

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

Minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on 7 June 2017

Present: Principal, Professor Kilburn, Paterson, Ross and Hannaford, Ms AM Slater, Professor Morrison Dr M Bain, Mr M Whittington, Professors Paton, Sahraie, Skakle, Guz, Kee, Pavlovskaja, Masthoff and Brown, Dr R Neilson, Dr P Bishop, Professors Wells and Akisanya, Mrs L Tibbetts, Dr J Lamb, Dr L McCann, Professor N Hutchison, Dr A Sim, Professor Schaper, Dr P Sweeney, Dr H Pierce, Mrs M Stephen, Dr T Rist, Dr A Lewis, Dr B Tribout, Dr A Simpson, Dr Z Yihdego, Mr S Styles, Dr M Mills, Dr A Oelsner, Dr D Lusseau, Professor Pinard, Dr J Baird, Dr K Kiezebrink, Dr J Macdiarmid, Dr M Delibegović, Dr G Macfarlane, Dr D MacCallum, Dr N Mody, Professor Barker, Dr K Foster, Professor Lee, Dr E Nordmann, Dr D Ray, Professor Jovcic and Kashtalyan, Dr J Oliver, Professors Feldmann and Coghill, Dr da Silva Baptista, Professor B Martin, Dr W Vasconcelos, Dr N Oren, Mr L Fuller, Miss K Metcalfe, Miss D Passinke and Miss E Harding

Apologies: Professors McGeorge, Glover, Haites, MacGregor, Welch, Irwin, Heys, Jolley, Hutchison, Jenkinson, Campbell and Shennan, Dr M Beaton, Dr M Ehrenscheidtner, Dr M Hole, Mr E Usenmez, Dr T Fahey Palma, Mrs D Bruxvoort, Professor Nimmo, Dr P Ziegler, Dr R Shanks, Dr D R Smith, Dr A Bryzgel, Professor Mealar, Dr T Argounova-Low, Professor Anderson, Dr M Barker, Professors Johnson and Jayasinghe, Dr A Rajnicek, Dr A Jenkinson, Dr D Scott, Dr N Vargesson, Dr R MacKenzie, Dr A Venkatesh, Dr S Fielding, Dr I Cameron, Dr F Thies, Dr K Pilz, Dr O Menshykov, Dr B Rea, Dr N Schofield, Dr A Ebinghaus, Dr C North, Professor Grebogi and Brittain, Dr C Black, Mr C Anucha, Miss A Boerkoel, Miss M Leskovska, Mr K Thomson-Duncan, Miss K Halop, Mr D Kaminek, Mr M Hickman, Miss D Parsons, Mr L Budrass, Miss C Henssen, Miss L Rossi, Miss A Hall, Mr N Lazaroz, Mr A Edirisooriya and Miss J Killin

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- 55.1 The Principal opened the meeting, welcoming members of the Senate and inviting them to join him in a moment of reflection, in memory of the recent events in both Manchester and London.
- 55.2 The Principal invited members to approve the agenda, suggesting its reordering to take Questions for the Principal immediately following the Approval of the Minutes of 24 April 2017. He further proposed the reordering of item 5, a Motion from the floor, to precede items 4, Health, Safety and Wellbeing and 3, Update from the Principal, respectively. No objections to this were raised and the meeting proceeded.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 56.1 The Principal invited members to confirm that they were content with the minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 24 April 2017.
- 56.2 Professor Martin noted an inaccuracy with regards to minute point 41.2 and stated that he was not present at the meeting of 25 January 2017.

QUESTIONS FOR THE PRINCIPAL

- 57.1 The Principal invited Professor Martin to ask his question. Professor Martin, on behalf of his constituents, raised concern at the removal of the 'any detriment' clause from the revised Terms and Conditions of Employment in regards to working overseas and noted that this undermined commitments made at Senate meetings. Professor Martin asked:

'Given that the University Management Group has suddenly removed the clause protecting members of staff from "any detriment" from the revised Terms and Conditions of Employment shortly to be tabled at Court, can the University Management Group explain how this act matches the multiple commitments made before Senate at its meetings in November 2016 and March 2017 that staff will not be forced to work overseas?'

