UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2019

Present: Professor G Boyne, Professor P McGeorge, Professor R Wells, Professor M Campbell, Professor A Speight, Dr P Sweeney, Professor K Bender, Professor G Paton, Professor I Guz, Professor A Jenkinson, Professor E Pavlovskaia, Professor G Nixon, Professor M Brown, Professor K Shennan, Mr D Auchie, Dr M Ehrenschwendtner, Mrs L Tibbets, Dr J Lamb, Dr L McCann, Dr A Zangelidis, Dr A Sim, Professor P Nimmo, Dr A Cecolin, Dr E Curtis, Dr H Martin, Dr S Thomson, Dr T Rist, Dr F Jürgensen, Professor O'Connor, Dr I Couzigou, Mr S Styles, Dr M Mills, Dr I Xypolia, Professor D Anderson, Dr M Barker, Professor M Pinard, Professor P Hallett, Dr G Norton, Dr S Woodin, Dr M Delibegović, Professor G Brown, Professor L Erskine, Professor I McEwan, Dr F Murray, Dr J Rochford, Professor A Lee, Dr D Skåtun, Dr D Watts, Professor J Jayasinghe, Dr A Rajnicek, Dr K Kiezebrink, Dr M Brazzelli, Dr D MacCallum, Dr J Hislop, Dr G Jones, Professor D Jovcic, Professor A Akisanya, Dr Y Tanino, Dr B Rea, Dr J Oliver, Dr M Spagnolo, Professor J Feldmann, Professor G Coghill, Professor C Grebogi, Dr P Henderson, Dr R Hepworth, Dr N Oren, Mr L Ogubie, Mrs D Connelly, Mr O Kucerak, Miss K Richie-Lawless, Mrs S Littlejohn, Miss I Drdakova, Miss J Paneva, Mr T Theurar, Mr J Lumsden and Mr H Chalklin

Apologies: Professor P Hannaford, Dr G Gordon, Professor E Welch, Dr DR Smith, Dr M Bain, Professor A Sahraie, Professor S Heys, Professor P Edwards, Professor D Jolley, Professor G Macfarlane, Dr R Neilson, Dr M Hole, Dr J Bohan, Professor W Naphy, Mr E Usenmez, Dr T Fahey Palma, Professor H Hutchison, Professor J Schaper, Dr G Hough, Dr B Marsden, Dr R Shanks, Dr A Bryzgel, Dr SJ Kim, Dr A Simpson, Dr RB Taylor, Dr A McKinnon, Dr D Lusseau, Professor C de Bari, Dr J Pettit, Dr S Miller, Dr D Scott, Dr J Macdiarmid, Professor N Vargesson, Dr A Jack, Dr P Murchie, Professor H Wallace, Dr E Nordmann, Dr M Jackson, Professor D Pokrajac, Professor M Wiercigroch, Dr N Schofield, Dr C North, Dr M da Silva Baptista, Mr A Vodentzis, Miss L Bacon, Miss M Jensen, Mr K Graham, Miss R Chowdhury and Mr Kirectepe

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

28.1   The Principal opened the meeting, welcoming members of the Senate to the meeting. He reminded members that the meeting would be audio recorded and asked that they introduce themselves before contributing to discussion to allow for an accurate minute.

28.2   The Principal invited members to approve the agenda. He noted that no items for routine approval or information had been brought forward for discussion. He informed the Senate that he had received one question, under general matters, which would be taken under item 10. No objections or comments were raised and the meeting proceeded.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

29.1   The Principal drew the attention of members of the Senate to a proposed Clerk's Note, intended to be added to the minute of the meeting held on 5 December 2018 as follows below:

Clerk's Note to Minute 16.11

Following the meeting, it was clarified that Stefan Brink's latest grant would have brought £312,000 into the University, spread over three years. Uncertainty arose from the fact that the University did not receive any formal notification of the grant award from the funder, even after Stefan's successful award was confirmed on the funder's website or a final version of the application as submitted to the funder for final University approval. The £90k previously stated relates to Stefan's own salary costs within the grant rather than the total award value. He did process the full application through his School, and it was formally approved by his Head of School in April 2018. With Stefan's departure, it is understood from the funder's website that this grant is now being administered through Cambridge University.

