UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

Minute of the meeting held on 3 February 2016

Present: Principal, Professors Kilburn, Kunin, McGeorge, Hannaford, MacGregor, Ross, Ms AM Slater, Professors Morrison, Welch and Coyle, Mr M Whittington, Heys, Skakle, Jolley and Guz, Dr A Arnason, Professors Davies, Wells, Brown, Campbell, Masthoff and Shennan, Dr M Ehrenschwendtner, Dr S Lawrie, Professor Lurie, Dr M Beaton, Mrs D Bruxvoort, Mrs L Tibbetts, Dr J Lamb, Professors McCausland and Hutchison, Dr A Sim, Professor Friedrich, Dr H Pierce, Dr P Ziegler, Dr Y Bain, Dr E Curtis, Ms S Cornelius, Dr G Sharman, Dr A Lewis, Dr A Simpson, Dr M Mills, Dr L Bennie, Dr T Argounova-Low, Professor Anderson, Dr J Sternberg, Dr D Lusseau, Professor Pinard, Dr J Barrow, Dr A Rajnicek, Dr S Tucker, Dr A Jenkinson, Dr N Mody, Professor Ibbetson, Dr D MacCallum, Dr L Aucott, Dr S Fielding, Dr K Foster, Professor Lee, Dr N Hoggard, Dr K Pilz, Professor Kashtalyan, Professor MacDonald, Dr J Oliver, Dr A Ebinghaus, Dr C North, Professor Coghill, Dr R Macpherson, Dr M da Silva Baptista, Dr B Martin, Dr W Vasonselos, , Miss G Clarke, Mr L Fuller, Miss A Pavelekova, Mr D Kaminek, Mr C Herbert, Miss A Hay, Miss C Henssen, Mr I Tashim, Mr F Archibald Miss C Christie, Mr C Coyle and Miss S Small

Apologies: Professors Glover, Haites, Gimlin, Baggs and Sahraie, Dr R Neilson, Professors Naphy and Connolly, Dr P Bishop, Mrs M Stephen, Dr K Groo, Professors Mealor and Duff, Dr Z Yihdego, Mr S Styles, Dr J Baird, Mrs C Dennis, Professor Johnson, Professor Teismann, Dr M Delibegović, Dr D Scott, Dr K Khalaf, Dr M Cruickshank, Dr R MacKenzie, Dr C Black, Dr A Venkatesh, Professor Barker, Dr I Cameron, Dr F Thies, Dr L Williams, Dr B Timermans, Dr D Ray, Professors Akisanya, Dr O Menshykov, Professor Dobney, Dr N Oren, Professor Brittain, Miss Z Howell, Mr J Waddell, Miss K Hood, Miss A Sevadjian, Miss D Passinke, Miss A Sharp and Mr F Neldelea,

OPENING REMARKS

16.1   The Principal began by welcoming those present to the February meeting of the Senate.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

17.1   The Senate was invited to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2015. The following issues were raised with regards to their accuracy:

(i)   Professor Coghill noted minute point 3.4 regarding the City Deal and proposed to the Senate that reference to 'Computing Science' be amended to 'Big Data' to accurately reflect the detail of the deal.

(ii) Mrs Tibbetts noted section 4 of the minute regarding Health, Safety and Wellbeing and proposed that the minute be amended to include reference to the agreement that]the impact of the change to the academic year structure on staff should be reviewed.

(iii) Dr Mills, on behalf of Mr Styles, noted that the discussion held on widening participation and rural participation was not included in the minute of the Principal's statement. The Principal noted that this discussion had taken place not as part of his statement but rather as part of the discussion of the Student Population and was reported as part of minute point 9.2. The Principal further advised members that he had written to the Scottish Government and that he had also attended a meeting of the Widening Access Commission.

(iv) Professor Anderson noted minute point 11.3 regarding Moderation, proposing that this be withdrawn on the basis that it did not accurately reflect discussion. The Vice Principal (Teaching and Learning), Professor McGeorge, expressed his surprise that there was no recollection of the discussion. He stated that the issue had taken place following a vote on the minutes. He reminded members that there had been discussion from the floor involving Dr Lamb and representatives of the School of Education both of whom had brought forward motions. The discussion had been supported by a PowerPoint slide detailing the proposed amendments to section 4 of the Moderation Procedures. Dr Lamb and Ms Cornelius, on behalf of the School of Education, confirmed the accuracy of the minute. Professor Anderson and Dr da Silvia Baptista noted concern that this fundamental change had been made without the appropriate committee approval. The Principal acknowledged the concern from the floor regarding the policy itself, noting that this would be discussed by way of agenda point 9 (minute section 25 below refers). The Senate was asked to vote with regards the accuracy of point 11.3 of the minute, the results of which were as follows:

Yes, the minute is an accurate representation:	43
No, the minute is not an accurate representation:	29
Senators abstaining from vote:	4

The Principal confirmed that the vote had been carried and no change would be made to minute 11.3.