- 57.2 Dr Nordmann, on behalf of the LGBT+ Staff & Postgraduate Student Network, was invited to make her statement, read as follows:

'The University of Aberdeen LGBT+ Staff & Postgraduate Student Network welcomes the University's outward looking perspective in terms of Transnational Education and the opportunities these activities can provide.

However, the membership, comprising academic, professional services and postgraduate students have collectively raised serious concerns about the proposed removal of the clause "nor will there be any detriment to you if you decline" from the Working Abroad Terms and Conditions due to potential discrimination based on several protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act (2010).

In particular, the removal of the clause would mean that an LGBT+ member of staff who is unhappy to travel to a country in which the rights of LGBT+ people are not protected (in law and/or in practice) would feel compelled to 'out' themselves as LGBT+. This is unacceptable. The University of Aberdeen is a Stonewall Diversity Champion and their guidance for Global Working states:

"The best organisations recognise the potential impact on career progression of having to decline an assignment for this reason [outing oneself] and take steps to make sure an employee won't suffer any detriment as a result".

The Network membership was reassured by discussions at Senate that overseas work would be wholly optional. As such, concerns for LGBT+ staff and the resulting vote in the Senate were mitigated by this approach.

The Network looks forward to working with the University to address these concerns and ensure that the necessary protections are in place for LGBT+ members of staff – and that they suffer no detrimental treatment.'

- 57.3 The Principal thanked both Professor Martin and Dr Nordmann for their contribution. In advance of asking Professor Paterson, Vice-Principal for Internationalisation, to comment, the Principal unequivocally stated his commitment to ensuring that no member of staff is forced to work overseas. He stated that it is entirely appropriate for anyone to volunteer or to be asked if they would be prepared to work overseas, however it is also absolutely right for them to be able to say that they do not wish to and without having to give any reason for this decision. He further stated that any such decision would not impact on their work, progression, promotion or anything else at the institution.

- 57.4 Professor Paterson echoed and endorsed the Principal's statement, noting it expressed the position of the Institution with absolute clarity. He stated he hoped the message was being conveyed as such and, on a personal note, as a teacher, expressed for both the welfare of staff and the student body that it would not be appropriate for any member of staff to be asked to teach overseas should they not wish to, for whatever reason.
- 57.5 Professor Martin thanked the Principal and Professor Paterson for their reassurances, however, he expressed concern that the removal of the 'any detriment' clause did not align with the reassurances as given. Professor Martin questioned whether the removal of the clause was appropriate. Professor Paterson stated that the 'any detriment' clause represented a much broader issue and that while it was absolutely clear there would be no negative consequences for an individual who did not wish to work overseas, 'any detriment' reflected a much wider context and may, for example, cover instances of different workload priorities or requirements for a member of staff in Aberdeen. Professor Paterson noted that the removal of the clause represented the Internationalisation and wider Institutional agenda to adapt resources appropriately and maintain a flexible approach to delivery as required, particularly in response to external pressures such as the ability to recruit students to the Aberdeen campus. Professor Martin agreed that Professor Paterson's response had addressed his question.
- 57.6 Dr Nordmann questioned whether the clause could be reworded rather than removed. Professor Hannaford, Vice Principal (Digital Strategy) noted that no instances where an individual had felt forced or harassed to work elsewhere could be found to have occurred and assured the Senate that should the situation arise, that the appropriate procedures were in place to ensure it was dealt with appropriately. Professor Hannaford noted the concerns in relation to LGBT staff but also a variety of other reasons for why staff may not feel comfortable or able to travel overseas. He expressed that no staff member should be expected to say why they did not wish to work overseas. The removal of the clause allowed for flexibility, within the workload allocation model, for the reallocation of workload in Aberdeen. He clearly stated that no staff member would be forced to go abroad.
- 57.7 Professor Schaper offered a practical solution, given the 'bad blood' at the removal of the clause, and proposed that the clause be re-inserted but that sentences be added as appropriate to qualify the definition of 'no detriment'.
- 57.8 Mr Styles noted the reassurances provided by the Principal and Professor Paterson, however, stated that the clause be reinserted as the law requires.
- 57.9 Dr Mills echoed Professor Schaper's proposal to add conditional statements to accurately provide clarity around and reflect the position of the University as represented by both Professor Paterson and the Principal.
- 57.10 The Principal and Professor Ross, Vice Principal (People Strategy), stated the importance of providing reassurance. Professor Ross raised concern at adding too many words which would add only confusion to the contract, however, noted that she felt that further clarity could be achieved by taking steps to appropriately define detriment as intended for the purposes of the document.
- 57.11 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 to be submitted for consideration to the Unions body.