Members of the Senate noted that this addition reflected a follow-up conversation between the Principal and Professor O'Connor, following the meeting regarding Professor Brink's grant. The Principal extended his thanks to Professor O'Connor and Dr Rattray for the efforts in achieving this agreed position. Professor O'Connor informed the Senate he was content with the addition. No objection from members of the Senate were raised.

29.2   The Principal invited members of the Senate to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2018. He noted no amendments had been received. With regards matters arising, the following updates were provided:

- Regarding minute point 16.7, Professor Campbell, Vice-Principal (Research) updated members of the Senate on progress made since the last Senate regarding Honorary Status. She noted she had held a useful meeting with Professor Anderson, Dr Martin and Ms White (representing Human Resources) to discuss the matters raised. Members of the Senate were reassured that there was no requirement for a 3 month break between a member of staff leaving the University and taking up Honorary Status. It was noted this was only a requirement where a member of staff was leaving as a consequence of redundancy. Professor Campbell updated the Senate that where academic members of staff retire, progression to Emeritus status is automatic. She acknowledged that there had been some glitches, such as IT facilities in some cases, in the implementation of this policy and committed to working with HR/IT to resolve these. With regards to staff who are made redundant, Professor Campbell informed the Senate that discussions were currently ongoing within the Joint Consultative Committee on Redundancy Avoidance (JCCRA) on procedures in this regard.
- Dr Jurgensen noted a special case of a member of staff within the department of Music who was an Emeritus member of staff, however, informed that he was not permitted to use the Emeritus title while working with students, instead he had been engaged on the low grade of Assistant Teaching Fellow. Professor Campbell stated that she could not comment on specific cases and committed but indicated that she would raise the query outwith the Senate.
- Professor Delibegović raised the issue of when individuals, such as post-docs, would be aware of whether they would receive Honorary Status, given scenarios where gaps arise. Professor Campbell confirmed discussions in this regard were ongoing at JCCRA.
- Mr Styles expressed concern at the glitches occurring. He informed the Senate that a colleague of his, retiring after 40 years' service and receiving Emeritus status had received correspondence from IT services regarding the imminent closure of his email account. Mr Styles stated this had caused immense upset and sought

reassurance something would be done. Professor Campbell assured Mr Styles that the issue was already being taken forward with IT Services.

- Professor Anderson sought to draw the attention of Professor Campbell to the original question raised at the meeting of the 5 December 2018. He noted that until very recently that had been no 90-day gap. He expressed his understanding that the gap was added as these individuals posed a perceived threat to the University. Professor Anderson asked for the basis, evidence, comparisons and substantive reasoning there was for the introduction of the 90-day gap. Professor Campbell requested that discussions take place in JCCRA and further updates be provided to Senate when possible.

- With reference to minute points 22.2 and 22.7, regarding Management of Change and the role and powers of Heads of School within that process, the Principal informed members of the Senate of positive discussions which had taken place at the Senior Management Team (SMT) covering the use of protected conversations, settlement agreements and like matters. He informed members of the Senate that the University's practice would be consistent with the (ACAS) Code of Practice. The Principal informed the Senate that on Monday 3 February 2019, the SMT would be looking at the wider management of change protocol. He advised that an update of the protocol would be made available to a subsequent meeting of the Senate.