(v) The Principal noted an issue raised by Mr Styles in advance of the meeting regarding point 8.3 of the minute. Mr Styles was of the opinion that the way in which this item was reported gave the impression that the thoughts of Professor McGeorge regarding Grade Point Averages (GPAs) had been taken as the thoughts of Senate as a whole. He proposed that the minute be amended to more accurately reflect the statement made as being Professor McGeorge's own view. Professor McGeorge agreed with this proposal.

17.2 In advance of progressing to the items listed on the agenda for Discussion and Approval, Dr Mills spoke to a proposal submitted by Mr Styles requesting that the items on the agenda be reordered. In particular he requested that items 9, 10 and 11 under the heading 'Motions Received' were all matters for discussion. Mrs Inglis, Secretary to the University, confirmed that these items had been added under a separate heading due to the time at which they had been received, this being after the Senate Business Committee (SBC) had met to discuss and agree the agenda. Dr Mills noted that all three motions were for discussion and would require a vote. As such, he proposed that these should be brought forward to after item five. Mrs Inglis advised Senate that two of the three motions presented related to issues outwith the remit of the Senate. While acknowledging that academic views could be passed to the Court in regards to them, Mrs Inglis reminded the Senate that these were not matters at the disposal of the Senate to approve, reject or change. Following a brief discussion, the Senate was asked to vote with regards to the proposal to reorder the agenda, the results of which were as follows:

17.3

Yes, the agenda should be reordered:	48
No, the agenda should not be reordered:	29
Senators abstaining from vote:	9

The Senate therefore agreed to reorder the agenda as proposed by Dr Mills.

STATEMENT BY PRINCIPAL

18.1   The Principal wished all Senate members a Happy New Year, welcoming them to the first meeting of the Senate in 2016.

18.2   The Principal acknowledged the Chancellor's autumn statement and its impact on Higher Education in the UK as a whole. The Principal specifically noted the impact on research funding and capital and the now accepted Nurse Report with regards research architecture. The Principal updated the Senate on the impact on the devolved Scottish budget, noting that a one year budget had been announced by the Scottish Parliament in December 2015. The Principal acknowledged the confirmed cash cut of approximately 3% as representing a better than expected position for Higher Education. The Principal informed the Senate that the effects of the cuts were as yet unknown on the University and that the Director of Finance was currently completing financial modelling in this regard. The Principal acknowledged that the budget proposed was for one year only and that the landscape would potentially change further after the Scottish elections. The Principal thanked Schools and Disciplines for their ongoing work in diversifying income.

18.3   The Principal referenced the Deputy First Minister's Speech and specifically his comments regarding 'Efficiency in the Learner Journey'. The Principal highlighted the importance of giving the degree model serious thought and informed the Senate that the position would be considered by the Scottish Government, in conjunction with the Learning and Teaching Committee of Universities Scotland.

18.4   The Principal noted the proposed discussions around consolidation of subjects in different regions, however, he was unsure of the impact this would have for the University.

18.5   The Principal acknowledged proposed discussions to improve efficiency in research enterprise and innovation, e.g. the sharing of equipment or hire with industry. The Principal expressed concern at the possibility of finding efficiencies in an area already so underfunded.

18.6   The Principal drew attention to the Nurse Report, noting that while Research Councils would remain in England, one body, Research UK, would now provide oversight. The Principal noted that the councils would no longer be public bodies and that the management of funding in England would be governed by Research UK. The Principal expressed his personal view that the continued celebration of the dual support system was critical and that he would continue to feed into discussions in this regard.

18.7   The Principal noted the review of the REF to be undertaken and his role in feeding into this. The Principal noted the importance of continued engagement with Europe and specifically acknowledged successes including University involvement in Horizon 2020. The Principal informed the Senate of the appointment of a consortium of seven people to replace Professor Anne Glover as Scientific Advisors.

18.8   The Principal updated the Senate on the announcement of the City Deal. The Principal expressed his thanks to all colleagues involved in the bid and noted the huge opportunity for innovation the deal presented to Aberdeen.

18.9   The Principal informed the Senate of the latest iteration of the Higher Education Governance Bill, stressing that the picture continued to move quickly. The Principal informed the Senate of the following key points (as at 3 February 2016):

- The impact of Scottish HEIs losing their charitable status had been removed;
- Within Institutions with elected Rectors, Rectors will act as chair of Court. A senior lay governors would be elected by a constituency of students and staff.
- Sabbatical Officers would remain classified as 'students' for the purposes of Court membership
- Staff will be represented on an Institution's governing body by one member of the UCU and one other union representative
- The clause regarding a maximum number of graduates on Court has been removed

The Principal confirmed that the Governance Committee was looking at the Bill in close detail in order to enable a considered and appropriate response. In response to a question, it was noted that Senate Assessors had not been mentioned.

18.10 The Principal thanked all Schools for their continuing work on Project 500, noting that the project could only happen with the commitment of the University as a whole. The Principal informed the Senate that the University's admissions figures as of the 18 January 2016 (closing date of UCAS) were respectable. The Principal thanked all Schools for their continued efforts in the recruitment process.

18.11 The Principal noted significant research successes specifically congratulating Dr Armstrong from the School of Divinity, History and Philosophy. He also noted the recent visit of the Chancellor to the School of Engineering's Fluid Dynamics Laboratory.

18.12 The Principal confirmed that the Chancellor of the University would officially open the new Rowett Institute building.