Professor Ross reminded the Senate that the discussion surrounding the Terms and Conditions have been ongoing since September 2015 and, until such time as they are finalised, the existing agreed documentation pertains.

MOTION TO ESTABLISH A WORKING PARTY WITH THE OVERSIGHT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF OVERSEAS CAMPUSES

- 58.1 The Principal invited Dr Rist to present his motion to establish a working party with oversight of the establishment of overseas campuses. Dr Rist stated that the proposal arises following recent discussions at Senate regarding overseas campuses and the minuted serious concerns as raised by Senate in regard to elements of these. In view of ongoing discussions and the likelihood of the University creating new campuses in the future, the proposal seeks a working group comprised of appropriate management and elected Senate representatives be set up to form a view and, if appropriate, redesign, the University's procedures for organising campuses abroad. The Working Party is to report to the spring meeting of the Senate for consideration of its findings. Dr Rist noted the opportunity afforded to him to discuss the proposal with the originators of the current Senate approved procedures but noted that given the Senate's role in considering overseas campuses for approval, that they too consider the procedures which underpin them. Dr Rist quoted from the document as approved by the Senate at the meeting held in January 2017 and, in so doing, expressed concern that consultation with Schools was missing from the procedures. Dr Rist asserted that this was a structural flaw and failure to engage with staff delivering teaching would impact on teaching and staff morale. Dr Rist noted that a further result would be the wasting of time at Senate and other University Committees. Dr Rist referenced the move from four to five Senate meetings per year as a reflection of the Senate's workload and need to ensure appropriate procedures are in place. Dr Rist noted that although a Link Tutor for overseas campuses would be appointed, they would be powerless to modify or reject proposed and/or existing campuses abroad. Dr Rist expressed his belief for the requirement of due diligence in respect of procedures for overseas campuses and the importance of ensuring reassurance as provided, such as those by the Principal, be incorporated into the University's procedures.
- 58.2 Professor Paterson, responding to Dr Rist, noted that the procedures in place had been considered and approved by the Senate very recently and questioned the need to reopen discussion at this point. Regarding school engagement, Professor Paterson noted the crucial nature of this and stated that at relatively early stages in all projects, Heads of School are engaged are involved. On this basis, Professor Paterson questioned what more could be done outwith the internal School structure to engage staff in proposals.
- 58.3 Professor Wells, Dean for Transnational Education (TNE), stated that, especially given the infancy of the agreed processes, discussions and suggestions to improve procedures were always welcomed. Professor Wells informed Senate, however, that the recently agreed procedures were the product of in-depth scrutiny and several lengthy discussions including representatives of Schools, Colleges and by way of consideration at the Undergraduate, Postgraduate and Quality Assurance Committees and at the University Committee on Teaching and Learning and at Senate on two occasions. Professor Wells noted that the procedures had therefore been extensively discussed by School representatives. In terms of the two large projects considered recently, Professor Wells reminded the Senate that the appropriate Heads of School were involved as soon as the project board was established, and at that stage, it is at the discretion of the Head of School how and when that information is dissipated throughout their School. Professor Wells informed the Senate that the University

received many suggestions of Transnational Education and would be a waste of a lot of people's time if this was taken to discipline or programme level immediately. Professor Wells expressed concern at the proposal to establish a much smaller and less representative group to consider existing agreed procedures.

