see in terms of PhD selection. If common practice elsewhere, he proposed it be adopted. With regards to the differentiation between Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught, Professor Coghill asserted that to have differences in practice, as exists in classification, would not be an issue.
- Professor Pavlovskaja echoed the comments made by Professor Kee and the feelings of the Postgraduate Taught Committee that while marks should be included on the transcript where they are available, to require that marks be provided would incur a large workload for some Schools.
- Professor Jenkinson stated that from an Undergraduate perspective including a resit mark where it was a good mark was beneficial, however, the release of a mark was less so when it wasn't as strong. Professor Jenkinson proposed that marks where students have excelled at resit, could be released to employers by way of academic reference.
- Miss Jensen expressed concern that students may be undertaking resits for medical reasons or other reasons considered good cause. It was further noted that revealing a mark achieved by way of transcript may serve to better motivate students.
- Professor McGeorge reassured the Senate that where students have experienced medical circumstances or other good cause, the resit diet will serve as their first attempt and therefore the mark achieved will count.

- 16.4 In recognition of discussions held, the Senior Vice-Principal invited Senators to first vote on the proposed amendment to the proposal, to include the actual mark awarded in a resit on the transcript.

In favour of the proposed amendment:	53
Not in favour of the proposed amendment:	19
Abstaining from the vote:	5

A vote having been taken, the Senior Vice-Principal confirmed that the proposed amendment had been carried.

- 16.5 The Senior Vice-Principal moved to invite Senators to vote on the proposal, with the now agreed amendment, to place a cap on resit grades and allowing this grade to be used for Honours/Master's degree classification purposes.

In favour of the proposal:	65
Not in favour of the proposal:	5
Abstaining from the vote:	5

A vote having been taken, the Senior Vice-Principal confirmed that the proposal had been approved.

### **POLICY ON RECORDING EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES**

- 17.1 Professor McGeorge introduced the draft policy on Recording Educational Activities to Senators. Professor McGeorge noted that the paper was, at this time, for discussion only, with discussions informing a policy for future consideration and approval. He asked Senators to input any further comments by way of forthcoming Committee meetings.
- 17.2 Professor McGeorge informed the Senate that lecture recording across Higher Education was increasingly normal practice in the UK and Internationally and that internally, the University already captures approximately 38% of timetabled lectures. Professor McGeorge expressed the need for a policy around the issue in order to develop appropriate process to support it. He acknowledged the draft policy as largely taken from practice elsewhere, as a means of a starting point for discussion.
- 17.3 Following its introduction, a discussion on the draft policy ensued. The main tenets of discussion were as follows:
- Mr Styles sought clarification that the policy was not provided for approval. Professor McGeorge confirmed that a revised policy, informed by discussion, would make its way through the teaching Committees and follow to a future meeting of the Senate.
  - Professor McGeorge confirmed that comments on the paper could also be returned to him writing.
  - Dr Oliver, on behalf of his constituency, expressed concern for a blanket policy that would require lecturers to record their lectures. He noted evidence regarding the lack of attendance offering recording lectures to students would bring, by way of tacit encouragement not to attend class. Dr Oliver expressed the need for policy to be grounded in evidence and noted the draft paper suggested that recording was a popular thing to do, however, that this was not

a reason to do it. Dr Oliver quoted from the American Economic Review and in doing so stated that students were less likely to remain enrolled at University if they're depending solely on lecture capture. Dr Oliver stated on the basis of papers he had been sent that lecture capture was a good way to lose student recruitment, if not done properly or for sound pedagogic reasons. He noted that for the right reasons, such as online courses, lecture capture was important.

- Responding, Professor McGeorge noted that there was an extensive number of research studies of the issue of lecture recording, much of which strongly suggests there is little evidence that it has a major impact on attendance. Professor McGeorge stated that it was not the intention that a policy be brought in only because others were doing so but because there were strong pedagogic reasons for doing so.
- Professor Hannaford, Vice Principal for Digital Transformation, provided the Senate with some data as follows:
  - Last year, the University captured approximately 6000 of the 16 000 delivered lectures, a 38% capture rate
  - The recordings were viewed approximately 226 000 times.

Professor Hannaford noted that the evidence suggests students find recording useful, may listen to them in part and use them at varying times including during periods of revision. He noted that the recording was not designed to be a replacement for a lecture, but to supplement the educational experience.

- Dr Nordmann informed the Senate of her own research in the area of lecture recording in 2016 and confirmed her findings that there was no relationship between lecture recording and lecture attendance at levels 1 to 4. Dr Nordmann also noted that at level 1 recording use and attendance were both positive predictors of attainment. Dr Nordmann highlighted to Senators that research has also demonstrated that non-native speakers use the recordings significantly more at level 1 as they get used to studying in English.
- Dr Lamb raised two issues from Business School discussion, firstly regarding the trust staff must place in their Head of School on the issue. Secondly, he raised concern from staff regarding the way in which lectures must be recorded, with staff preferring their own means of doing so.
- Dr Mills thanked Professor McGeorge for the opportunity to discuss the policy in its early stages. He stated that the policy as presented was inflexible, specifically expressing concern with regards the 48-hour turnaround time for the production of the recording, a window that would reduce the capacity of staff to engage with the process with skill particular to the material being presented.
- Ms Connolly, Education Officer, stated to Senators on behalf of the Student population, that students want lecture recordings. She noted they enhance the student experience, allow students to focus on a lecture, to increase engagements, to help with revision and to revisit concepts they may find particularly difficult. Ms Connolly stated that, in her own experience, lecture attendance was not affected and following discussions with the Education Committee and various students, they were overwhelmingly in favour of the proposal.
- Dr Simpson noted the significant engagement with recording across the University, as reported by Professor Hannaford. He noted, anecdotally, little change in attendance as a consequence of the recording of his own lectures. On behalf of his constituency, however, he acknowledged varied experiences amongst staff in the Law School. Further to this, Dr Simpson noted the importance of ensuring recordings were of a high quality, and the issue as raised by Dr Mills regarding the 48-hour time period for the release of

recordings. Dr Simpson agreed to pass further comments to Professor McGeorge directly.