18.13 Finally, the Principal expressed his congratulations to Ms Zoe Clark, a 3rd year Engineering student on her successes in achieving a place in the top 10 of the world ranking for 400 metres. The Principal noted that a note of congratulations would be sent to Ms Clark on behalf of the Senate.

HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING

19.1 The Principal noted that there were no specific issues of Health, Safety or Wellbeing arising.

19.2 The Principal congratulated those involved in the first Health, Safety and Wellbeing day held on 6 January 2016, noting that the initiative was not a one-off. The Principal informed the Senate that a series of activities would be taking place to promote the importance of Health, Safety and Wellbeing.

19.3 The Principal specifically noted the work of Professor Heys for the forthcoming World Cancer Day on 4 February 2016 and urged members of the Senate to view a very informative PowerPoint presentation prepared by Professor Heys in this regard.

19.4 The Principal informed the Senate that he and members of the senior team, would be continuing to conduct Health and Safety visits to Schools. The Principal noted a recent increase in the number of near misses reported by students, acknowledging not necessarily an increase in the number occurring, but a definite increase in awareness of matters pertaining to Health, Safety and Wellbeing across the University.

ATHENA SWAN UPDATE

20.1   Members of the Senate received a PowerPoint presentation from Professor Ross providing an update on the work of the University with regards to Athena Swan (a copy of the presentation is available on the Senate website).

20.2   Professor Ross noted that all Schools were working to a November 2016 deadline for accreditation and that two Schools, Engineering and Psychology, had already submitted. Members of the Senate noted that toolkits, in addition to resources available on the University's dedicated Athena Swan webpages, were available to support schools. Professor Ross highlighted the benefits of Athena Swan to the University as a whole and not just to women. Professor Ross reinforced the importance of the engagement and commitment of all Schools to the project, specifically in removing any obstacles and making positive changes.

20.3   Professor Ross was asked whether there was a preference to recruit academic staff to act as part of the School teams putting submissions together.   Professor Ross responded that this was not the case and that Schools were using professional services and support staff in preparing submissions representative of their area as a whole.

REPORT FROM THE SENATE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

21.1   The Senior Vice-Principal, Professor Kilburn, introduced to Senate a report from the Senate Effectiveness Review Implementation Group (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Senate noted that at its meeting on 4 November 2015 it had been agreed to establish an Implementation Group to discuss and bring forward recommendations to the Senate for approval. Professor Kilburn noted that the majority of proposals (22 of 24) as detailed in the paper had been agreed unanimously. He advised that Recommendations 1 and 18 had been discussed in detail by the Group and that there had not been unanimous agreement reached regarding these two proposals.

21.2   Members of the Senate considered the recommendations of the paper with the exception of 1 and 18. The main tenets of discussion were as follows:

- Dr Simpson queried the required revision of the Standing Orders of Senate as a consequence of the proposed changes. Dr Mackintosh confirmed that these would be brought to the May meeting of the Senate for approval.
- Dr North noted the 10 day cut off for motions as detailed. The Senior Vice-Principal confirmed the importance of submitting papers in enough time for consideration and circulation, however, reminded the Senate that issues to be raised for discussion could be brought to the attention of the clerk by 5pm on the Monday (or where Senate does not meet on a Wednesday, two working days) prior to the meeting of the Senate.
- Professor Coghill noted the disparity in the election of academic Senate members and student Senate members to the Senate Business Committee (SBC). Ms Clarke, Student president, proposed that the student membership be comprised of the Student President and President for Education.
- Dr Sharman noted item 10.2 and the definition of term 'clear-majority' querying whether a majority would represent more 'yes' than 'no' votes. The Principal confirmed this to be the case and, where senators opted to 'abstain' from the vote, these votes would not count.

- Mrs Tibbetts, on behalf of the Business School, requested the addition of 'where appropriate' to recommendation 20, to allow the Business School to determine on which Committees they would require representation.

21.3 Members of the Senate gave specific consideration to recommendation 1. It was noted that there had been disagreement amongst members of the Implementation group as to whether the Principal should have responsibility for the final approval of the Senate agenda. It was noted that the Convener in other University committees has responsibility for approving the agenda. Following discussion, a vote was taken to determine whether the Senate Business Committee should have final approval of the agenda or whether the Principal should continue to have this role. The results of the vote were as follows:

Yes, the SBC should determine the final agenda:	34
No, the Principal should determine the final agenda:	32
Senators abstaining from vote:	8

21.4 The vote being carried, the Principal confirmed that the Senate Business Committee would be responsible for approval of the Senate agenda.