- 58.4 Dr Rist alleged that the procedures were cut and pasted from other books and not the result of extensive consideration. Dr Rist asserted that he could find the origins of the statements cut and pasted and stated that he felt proper due process had not been followed. Professor Wells responded to assure Senate that due notice of other Institutions procedures had been taken as felt appropriate. He further assured Dr Rist and the Senate that the document had not been cut and pasted but extensively discussed. Dr Rist provided an example with regards the establishment of project boards and stated he felt did not suggest great thought and as woefully short on the information required on the role and responsibilities of a project board.
- 58.5 Dr Oliver, reiterated points raised by members of staff within Geosciences in January 2017 that if consultation is ongoing, Schools are not feeling or recognising this. Dr Oliver stated it is the role of teachers and programme leaders to know how well or indeed if their teachings can be delivered overseas.
- 58.6 Professor Kilburn noted the appropriate procedure would be to return the document to its originators to consider the points raised and amend appropriately and to allow a much greater proportion of the University to engage in the process. Professor Kilburn further noted the issue of timing associated with TNE opportunities and that it is often the fact that the University must move quickly in response to opportunities. He stated that Schools are fundamental to the process and that consultations are pursued when appropriate.
- 58.7 Professor Schaper stated the importance of the appropriate accountability of the Senate for TNE, highlighted by recent events and the political climate in both Rwanda and Qatar. Professor Paterson stated the importance of the Head of School's role in representing and informing their Schools. Professor Paterson further assured the Senate that the University was not complacent regarding the issues and/or risks associated with ventures in countries such as Qatar and Rwanda and had researched both extensively. He noted the University's role in transforming Education and the importance of facing challenges and not turning away from them.
- 58.8 Dr Nordmann, on behalf of the LBGT+ network asked that if a Working Group was established that a representative of the network be invited to form part of it. The Principal accepted this proposal.
- 58.9 Dr Oliver expressed that Heads of School are very busy people and not subject experts in all parts of the School of which they preside. He noted this as part of the problem with the existing procedures.
- 58.10 The Principal noted the importance of the role of Senate in any decision and that this would not change. He confirmed a vote would now be taken on whether or not a Working Party with Oversight of the Establishment of Overseas Campuses should be established.

In favour of the motion to establish Working Party with Oversight of the Establishment of Overseas Campuses:	34
Not in favour of the motion to establish Working Party with Oversight of the Establishment of Overseas Campuses:	29
Abstaining from the vote:	1

A vote having been taken, the Principal confirmed that the decision taken by the Senate was to move forward with a Working Party as proposed.

UPDATE FROM THE PRINCIPAL

- 59.1 The Principal, in providing an update to the Senate, acknowledged the General Election to be held on Thursday 8 June and, as such, the current differences in political opinion of the political parties surrounding Higher Education in England. The Principal informed the Senate that the position of the Scottish Government, however, was one over the next few years one of continuing challenges around budgets and that it was unlikely that Higher Education would be an absolute priority within these budgets. The Principal confirmed that he and other Principals continued to push for clarity in this regard. He further noted that both in the short and long term it was extremely likely that in real terms, Scottish Government funding would continue to decline and impact on the University and Higher Education sector as a whole. He stated the importance of action the University must take in order to mitigate the effects of this and highlighted the importance of innovation and seeking new means of funding.
- 59.2 The Principal noted advances in the number of applications for Postgraduate Taught (PGT and Postgraduate Research (PGR) places and stressed the need for further improvements in this area. He reminded the Senate of the immense challenges faced as a consequence of Immigration Law and the importance of the sector continuing to encourage the political leadership to recognise the importance of this, and the advantageous nature of post study work visas. The Principal stressed the importance of continuing to work tirelessly on improving the student experience and congratulated colleagues in the disciplines of Sports Science, Anatomy, Dentistry and School of Law for their excellent results in this regard.
- 59.3 The Principal stated the importance of the University continuing to develop its research profile, as agreed within the strategic plan. He noted that it remains clear that the Institution is research intensive and noted the necessity to review where the university stands in this regards with the forthcoming Research Excellence Framework (REF). Senators noted that the rules of the revised REF are broadly understood, with further information to follow. In concluding, the Principal informed the Senate of the proposed pay increase of 1.7% currently with the Unions for their consideration. He noted this increase as more than had been budgeted for.

HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING

- 60.1 The Principal moved to the agenda item of Health, Safety and Wellbeing.
- 60.2 The Principal invited Professor Ross to update the Senate on the University's Mental Health Strategy. Professor Ross noted that a short update and sources of information for support on mental wellbeing and instances of mental ill health had been prepared by the University's Equality and Diversity Team and circulated to Heads of School and Discipline at the University Management Group (UMG) for appropriate dissemination now, and again at the start of the academic year. Professor Ross noted that she had met with the Senior Personal Tutors on mental wellbeing and shared this information with them and received their input on the kinds of support advice they would like to receive. It was noted that this information would also be distributed to all personal tutors. Senate was updated on the success of the wellbeing day held at Foresterhill and advised of the appointment of a professional trained Mental Health Adviser, with

a clinical background, joining the Student Support Team in August to support the work of the University in regards to mental health, to provide advice, carry a small case load and engage with any emergent issues on a day to day basis.

- 60.3 Professor Ross noted the recent press coverage of the death of a student and subsequent court case involving someone with whom the student had had a relationship. Professor Ross assured the Senate that the University was monitoring the situation, learning lessons from it and aiming to support all those affected.
- 60.4 Professor Ross expressed the importance of wellbeing wherever staff and/or students are (i.e. on fieldtrips) but highlighted that the University needs to be aware of where staff and/or students are at any time, if off campus. The Principal echoed this and reminded the Senate of the importance, in the world in which we live, of the University's awareness in this regard.
- 60.5 Professor Akisanya welcomed the appointment of the Mental Health Adviser, however, queried whether one person could undertake this role given the increase in reported instances of mental ill health across the University. Professor Ross confirmed that this individual's role was to assist existing members of staff and to provide University support at an appropriate level and not to replace any other mechanisms of support available to individuals, such as those provided by the NHS.

ELECTION OF SENATE ASSESSORS TO THE UNIVERSITY COURT

- 61.1 The Principal invited Mr Styles to present his proposed method for the election of the Senate Assessors to the University Court. Mr Styles informed the Senate that the intention of the proposal was to enhance the motion as passed at the last meeting of the Senate where fundamental principles in the election of Senate Assessors were agreed namely; (i) gender equality, (ii) equal representation between the science and non-science subjects and (iii) fresh elections for all positions of Senate Assessors. Mr Styles noted that he had formalised the substance of the motion carried at the last meeting and sought the approval of the Senate for this.
- 61.2 Professor Kee suggested that there be a motion supporting the intention and meaning of clause 1(b) and elsewhere where the phrase 'equal gender balance' is used but that formal advice be sought on how this should be drafted. Professor Kee noted the recent Athena Swan accreditation and the importance of this. He stated that the current draft represents a binary gender split of male and female and that may be read to prohibit any Senate Assessor who identifies as (as defined by Athena Swan) a-gendered polygendered, non-gendered and gender queer. Professor Kee noted that Athena Swan states the importance of including trans equality in all relevant policies and procedures and suggested that the policy be amended in this regard, if otherwise approved, but without the need for it to be returned to the Senate. Mr Styles agreed the appropriateness of an amendment in this regard.
- 61.3 Professor Akisanya questioned how a gender balance could be maintained through a voting model. Mr Styles responded to state there would be male and female seats.
- 61.4 Dr Lusseau asked whether the University's Equality and Diversity team had had the opportunity to review the document to ensure its appropriateness.
- 61.5 Dr Lamb noted that there was a subtle difference between equality of representation and equality of opportunity and, as such, the use of a progressive or reactionary voting

system. Dr Lamb proposed statistical means by which equality of opportunity might be best achieved if considered appropriate by the Senate.