29.3   No further objections or comments were raised in regards to the minute and the meeting proceeded.

UPDATE FROM THE PRINCIPAL

30.1   The Principal, in providing an update to the Senate, began by informing the Senate that approximately 70 bids had been received for the 50 Teaching and Research posts to be funded in the months ahead. He informed the Senate that, to date, two meetings had been held to review the quality of the bids. He noted that a large number of very impressive bids had been received, making the task to decide between them, very difficult. He noted that a final meeting to look at the first criterion set, that the investment should contribute to a likely top quartile finish for the respective unit of assessment in the Research Excellence Framework (REF). The Principal informed the Senate that he expected that by the end of February 2019 that the posts would be ready for advertisement. With regards to the University's Estates, the Principal informed the Senate that Court had given final approval to move ahead with the construction of the Science Teaching Hub (this is subject to projected costs falling within the agreed budget). He further noted that at a special meeting of the Court, final approval was given to seek to borrow £50 million to invest in the Estate, primarily on the King's Campus. He noted that this did not mean that the University as yet had access to this money, with proposals for investment and interest rate details etc. to follow. The Principal expressed to the Senate, however, that he was optimistic that the funding could be raised. The Principal acknowledged that expenditure in staff and in the Estate meant good progress in student recruitment must be continued, to ensure the University could afford such investment. In this vein, he informed the Senate that an agreement with a pathway provider, to help bring more international students to the University was now very close, with the first students expected to be admitted in the autumn of 2019, starting in a measured way and expanding in future years. Finally, the Principal thanked all those involved in his installation and the positive impact of the installation in raising the profile of the University.

HEALTH SAFETY AND WELLBEING

31.1 The opportunity for Senators to raise any issues regarding health, safety and wellbeing was provided. No issues were raised and the meeting proceeded.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERISTY COURT

32.1 The Senate received an update from Dr Oren on behalf of the Senate Assessors on the meeting of the University Court held on 11 December 2018 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minute). Dr Oren informed the Senate of the key issues arising as follows:

- With regards to Capital Investment and Financial Strategy, the Court approved the £50 million bond, the movement of the break even position to academic year 2020/21 and final approval to move ahead with the construction of the Science Teaching Hub.
- Regarding the Appointment of the Senior Governor, it was noted that the motion from the Senate had been considered by the Governance and Nominations Committee.
- The Court had received a report on student recruitment for 2018/19 and while noting increases in many areas, ambitious targets had not been met.
- The Court received an update on the University's REF preparations and noted the importance of the 50 new Teaching and Research posts in contributing to the University's outputs.
- With regards to Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), the Court noted most were being met.
- The Court approved the University's annual report and accounts for the financial year to 31 July 2018.
- Finally, it was noted that Court received reports in the progress of the University's Transnational Education (TNE) projects.

RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK – CODE OF PRACTICE ON REF PREPARATIONS

33.1 Professor Campbell, Vice-Principal (Research) provided members of the Senate with an update on the University's draft Research Excellence Framework (REF) Code of Practice. Professor Campbell informed the Senate that it was a requirement of any Institution intending to submit to the REF 2021 to submit for approval a code of practice, outlining an Institution's preparation of the REF submission. She sought the views of the Senate on the draft to allow for its submission by June 2019. She outlined that earlier drafts of the document had already been discussed with School Directors of Research and Unit of Assessment leads, HR and at the recent meeting of the Research Policy Committee. It was noted that the draft code would be presented to the Partnership Negotiating and Consultative Committee (PNCC) for comment and to the University Management Group (UMG), Senate and Court for final approval.

33.2 Following introduction of the draft Code of Practice, a discussion ensued; the main tenets of discussion were as follows:

- Professor Anderson thanked Professor Campbell for the paper and the well-drafted document. He noted that he had received a number of requests for clarity from constituents, primarily with reference to *Part 4: Submission Structure* and *Part 7: Appeals*. He noted within Part 4, the bullet point which states, *'Schools will be invited to express preference and request appraisal of their preferred submission*

options' and stated that there existed a lack of understanding of this statement amongst colleagues. He asked that that it be redrafted. Regarding the final paragraph of Part 4, Professor Anderson stated that this was a new addition to the draft. In particular, he expressed concern over its perceived threatening approach and although its intentions had since been clarified by Ms Barraclough; he sought a redraft to ensure it does not read as it does currently. Regarding Part 7, Professor Anderson stated this was the most important section of the document. He stated the document was unclear as to which process would be followed in each potential scenario, which could arise. He asked for clarity around the matter of appeals from the perspective of both individual academics and Schools.