21.5 Members of the Senate gave specific consideration to recommendation 18. It was noted that there had been disagreement amongst members of the Implementation group as to how vacancies on the Honorary Degrees Committee, or other Committees with Senate representation, should be filled when they arise. The main tenets of discussion around this recommendation were as follows:

- Dr Mills, on behalf of the Implementation Group, noted three possible options as means of determining how vacancies are filled:
  (i) The Senate Business Committee (SBC) decides on behalf of the Committee;
  (ii) The Individual Committee with the vacancy should make a recommendation to the SBC for approval;
  (iii) Senators should elect members as vacancies arise
- Dr Mills noted that Mr Styles had felt strongly in favour of option (iii).
- Members of the Senate recognised the potential for a large number of elections should option (iii) be favoured.
- The Senior Vice-Principal noted the importance of ensuring Committee members understand the business of the Committee on which they sit. The Principal added that the Committee on which there was a vacancy should specify the skill set required for the vacancy.
- Professor Masthoff noted concern that members of Committees should be derived only from Senate membership when a larger skill set exists outwith Senate alone.
- Dr Lusseau noted the Senate's size as a large forum from which memberships can be derived.
- Professor Coghill noted the difficulty in recruiting to some University Committees and highlighted the importance of ensuring all vacancies on Committees are filled. If this cannot be done democratically, there should be another way to do so.

21.6 Following discussion, it was agreed that a vote would be taken. Firstly, members were invited to vote on the whether the committee should identify members or whether the Senate Business Committee should identify members. The results of this vote were as follows:

Yes, Senate Business Committee should appoint members	22
No, individual Committees should identify members:	44
Senators abstaining from vote:	6

21.7 With this vote confirming support for individual committees identifying new members, Senate was then invited to vote on whether the committee should identify members or whether posts should be filled through election. The results of this vote were as follows:

Yes, posts should be filled through election	31
No, individual Committees should identify members:	43
Senators abstaining from vote:	3

The vote being carried, the Principal confirmed that the individual committees would be responsible for identifying new members for approval by the Senate Business Committee.

21.8 Members of the Senate then voted on the each of the remaining recommendations detailed in the report, the results of which are noted as follows:

Following discussion, recommendation 1 was considered on the basis of its revision (as detailed in 21.3 above) to read:

Recommendation 1: *In line with the current broad definition of Senate's remit (to regulate and superintend teaching and discipline of the University and to promote research), that Senate's role in exercising its remit should be made clear in agenda setting with items being separated into those where Senate is:*
a. To explicitly approve matters of academic business, with these normally having had prior consideration through the appropriate sub-committees; and
b. To debate and express a view on matters of academic interest.

To enhance clarity, papers presented to Senate should clearly detail the origin of the paper, the action required by Senate and the reasons why the paper is presented for approval or for discussion (in order to provide an academic view and/or to allow Senate to inform the ongoing debate on the matter). Papers not originating from Committees should identify the proposer and seconder

The membership of the Senate Business Committee should be enhanced by the addition of seven elected members (two elected from the elected Senators in each College, ensuring gender balance, and one from the Business School) for a two-year fixed term. In addition, an additional student member would be nominated by the Student President on an annual basis.

With this wider membership it was agreed that the Senate Business Committee would have final responsibility for the approval of the Senate agenda and for determination of which agenda items are for 'discussion and approval' and which are for 'discussion' to form an academic view.

Senators should be invited, in advance of each meeting of the Senate Business Committee, to bring forward possible agenda items (notwithstanding that issues can be raised for discussion at the Senate meeting itself). The Senate Business Committee should consider these and agreed whether they should be included on the agenda or, where appropriate, be

referred to the relevant Senate committee for prior consideration. Where items are referred to a Senate committee or are not deemed appropriate for consideration by Senate, these would be reported on the agenda for Senate to ensure transparency.

Yes, agreement with recommendation 1:	69
No, disagreement with recommendation 1:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	4

Recommendation 2: *The roles and responsibilities of Senators should be more clearly articulated and disseminated at the point of nomination and election, and through induction and should be regularly re-visited by all senators (for example, at the beginning of each academic session).*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 2:	70
No, disagreement with recommendation 2:	0
Senators abstaining from vote:	4

Recommendation 3: *Induction for new Senate members should be reviewed and should include input from experienced Senators and/or Senate Assessors.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 3:	72
No, disagreement with recommendation 3:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

Recommendation 4: *Senators should be reminded of their role as governors of academic matters and of the importance of gathering and articulating the view of their constituents. Senators should be actively encouraged to represent the views of their constituents whilst also acting as responsible individuals keeping the benefit of the university community as a whole in mind.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 4:	70
No, disagreement with recommendation 4:	1
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

Recommendation 5: *In line with the view that Senate is a process, Schools should ensure that appropriate routes are provided to enable those representing the School on Senate sub-committees and at Senate to obtain the views of the School on items of business and to feedback on outcome of meetings. In support of this, agenda and papers of Senate sub-committees should where possible be made available to all staff in a timely fashion.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 5:	70
No, disagreement with recommendation 5:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

Recommendation 6: *Through the Senate sub-committee process, Schools and Senators should be able to raise items for business and in so doing enable items to inform the Senate agenda following appropriate consideration at the relevant sub-committee.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 6:	70
No, disagreement with recommendation 6:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	4

Recommendation 7: *Senate Assessors should continue actively to represent the view of Senate to the Court on issues of academic interest. To enhance the linkage between Senate and Court, Senate Assessors should routinely report back, within the confines of appropriate confidentiality, to Senate on those items of Court business particularly those that have academic implications. At meetings following a meeting of the Court, an item should be included on the agenda to ensure such feedback can occur. Senate Assessors should continue to be split into professorial and non-professorial roles, however, the constituencies for both elections within a college should include all Senate members for that college.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 7:	62
No, disagreement with recommendation 7:	1
Senators abstaining from vote:	6