- 61.6 Mr Styles noted the mandated statute requiring the University to ensure equality of representation on the University's governing body. He noted the division of 2 male and 2 female seats as a clear and appropriate means of distribution.
- 61.7 Mr Fuller, on behalf of the Students' Association (SA), supported Professor Kee's points and the importance of ensuring everyone can be involved. He noted that the SA have engaged in ensuring such equality for some time and may be able to provide advice in this regard. With regards to gender split, Mr Fuller recognised the student population split as 55% female and 45% male and, as such, supported the 2 female 2 male seat split as proposed by Mr Styles, pending the inclusion of appropriate Trans awareness terminology.
- 61.8 Professor Coghill expressed concern that non-gendered individuals would not be included in a 2 female 2 male seat split.
- 61.9 The Principal noted agreement amongst the Senate as a whole that this was an issue which needed to be appropriately consulted on and incorporated into the process. He confirmed a vote would be taken on whether or not the proposed method for the election of the Senate Assessors to the University Court would be accepted, subject to the appropriate revision of the document in recognition of Professor Kee's points (minute point 61.2 refers) and its circulation to Senators by way of email.

In favour of the proposed method for the election of the Senate Assessors to the University Court	49
Not in favour of the proposed method for the election of the Senate Assessors to the University Court	9
Abstaining from the vote:	2

A vote having been taken, the Principal confirmed that the decision taken by the Senate was to approve the document, subject to revisions to be confirmed by way of circulation.

RUK UNDERGRADUATE OFFER-MAKING PROTOCOLS FOR SEPTEMBER 2018 ENTRY

- 62.1 Professor Paterson, on behalf of Professor McGeorge, Vice Principal (Teaching and Learning), presented the paper on rUK Undergraduate Offer-Making Protocols for September 2018 Entry. Professor Paterson noted the funding context as described by the Principal in his update and the need for the University to take appropriate steps to recruit and engage future student. Professor Paterson noted that the proposal was designed to mitigate as many risks as possible.
- 62.2 Dr Mills noted his support for the proposal but questioned the resourcing of the bursary as referenced. The Principal confirmed that the impact of the bursary, a reduced fee received by the University, would be shared amongst Schools.
- 62.3 Dr Foster, Admissions Selector for Medicine, informed the Senate of their experiences in interviewing applicants and the challenges associated with it. Dr Foster noted that it had proved useful to base the system on as much evidence as possible. It was also noted that predicted grades are very rarely accurate.

- 62.4 Professor Martin questioned whether students attending for interview would pay their own expenses. The Principal confirmed this would be the case. Professor Martin also raised concerns regarding the extra workload the interviews may incur. Professor Paterson, on behalf of Professor McGeorge, acknowledged that the numbers undergoing interview were not expected to be large. Professor Paterson stated that while the return from the proposal may not be huge, it was essential that the University do everything it can in the current climate. It was further noted that the process as proposed has been adopted by several English Institutions and to not engage, would leave the University at a disadvantage.
- 62.5 The Principal confirmed a vote would now be taken on whether or not the revised rUK Undergraduate Offer-Making Protocols for September 2018 Entry should be accepted.

In favour of the revised rUK Undergraduate Offer-Making Protocols for September 2018 Entry:	58
Not in favour of the revised rUK Undergraduate Offer-Making Protocols for September 2018 Entry:	6
Abstaining from the vote:	1

A vote having been taken, the Principal confirmed that the decision taken by the Senate was to move forward with a Working Party as proposed.

AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION NO 282: [PROCEDURE FOR REMOVAL OF MEMBERS OF COURT]

- 63.1 Mrs Inglis, Secretary to the University presented the paper regarding amendment to Resolution No, 282, seeking any comment from the Senate as it relates to the procedure for removing members of Court. Mrs Inglis informed the Senate that the amendment was being sought in order to conform to the Higher Education Governance Act Scotland which requires the removal of a member of the Court requires a majority. No comments on the amendment were raised.

AOCB

- 64.1 Dr Mills raised concern regarding the current political climate in Qatar and sought clarity as to the University's intentions to move forward with its campus in the country. Professor Paterson responded to assure Senators that the situation was being monitored very closely and that no unnecessary risks would be take. The Principal added that should it be necessary to recall Senate over the summer to consider the issue, this would be done.
- 64.2 Dr Rist asked what the position was with regards University activity in Rwanda. The Principal referred to the update provided at the last meeting of the Senate and noted the Rwandan Government had put a temporary hold on the development of international campuses pending clarification of their own Education funding position. He confirmed that the project in Rwanda was currently on hold.
- 64.3 The Principal thanked Senators for all their work and input over the last academic year.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Senate noted the recommendations arising from the meeting of the University Committee on Teaching & Learning on 3 May 2017.