- Professor Jovcic noted references within the document to a 13-point scale. Professor Campbell noted that she was content to attach this to the paper. Professor Jovcic further requested, with reference to *Part 5: Selection of Outputs and Impact Case Studies*, that it be added that authors would be made aware of the final assignment of outcomes, for the purposes of transparency.
- Dr Skåtun, with reference to Part 3: Staff, Committees and Training, stated that references to post-doctoral staff was not required.

PRESENTATION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT EXPERIENCE 2018

34.1 Professor McGeorge, Vice Principal (Education), gave a presentation to Senate on the Undergraduate Student Experience 2018, a copy of which is filed with the Principal copy of the minute.

34.2 Following Professor McGeorge's presentation, a short discussion ensued, the main tenets of which were as follows:

- Ms Paneva asked whether the change in the gathering of data from graduates from 6 months to 15 months applied only to graduate level employment. Professor McGeorge confirmed it applied also to further study.
- Mr Ogubie thanked Professor McGeorge for the helpful presentation and the commendable data contained within. He asked what could be done to improve graduate prospects, a topic he was critically aware of in his role. Professor McGeorge noted that this was an area in which Schools were already engaged. He noted work by Schools to increase opportunity around work experience, placements and credit-bearing courses in this area. He emphasised the importance of interaction of business and industry contacts. Professor McGeorge highlighted the importance of ensuring students are acutely aware of and understand the skill sets they are generating, outside those at subject level.
- Mr Theurar sought clarity on what is meant by 'non-continuation' figures. It was confirmed that this refers to students who have left Higher Education.
- Ms Drdakova asked why comparisons had been drawn with the University of Surrey as opposed to other Institutions across the UK. Professor McGeorge confirmed that he had used Institutions of similar size; roughly the same discipline mix and research metrics to make comparisons. He acknowledged there were many ways of determining means of drawing comparisons.
- Dr Oren highlighted that Computing Science is a discipline notorious for non-continuation, both within Aberdeen and across the UK. He asked if there were School/discipline benchmarks, which may be more appropriate. Dr Oren also asked what figure the University should be aiming for with regards non-continuation. Professor McGeorge acknowledged that zero was not a realistic aim for non-continuation and that ensuring alignment with data from comparator Institutions may represent the most appropriate end point. He noted that it is harder to obtain non-continuation data at discipline level across the UK, but that if there is an

awareness that it is higher in any area, this should be explored to understand the reasoning why and to potentially make improvements.