Recommendation 8: *Senate papers should be issued, electronically via the Senate website, no later than 10 working days in advance of each meeting.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 8:	72
No, disagreement with recommendation 8:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

Recommendation 9: *Dates, membership and papers for all Senate sub-committees should, within the confines of appropriate confidentiality, be made available electronically to all staff and students.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 9:	72
No, disagreement with recommendation 9:	1
Senators abstaining from vote:	1

Recommendation 10: *Each agenda item at Senate should be introduced in a manner that clearly states what Senate is expected to do about it (note, approve, express a view) to ensure clarity of expectation.*

In the case of items for approval, a formal vote will be taken at the end of the debate to provide a clear outcome.

Yes, agreement with recommendation 10:	71
No, disagreement with recommendation 10:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

Recommendation 11: *Discussion of each agenda item should be concluded with a clear statement from the University Secretary of what Senate has done (noted, approved, expressed the following view). This outcome will be included in the minutes in bold type.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 11:	72
No, disagreement with recommendation 11:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

Recommendation 12: *Consideration should be given to introducing a "horizon-scanning" report to Senate with the purpose of informing Senators of emerging issues in the wider context in which academic business is being conducted, soliciting the view of Senate on these issues and commissioning further detailed scrutiny of policy implications by appropriate committees or other bodies.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 12:	64
No, disagreement with recommendation 12:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	5

Recommendation 13: *Opportunity for information sharing as part of the Senate agenda should be introduced including where possible a presentation on key topics of sector-wide interest (e.g. Teaching Excellence Framework).*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 13:	65
No, disagreement with recommendation 13:	4
Senators abstaining from vote:	5

Recommendation 14: *Notwithstanding the current opportunity for senators to formally ask questions of the Principal ahead of Senate meetings, opportunity should be included within the agenda for an informal Q&A session within Senate meetings, covering matters of academic interest proposed by senators. Questions and Answers will be noted in the minutes.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 14:	66
No, disagreement with recommendation 14:	4
Senators abstaining from vote:	6

Recommendation 15: *To ensure prompt and effective dissemination of Senate decisions, a "digest" of Senate business should be made available to its constituencies within 48 hours of meetings (notwithstanding the formality of the minutes as official record of business). Such dissemination should also be considered for Senate committees.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 15:	65
No, disagreement with recommendation 15:	5
Senators abstaining from vote:	4

Recommendation 16: *Senate should actively work towards greater diversity of membership with a specific goal of achieving at least 40% of each gender by end of session 2017/18, by publishing its current composition against recognised indicators, by encouraging nominations from under-represented groups, by reviewing the extent to which Senate's population reflects the population of the University and by reviewing eligibility criteria for membership. AUSA may wish to review representation arrangements for emerging student populations, such as taught postgraduate, research postgraduate and international students. In addition, Senate may wish to monitor and anticipate the provisions of the draft HE bill with regard to overall membership numbers.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 16:	64
No, disagreement with recommendation 16:	7
Senators abstaining from vote:	5

Recommendation 17: *The Senate Business Committee should review the calendar of meetings (with due regard to related committee deadlines) with a view to having Senate meetings more evenly spaced across the year. In doing so, consideration should also be given to the timing of meetings to ensure their schedule appropriately recognises the needs of Senators.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 17:	64
No, disagreement with recommendation 17:	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	4

Following discussion, recommendation 18 was considered on the basis of its revision (as detailed in 21.5-21.7 above).

Recommendation 18: *In regard to the Honorary Degrees Committee, fixed terms of office for a period of four years should be introduced for non ex officio members and that where members cease to be a member of Senate, their membership of the committee should also cease. Where vacancies arise, the committee concerned would be invited to bring forward nominations for new members for approval by the Senate Business Committee. This process should also apply to other committees of Senate with Senate representatives.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 18:	65
No, disagreement with recommendation 18:	3
Senators abstaining from vote:	5

Recommendation 19: *Attendance by members at Senate meetings and Senate sub-committees should be published on the Senate website and that, to enhance transparency, the minutes of meetings identify by name those who speak.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 19:	54
No, disagreement with recommendation 19:	4
Senators abstaining from vote:	6

Following discussion, recommendation 20 is considered on the basis of its revision (as detailed in 21.2 above) to read:

Recommendation 20: *Consideration should be given to ensuring appropriate representation by the Business School, where appropriate, on Senate Committees in light of recent changes to the academic structure. The Business School should determine the Senate committees on which it feels it should be represented.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 20:	49
No, disagreement with recommendation 20:	8
Senators abstaining from vote:	8

Recommendation 21: *Consideration should be made for updating the infrastructure in the Senate chamber to better facilitate and encourage the use of electronic papers (e.g. AV and plug sockets).*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 21:	46
No, disagreement with recommendation 21:	5
Senators abstaining from vote:	10

Recommendation 22: *Review of the effectiveness of the Senate should be conducted every five years with an annual survey of members being conducted on an annual basis.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 22:	64
No, disagreement with recommendation 22:	5
Senators abstaining from vote:	5