1. Changes in Regulations for Various Degrees

- 65.1 The Senate approved, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, and forward to the University Court, the draft Resolution 'Changes in Regulations for Various Degrees' (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

The Senate was further invited to ask the University Court that, in accordance with the provisions of Section 6 (2) of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, the draft Resolution be passed forthwith, so that the amended provisions may be applied with effect from date on which they are passed by the University Court.

2. Proposal to Pilot a New Internal Teaching (ITR) Review Process

- 65.2 Senate noted that the Committee approved the introduction to pilot a new Internal Teaching Review (ITR) process (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

3. Class Representatives

- 65.3 The Committee acknowledged the level of monitoring of Class Representatives undertaken and agreed, subject to the assurance of the quality required, that approval be granted for the proposal. The Committee recommended that the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) undertake the role of reviewing the quality assurance of the initiative, consider reports from the Students' Association as appropriate and review any further roles proposed for recognition.

4. Attendance Monitoring

- 65.4 The Committee approved a pilot of the use of Quick Response (QR) codes as a means of attendance monitoring in lectures. The code (a type of two-dimensional barcode) can be scanned by a students' mobile device and their attendance logged. The Committee noted the reasoning for the trial as:

- Registering attendance electronically and without the need for significant administrative intervention.
- As a driver for student attendance.
- To allow for the opportunity for intervention when a student is not engaging.

Senate noted that the Committee had agreed with the proposals as a means of encouraging conversation and intervention for students who don't engage or may be experiencing difficulties. The Committee noted a pilot of the proposals would be undertaken with Schools volunteering appropriate courses.

5. Undergraduate Offer Making Protocols for September 2018 Entry

- 65.5 The Committee considered a paper proposing new Undergraduate offer making protocols for September 2018 and setting out a process by which the University would widen its criteria for making unconditional offers with the aim of attracting and converting more Rest of UK (RUK) applicants. The Committee noted the minimal risk associated with the proposals, aimed at the very best of the RUK population, but also

the uncertainty surrounding whether or not they would result in a significant impact on the recruitment of Undergraduate students.

6. Revised Annual Programme Review (APR) Form

- 65.6 The Committee approved the proposed changes to the Annual Programme Review (APR) form (copy filed with principal copy of the minute). The Committee noted that the APR proforma has been revised to include programmes offered collaboratively with other institutions.

7. Partnership Process Changes

- 65.7 The Committee approved the proposed changes to the partnership approval process.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WORKING GROUP

- 66.1 Senate noted the agreed Policy on Intellectual Property (copy filed with principal copy of the minute).

STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION FORMS

- 67.1 Student feedback on our courses and programmes is an essential part of our Quality Assurance/Quality Enhancement processes. The Student Course Evaluation Forms (SCEF) that are now filled in online are one way of obtaining student feedback but it has been noted that in some areas of the University the number of students completing SCEFs is low. Discussion with other Institutions suggested that a move to online forms would likely lead to a reduction in the numbers of responses but that such responses would often be more informative. This has been found to be the case here. The Quality Assurance Committee considers SCEF as one of a number of routes for obtaining feedback from students; however, in response to the concerns raised by some sections of the University, the Convenor of the Committee has agreed to set up a working group to investigate how we might improve student feedback through this mechanism.

DATES OF THE NEXT MEETINGS

- 68.1 Senate noted that the meetings of Senate in 2017/18 will take place as follows:

Wednesday 18 October 2017 at 1.00 p.m.
Wednesday 13 December 2017 at 1.00 p.m.
Wednesday 21 February 2018 at 1.00 p.m.
Monday 23 April 2018 at 1.00 p.m.
Wednesday 16 May 2018 at 1.00 p.m.