- Dr Mills reiterated the point made by Professor McGeorge regarding students being unable to articulate the skills they have accumulated during their studies. Dr Mills asked how mobile students of the University are, post-graduation. Professor McGeorge informed members of the Senate that data from the last survey had been analysed with regards to those students who started University from an 'AB' postcode area. He stated that a relatively large proportion of these students at the point of survey no longer have an AB postcode and can therefore be seen to move outside of the immediate region. Overall, he stated that Aberdeen graduates are very mobile. While noting this is the opportunity the University wants to create for its students, he acknowledged the view of the Scottish Government, is that Universities should drive regional economic activity. Dr Mills asked how much a downturn affects employability. Professor McGeorge noted that a downturn can and will affect graduate employability and that this is mirrored in the 2015/16 data. Professor McGeorge noted, however, that the students most affected by the downturn were not necessarily those directly connected with the affected industries (such as Engineering or Geosciences graduates) but those from within the humanities who would typically have progressed to administrative roles within these sectors.
- Professor Delibegović asked if non-continuation rates had been affected by a change from Advisers of Studies to Personal Tutors. Professor McGeorge stated that an analysis at School level had not been completed, but that at Institutional level there was no evidence to suggest a correlation between the two, particularly as non-continuation rates had recently improved.
- Dr Jurgensen asked if there was any relation between the mobility of students and economic downturn both in Aberdeen and at other Institutions. Professor McGeorge noted that the DELHE data available publically would not allow for this level of analysis.
- Dr Oliver acknowledged the issue of the award of degree classifications and the increasing proportion of upper second and first class degrees. Dr Oliver noted that every year these figures go up. While acknowledging the correlation between entry tariffs and degree outcomes, he stated that these should surely plateau. He expressed concern over the lack of critical analysis of this issue. Professor McGeorge agreed that that the proportions could not always rise, particularly in recognition of a plateau in entry tariffs. He noted that there was modelling and analysis being undertaken at an Institutional level.
- Dr Xypolia sought further clarity around the reasoning provided by students when withdrawing from the University. Professor McGeorge acknowledged that the presentation provided information on the top three reasons for leaving provided. He noted that students do not have to provide their reasoning and often 'Personal Reasons' will be as much information as the University have. He stated that the University does routinely try to dig a little deeper but often a full explanation is not provided.
- Dr Spagnolo noted the recent significant improvements in non-continuation data made by the University of Edinburgh and asked if there was anything, the University could learn from their practices. Professor McGeorge acknowledged that this was worth investigating further.
- Mr Styles requested that the slides be made available to the wider University and the news shared amongst colleagues.
- Dr Jones proposed the non-continuation data might be usefully analysed more widely.

- Dr Watts proposed that degree outcomes be tested for association between a potential relationship between entry tariffs and degree outcome. Professor McGeorge noted that this has been undertaken at sector level and at other institutions.

POLICY ON THE USE OF STUDENT DATA FOR LEARNING ANALYTICS

35.1   Professor McGeorge introduced the draft Policy on the Use of Student Data for Learning Analytics. He noted that the paper was at Senate to continue to gauge an academic view in its development and particularly in ensuring the preparation of a policy, imperative in enabling the University to proceed with the use of Learning Analytics. Professor McGeorge acknowledged that consultations, open sessions, focus groups and surveys already been taken forward as part of the project. He noted that a revised policy would be brought to a future meeting of the Senate for approval and, in the meantime, welcomed comments and observations.

35.2   A discussion then ensued, the main tenets of which were as follows:

- Dr Oren noted that the paper focuses on more than just the values to underpin policy. With regards to the values, he expressed concern that there was much academic work on the danger of learning analytics but that is not reflected within the paper. Secondly, regarding the exposure of students to data, he emphasises that the transparency of algorithms themselves, rather than data alone, is fundamental.
- Dr Sim noted section point 3.11 and the work of the Retention Taskforce, stating that this was being taken forward at a meeting of the Taskforce clashing with the meeting of the Senate. He noted work of the Taskforce and useful discussions in regards to retention strategies and a proposal to a return to Advisers of Studies.
- Dr Rea expressed concern that the paper did not adequately address issues of workload. He acknowledged that this was a major issue and stated that if there were to be additional workload arising from the use or analysis of Learning Analytics, staff within Schools are already at their limit. He expressed the need for a serious evaluation of the proposal to consider additional workload. Professor McGeorge, responding, noted that feedback from Schools in regards to workload varied significantly.
- Dr Rist echoed concerns with regards to a potential increase in workload for staff. Dr Rist, referencing section 3.10, suggested that this was the wrong way round and that a Business Plan, with costings, should be seen upfront. Professor McGeorge stated that without a policy underpinning the University's use of data, it should not be used. He stated that the agreed values would help formulate a business case. While Professor McGeorge further stated that he had no problem in Senate seeing the business case, he emphasised the need for an agreed policy about how the University would use data, to ensure transparency and to be available upfront.
- The Principal stated that it would be useful to see at least an outline of a business case, both the logic of how success will be achieved and to provide some idea of the cost in order to contextualise the decision Senate would be asked to make.
- Dr Oliver reiterated concerns over workload. He noted the workload implications of the initial MyAberdeen rollout, not explored at its launch. He emphasised that this should not happen again. Dr Oliver expressed the concern of his constituents regarding the University inadvertently transforming the meaning of engagement, from engaging directly in a learning environment to a definition based on primarily on 'clicking on links' and the use of social media. He stated the need to be very clear on the definition of engagement. Responding, Professor McGeorge acknowledge the concerns raised regarding workload and assure members of the

Senate that it was not in the interest of the University to put something in place which could not be adequately staffed.