Recommendation 23: *While elected Senators are appointed for a four-year term on a biannual basis with half of the membership turning over every two years, elections should be held on an annual basis at the end of each academic year to fill any vacancies with those appointed serving for the remainder of the term where members have left mid-way through their period of office.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 23:	66
No, disagreement with recommendation 23:	3
Senators abstaining from vote:	4

Recommendation 24: *In the event of an elected Senator moving to a new School, they will be required to stand-down as an elected Senator and would have the opportunity to stand for election as a Senator in their new school at the next available opportunity.*

Yes, agreement with recommendation 24:	56
No, disagreement with recommendation 24:	0
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

With voting on all recommendations being completed, the Principal invited members to confirm that they were content. No dissent was expressed.

21.9 Dr Mills raised the issue of the recording of meetings of the Senate, noting that this matter had not been reflected in the report considered. There followed a short discussion, the main tenets of this were as follows:

- Members of the Senate acknowledged the options of recording as being (technology allowing) audio only or video recording.
- Members of the Senate noted that recording would attribute all comments to an individual and that Senators must be comfortable with this course of action. Dr Mills commented that Senators were elected individuals acting on behalf of their constituencies and, as such, this should not represent an issue.
- Professor Masthoff noted that recording in instances such as focus groups required the signed consent of all attendees. Professor Hannaford noted, however, that this was a requirement of an instance such as a focus group and differs from a meeting conducting University business. Professor Hannaford further noted the importance of being open and honest and reminding members that meetings would be recorded.
- Professor Masthoff raised the issue of individuals who may not want to be video-recorded for religious purposes. It was acknowledged that recording audio alone may a simpler approach to avoid issues such as these arising.
- Professor MacGregor noted that the precedent for the recording of meetings did exist, having been undertaken for Curriculum Reform meetings and even included live webcasts.
- Dr Simpson queried whether, recording of proceedings should be extended to sub-committees. The Principal agreed that this issue would be taken away for further investigation.

21.10　Members of the Senate agreed to vote on the proposal that all meetings should be recorded. The results of which are recorded as follows:

Yes, meetings should be recorded:	54
No, meetings should not be recorded:	12
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

The vote being carried, the Principal confirmed that going forward meetings would be recorded. The feasibility of audio versus video would be explored.

RESPECT FOR THE ROLE OF SENATE IN THE REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT & MODERATION

22.1　Professor Friedrich introduced a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) setting out recommendations regarding the new Moderation procedures approved by the Senate in November 2015. As detailed above (section 1 above refers), Professor Friedrich noted significant concern regarding the approval process that had been followed in agreeing the new procedures. Professor Friedrich expressed concern that amendments to the paper as presented for routine approval to Senate, specifically detailing a revised section 4, had not been considered or discussed by the University Committee on Teaching and Learning (UCTL) or the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). Professor Friedrich expressed the view that there should have been more opportunity for fuller consideration of the proposed amendments.

22.2　The Vice Principal (Teaching and Learning), Professor McGeorge, responding to the paper, identified the two key issues arising as (i) the process followed to consider the policy and (ii) the content of the policy itself. Addressing point (i), Professor McGeorge detailed the approval path of the policy. Beginning as a paper discussed and drafted at the QAC, the paper was considered at both the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Committees before, following extensive discussion, being approved by the UCTL. Submitted to the June Senate for approval, concerns were raised by a Senator, Dr

Lamb, and seconded by another, Dr Sim, specifically with regard to section 4. The policy was, therefore, taken away for further discussion, before being presented again to the November meeting of the Senate. Although initially on the agenda for routine approval, Dr Lamb and Dr Sim's concerns were addressed by way of discussion (point 11.2 of the minute of the November minute and section 1 above refers). As no further concerns were raised, the policy was taken as approved. Professor McGeorge recognised the process of approval followed as demonstrating the effectiveness of the Senate. Professor McGeorge recognised the iterations of the policy as representative of the discussions held at all stages of the approval process.

22.3   Addressing point (ii), Professor McGeorge detailed the reasoning behind the need for a moderation policy as a requirement of the University, and the specific reasoning behind why the policy in place prior was no longer fit for purpose. Professor McGeorge noted the decision, as taken by the Senate, to move to a system of Grade Point Averages (GPA) and that, as a direct consequence, the system of moderation based on borderlines as operated at the time was no longer appropriate or fair. Professor McGeorge noted the necessity that the policy introduced be consistent with other University policy.

22.4   Professor McGeorge acknowledged the proposal as detailed within the paper, to reject the policy and return it to Committee for discussion. Professor McGeorge cautioned Senate that to take this decision would mean that no moderation policy would be in place and, as a direct consequence, schools would be required to double mark all submissions until such time as a policy was fully approved.