- Dr Barker stated that if students are requesting lecture recordings, they should be provided. Dr Barker proposed further engagement with students in order to establish exactly what they would like, and how best the University can provide it.

- 17.4 Following the brief discussion, Professor McGeorge invited further comments by way of email or discussion with School representatives on the various teaching Committees.

## **REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING & LEARNING**

The Senate approved and noted the recommendations arising from the meeting of the University Committee on Teaching & Learning on 13 September 2017.

### **1. Changes to Various Policies**

- 18.1 The Senate approved, on the recommendation of UCTL, the amendments to the following policies (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

- (i) Policy and Procedures on Academic Appeals
- (ii) Complaints Handling Procedure (CHP)
- (iii) Code of Practice on Student Discipline (Academic)
- (iv) Code of Practice on Student Discipline (Non-Academic)
- (v) Status of Students Pending the Outcome of (a) an Academic Appeal or Complaint; or (b) Undergraduate Student Progress, or Fitness to Practise

### **2. Latest Dates for the Return of Examination Results 2017/18**

- 18.2 The Senate noted that the Committee had approved the latest dates for the Return of Examination Results 2017/18.

### **3. Dates of Term to 2028**

- 18.3 The UCTL approved the Dates of Term to 2028 (copy filed with principal copy of the minute), noting that the start of term for academic year 2018/19 and subsequent years will begin at approximately the same time, with a view to ensuring term does not close as late as Friday 21 December and in so doing, improving the Student Experience and allowing students who require to travel (possibly overseas) for the Winter break to do so.

### **4. Academic Flexibility**

- 18.4 The Committee noted the Policy and Procedures on Academic Flexibility (copy filed with principal copy of the minute) as approved for use as a pilot exercise in 2017/18 by the Convener of the University Committee on Teaching & Learning by way of Conveners Action.

### **5. Dates and allocations for November 2017 graduations**

- 18.5 The Committee noted the dates and allocation for the November Ceremonies as summarised below and as approved by the Convener of the UCTL by way of Conveners Action.

**Thursday 23 November at 11.00 a.m.**

Higher and First Degrees in the Business School, School of Law and School of Psychology

**Thursday 23 November at 3.00 p.m.**

Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition and School of Biological Sciences.

**Friday 24 November at 11.00 a.m.**

Higher and First Degrees in the School of Engineering, School of Natural & Computing Sciences and School of Geosciences.

**Friday 24 November at 3.00 p.m.**

Higher and First Degrees in the School of Education, School of Language, Literature, Music & Visual Culture, School of Social Science and School of Divinity, History & Philosophy.

**ACADEMIC DRESS FOR DEGREE OF MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

- 19.1 The Senate approved that the hood for the Degree of Master of Public Health be White silk, lined with crimson silk and bordered inside with white cloth 12mm wide

**ENHANCEMENT-LED INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW (ELIR)**

- 20.1 The Senate noted the preliminary information regarding the forthcoming Institutional Review (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

**FORMAL NOTIFICATION OF THE CHANGE TO COMPOSITION OF COURT**

- 21.1 The Senate noted that the composition of Court which was formally amended by the Privy Council on 19 July 2017 (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

**SENATE ELECTIONS**

- 22.1 Senate noted the outcome of the Senate elections conducted at the end of last academic year as detailed below:

The following have been elected to serve on the Senatus Academicus from 01 October 2017 to 30 September 2021:

**School of Divinity, History & Philosophy**

Dr G Hough

**School of Education**

Dr H Martin

**School of Law**

Dr P Glover

**School of Social Science**

Dr A McKinnon

**School of Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition**

Dr M Brazzelli

Dr J Hislop

Dr A Jack

Dr G Jones

Dr P Murchie

Professor G Nixon

Professor H Wallace

**School of Psychology**

Dr M Jackson

**APPOINTMENT OF SENATE ASSESSORS TO THE UNIVERSITY COURT**

- 22.1 The Senate noted that following recent elections Professor Schaper, Professor Delibegovic, Dr Shanks and Dr Oren were elected as Senate Assessors from 1 October 2017.

**ELECTION OF THE RECTOR**

- 23.1 The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee, on behalf of the Senate, approved the composition (below) of the Election Committee who will oversee the Election process for the forthcoming Election of a Rector.

Professor Margaret Ross

Professor Peter McGeorge

Mrs Caroline Inglis

A nominated student senator from AUSA.

The Committee further agreed that Professor Jeremy Kilburn is replaced by Professor Michael Greaves as Returning Officer for the Election. Traditionally this role is carried out by the Senior Vice Principal.

**ANNUAL SENATE SURVEY**

- 24.1 The Senate noted that the annual Senate Survey will be conducted in December 2017. The Senate Business Committee agreed that undertaking the survey at this time will permit new Senators to have more experience of becoming a part of Senate before completing the survey.

#### **COUNTY OF BANFF BURSARY FUND**

- 25.1 The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee approved that Dr Glynn Hesketh should be appointed as the University's representative on the above Fund.