- Mr Ogubie thanked Professor McGeorge for his engagement with students on the issue of Learning Analytics. He acknowledged the support of students in the development of a policy to help students, particularly those struggling. He emphasised the need for transparency around the use of data and information on how students could opt out, if appropriate.

- Dr Jurgensen stated it was important to compare to the possible effects of investing the same time and money of other forms of engagement, such as the reinstatement of advisers of studies system etc.

- Dr Hepworth asked whether the draft policy had been sent to any of the University's ethics committees for discussion and feedback. Professor McGeorge stated that it had not, but that it was a very good point.

- Professor Anderson noted that the paper had attracted many comments from his constituents. Overall, he expressed that there was confusion as to the state of the policy and concern at the proposed pace of implementation. He stated that he had received questions as to whether it should be pursued, not how it should be. He stated that there was a lack of reflection on data issues within the paper. He noted concerns from students and a lack of assurances contained within the paper or explicit references to issues such as that data would not be sold. He expressed the desire of constituents for evidence for the need for the system, particularly in recognition of the existing monitoring process. He noted that MyAberdeen may not even be used by the best students and therefore invisible to such a system. He expressed concern that such a system could change the way Schools teach. Overall, he expressed that the Senate did not have the information to make a decision. He expressed concern at the use of percentages and data sets within the paper. Professor McGeorge stated that a number of focus sessions were held and publicised on the University website.

- Ms Drdakova stated that the policy might reduce workload for staff, as the algorithm could help in identifying students who are struggling, at an earlier juncture and therefore allowing for earlier intervention.

- Ms Paneva expressed her understanding that the existing monitoring system of C6s and C7s is a punitive one, and the use of Learning Analytics would not. She stated the importance of such a system to allow for early intervention where students are struggling or experiencing difficulties.

- Dr Rist sought assurances that the policy would now progress to an Ethics Committee. The Principal confirmed he understood this to be Professor McGeorge's intention.

- Professor Pinard noted that much of the data referred to within the paper is collected, in different ways across the Institution. She noted that, with the right measures, such a system would prove very useful and, as such, be very welcome.

- Dr Oren noted the presentation delivered to Schools and noted concern that they were of little substance. Dr Oren stated that, done right, Learning Analytics can help to support staff and students but that questioned whether it was being right, in this instance.

SENATE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

36.1 Dr Martin, on behalf of the Senate Business Committee (SBC), updated the Senate on discussions in relation to the recommendations from the Senate Effectiveness Review 2015, acknowledging the provision as stated regarding Effectiveness Reviews contained with the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance 2017. She further noted the update on the Annual Senate Survey provided within the paper and the proposal for a

Senate working group to consider how to further enhance the effectiveness of Senate and its sub and joint committees.

36.2 Professor Anderson asked whether there would be scrutiny of the role of ex-officio members of the Senate and its sub and joint committees. Dr Martin acknowledged that this issue would be considered as part of the review of Senate and would form part of the role of the working group.

36.3 The Principal moved to undertake a vote on the recommendations contained within the paper, as follows:

In favour of approving the changes to the annual Senate survey:	67
Not in favour of approving the changes to the annual Senate survey:	0
Abstaining from the vote:	6

In favour of a Senate working group:	71
Not in favour of a Senate working group:	2
Abstaining from the vote:	1

In favour of the proposed composition of the working group:	70
Not in favour of the proposed composition of the working group:	4
Abstaining from the vote:	2

Votes having been taken, the Principal confirmed that each recommendation had been approved.