22.5   Further points as raised by way of discussion are noted as follows:

- Professor Anderson raised concern that the process as detailed was incorrect. Professor Anderson noted that it was section 4 of the policy around which there existed controversy and acknowledged that 3 versions of this section had been proposed, that of the meeting of June 2015, that of the meeting of November 2015 and the amended version as received from the floor in November 2015. Professor Anderson acknowledged he had missed the discussion in November 2015 and suggested that motions to the floor should concern matters of date or misspelling and note those as substantial as this. Professor Anderson asserted that it would require immense skill to assimilate and understand the implications of changes presented in this way, noted that it was poor procedure. Professor Anderson stated that the approval of the policy did not reflect opinion.
- Professor McGeorge, responding to Professor Anderson, stated that the opportunity to discuss was made available in November and the slides were also available for Senate members.
- Dr North noted that he could not read the text on the screen and, as such, he was at a loss in trying to assess the impact of the proposed changes for his constituents.
- Dr de Silvia Baptista noted that trust in the Senate could be lost by last minute changes presented without the ability of Senate members to prepare in advance of the meeting.
- Dr Oliver noted comments from his constituents, strongly against automated moderation. Dr Oliver stated that the detail of the paper surrounding the assumption a student should be awarded the higher mark where disparity exists prompted concern.
- Professor McGeorge, responding to the comments raised, noted that the policy as previously in operation was not an appropriate process. Professor McGeorge

explained that the borderline approach was no longer fair in recognition of the GPA approach.

- Professor Friedrich noted that there was not an objection to changing the process itself, but to the procedure followed and content of the change approved. Professor Friedrich requested that the issue be put to a vote.

22.6   The Principal summarised the position by noting that following the process of the sub-Committees, Senate received the paper at which point an amendment was brought and discussed. The Principal acknowledged the motion raised that not all Senators were understanding of the proposals discussed and asked members to vote on whether or not they were in favour of a review of the policy. The results are noted as follows:

Yes, in favour of policy review:	37
No, Not in favour of policy review:	22
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

22.7   The Principal confirmed the result of the vote as concern surrounding the policy as it stands and that it would be returned to committee for discussion. The Principal pointed out that as a consequence of this decision, full double marking of all scripts at levels 3 and above would be required.

ACADEMIC LINE MANAGEMENT

23.1   Professor Anderson presented to the Senate a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) regarding the Academic Line Management proposals as previously discussed by the Senate in June 2015. While noting overall support for the policy, Professor Anderson commented on the different approaches to implementation being adopted across the University and concerns amongst the University community in this regard. Given Senate's role in superintending teaching and research, Professor Anderson proposed that Senate has a clear role in the roll out of academic line management. He proposed that UMG be invited to bring a paper on the roll out to the next meeting for discussion and a vote.

23.2   Members of the Senate were reminded by the University Secretary that whilst appropriate for Senate to express a view on staffing-related matters such as this, responsibility for management of staff falls to the University Court.

23.3   Professor Ross thanked Professor Anderson for his input and overall support for the policy. Professor Ross acknowledged the position of Senate in the stewardship of teaching and research matters but noted that the management of an individual falls under the remit of Court. Professor Ross assured Senate that feedback could be passed to the Court from the Senate but that a vote in this regard would not be appropriate. Professor Ross noted that the implementation of the policy (as approved in November 2015) had been taken forward in such a way as to meet the needs of each school. Professor Ross further added her willingness to discuss with colleagues the rollout of the policy and any other issues arising.

23.4   Dr Lusseau noted feedback from within his constituency regarding the line management of post-doctoral fellows and concern regarding impact of the new arrangements on research. Professor Ross noted the difficulties arising in this regard and agreed that, although flexible to the needs of individual schools, the policy should incorporate post-doctoral fellows and provide them with a line manager separate from

their supervisor. Dr Lusseau further queried how best to proceed where disparity exists between the supervisor and the line manager. Professor Ross commented that the approach taken would need to fulfil the requirements of the grant but that the supervisor and line manager could discuss such instances if they arise.

23.5   Professor Heys commented that in his School, they had taken a pragmatic approach in supporting post-doctoral fellows and were operating a system of separate line management to that of the PI role in supervision.

23.6   Dr Lusseau queried the process of annual review and what would happen if the line manager sets targets which are at odds with those of the supervisor or the project. Professor Ross proposed that this should be addressed pragmatically and that it would be important to ensure conditions of grant are met. Heads of School would be responsible for ensuring effective operation of line management and that any issues should be referred to them for attention.

23.7   Following this discussion, members of the Senate were invited to vote on whether they would wish a paper to be brought to the Senate to provide further update on the roll-out of academic line management on school-by-school basis. The results of the vote were recorded as follows:

Yes, in favour of a paper being brought:	32
No, not in favour of a paper being brought:	24
Senators abstaining from vote:	3

The vote being carried, the Principal confirmed a paper on the roll-out of academic line management would be brought to the May meeting.

A PROPOSAL TO RECALIBRATE THE USE OF KPIS TO BRING THEM IN LINE WITH THE UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC AIMS

24.1   The Senate received a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) from Dr Oliver setting out proposals regarding the University's Key Performance Indicators (KPI) established to support the Strategic Plan and institutional planning processes. In particular, Dr Oliver proposed:

(i)   KPI 1: *International Market Position* be eliminated on the grounds that Schools and or Disciplines, which are academic bodies, have no way of influencing marketing targets concerning student recruitment.