ANY OTHER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

37.1 Professor Anderson was invited by the Principal to ask his question as follows:

It seems that members of staff who have been involved in piloting the roll-out of a new version of MyAberdeen Ultra Blackboard have been told that the new version will no longer have an email function within it, and may or may not have messaging function within it. This was later confirmed by students in my tutorial groups involved in the pilots. The direct access between tutors and students is absolutely essential to organizing our teaching - and that teaching would be but a pale reflection of what it is without it. One constituent described it as the "only function" in the current version of the software which works well. During the consultations I am told that the facilitators noted but did not take seriously the request to preserve this function. I would like to ask the Principal that the ability to communicate directly with students by email be confirmed as an unnegotiable requirement for the update - or that the update will be postponed until that functionality can be provided.

37.2 Responding, Professor McGeorge, Vice-Principal (Education) noted that, as far as he was aware, there were no live pilots of Ultra. Professor McGeorge confirmed that there is a messaging facility in Ultra, allowing staff to message individual students, groups of students or the entire class. He informed the Senate that following consultation with Schools, the University fed back to Blackboard regarding email functionality and it has been added that a message can be sent by email if desired. Professor Anderson stated

that he understood that in order for messaging to work as an email, the student has to first log on, amend their preferences and add a forwarding address. He expressed this extra step was particularly difficult when dealing with level one students. He stated extra layers and difficulties were not helpful. Professor McGeorge committed to check the technical aspects of this request.

37.3   Dr Jurgensen sought clarity on which platform students will receive messages and asked whether students were required to log in to the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) to receive messages. Professor McGeorge stated that it was his understanding that messages would be within the VLE with the option to have these sent by email. Dr Jurgensen expressed concern of this extra layer, particularly where students are already difficult to contact. Professor McGeorge reiterated the option for messages to be sent by email.

37.4   Dr Sim noted that, currently, announcements made on MyAberdeen are automatically also emailed out. He stated that to lose this functionality would be a step back in the technology. Professor McGeorge committed to clarify the technical aspects associated with this. Dr Hepworth emphasised the power of email and the agreement students sign, to make a commitment to read email. Dr MacCallum stated that the eLearning Team were currently running courses, covering the changes and, quite clearly, the messaging, email and announcement functions. She assured members of the Senate that the functions all still existed in the new system and that settings were changeable.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERISTY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Senate approved and noted the actions taken by the University Committee on Teaching and Learning at its meeting on 12 December 2018.

1.   Changes in Regulations for Various Degrees

38.1   The Senate considered, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, for forwarding to the University Court, the draft Resolution 'Changes in Regulations for Various Degrees (copy filed with principal copy of minute). Members of the Senate raised questions regarding proposed changes to the General Regulations and it was agreed these would be raised with the Dean for Quality Enhancement and Assurance prior to approval by the Court.

2.   Delivery Partners Policies and Procedures

38.2   The Senate approved, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, and forward to the University Court, the proposed changes to the Delivery Partners Policies and Procedures. (copy filed with principal copy of minute).

3.   Student Experience Presentation

38.3   Senate noted that the Committee had received the Presentation delivered by Professor McGeorge, Vice-Principal (Education) on the Undergraduate Student Experience.

4.   Learning Analytics Policy

38.4   Members of the Committee received the latest draft paper on the Learning Analytics Policy. Members of the Committee provided feedback on the draft, ahead of discussion of the Policy discussed by the Senate.

5. Revised UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance

38.5   Members of the Committee noted that recent publication of the new Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education and its accompanying guidance. Members of the Committee agreed the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) should propose a format for its dissemination and adoption across the University.

6. Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) Update

38.6   The Committee received an update on the ELIR Panel Visit held during the week commencing Monday 19 November 2019 and its subsequent outcome. The Committee noted the early draft of the outcome report.

39.1   The Principal thanked members of the Senate for their contributions to discussion and closed the meeting.