(ii)   KPI 3: *Research* be eliminated on the grounds that the targets are poor indicators of academic quality and may distort academic activity and harm the long term health of disciplines. Dr Oliver stated to the Senate that these may have unintended consequences on the activities of or between Schools / Disciplines such as competition and not collegiality.

(iii)   Senate votes to create a representative Committee formed by members of all Schools and/or Disciplines to assess remaining and future KPIs. This Committee would make sure that KPIs are appropriate to the capabilities of Schools and/or Disciplines as well as the vision of the University, to create 'a World with Greater Knowledge'. Where KPIs are found to be inappropriate the Committee would be able to recommend to Senate that they be adapted or eliminated. All new KPIs would thereafter be vetted by the Committee.

24.2 The Principal in response advised that KPI could not be abandoned as the University is required to have processes in place to monitor and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the University against approved plans and key performance indicators. He further advised that approval of KPIs is a primary responsibility of the University Court and not the Senate. He did however confirm that it would be appropriate for Court to be informed of the view of Senate.

24.3 Further discussion on the paper then followed. The main tenets of discussion were as follows:

- Professor Kilburn, responding to the paper, thanked Dr Oliver for his input, specifically welcoming feedback regarding the unintended consequences of the KPIs. Professor Kilburn noted that the issue of the KPIs had been extensively debated with the Court.
- Professor Kilburn informed the Senate that each School had been encouraged to consider their ambitions and, following extensive dialogue undertaken with Schools as part of the planning process, were asked to set realistic but ambitious targets. In instances such as retention, Professor Kilburn confirmed that targets were set.
- Professor Kunin, addressing the KPI regarding internationalisation, acknowledged the importance of the academic community in reaching this. While noting that SRAS and the International Office had a role to play, so too did the academic community in supporting and building on internationalisation.
- Professor Heys, Head of the School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition, acknowledged the important role played by academic staff within his School in influencing International Market Position.
- Dr de Silvia Baptista queried the use of KPIs in relation to degree classifications awarded.
- Dr de Silvia Baptista further noted the unrealistic pressures applied to schools as a consequence of KPIs.
- The Principal noted the potential of the University to rank between 9 and 16 in every league table with the support and ambition of colleagues.
- Professor Kilburn noted that the KPIs had been developed with the ambition of being in the top 20 in the UK in mind. Schools had been asked to consider their relative position to that of the top 20 institutions and to set targets on that basis.
- Mr Whittington noted the reflective process as experienced by the Business School in setting targets to meet the KPIs. He acknowledged the importance of the fact these targets were not set in stone, and the importance of the discussions held in determining them.
- Professor Coghill raised the issue of potential internal competition as an unforeseen consequences of the KPIs. Professor Coghill noted the potential for tension in potential interdisciplinary internal collaborations.
- Dr Mills noted the limited opportunity for Schools to influence student recruitment. In response, Professor Kunin noted that there is shared ownership between the International Office, Student Recruitment and Schools. He proposed there was opportunity to enhance the partnership working in this area.
- Professor Masthoff noted her support for the KPIs but acknowledged that many Senators may be unaware of the purpose of KPIs. Professor Masthoff proposed a presentation of the reasoning behind the KPIs at a forthcoming meeting of the Senate to allow for enhanced understanding and a reduction in concern.
- It was noted that it would be helpful for Senators to have sight of the data regarding KPIs. Professor Kilburn confirmed that benchmarking data would be made available to Senators.

24.4 Following discussion, the Principal invited members to vote on three issues.

(i) A request to Court on the elimination of KPI 1 on the grounds that Schools and or Disciplines, which are academic bodies, have no way of influencing marketing targets concerning student recruitment.

(ii) A request to Court on the elimination of KPI 3 on the grounds that the targets are poor indicators of academic quality and may distort academic activity and harm the long term health of disciplines.

(iii) The establishment of a Working Group of the Senate to assess remaining and future KPIs and make recommendations to the Senate for further recommendation to Court

The results of the votes were recorded as follows:

Yes, in favour of a request to remove KPI 1:	14
No, not in favour of a request to remove KPI 1:	32
Senators abstaining from vote:	2

Yes, in favour of a request to remove KPI 3:	17
No, not in favour of a request to remove KPI 3:	29
Senators abstaining from vote:	1

Yes, in favour of the convening of a WG on KPIs:	27
No, not in favour of the convening of a WG on KPIs:	0
Senators abstaining from vote:	20

Therefore, the proposals made to recommend to Court elimination of KPI 1 and KPI 3 were not carried. It was, however, agreed that a Senate Working Group formed by members of all Schools and/or Disciplines be established to assess remaining and future KPIs. This group would make sure that the remaining and future KPIs are appropriate. Where found to be inappropriate, the group could make proposals for Senate to consider which, if supported, would be passed to Court for their consideration. It was further agreed that a presentation on the role of KPIs would be provided at a future meeting.

INTRODUCTION OF ONLINE 'PROFESSIONAL SKILLS COURSES' FOR ALL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

25.1 The Senate agreed, by way of vote, to postpone this agenda item for consideration at the next meeting of the Senate. The outcome of the votes being recorded as follows:

Yes, in favour of postponing to May meeting:	37
No, against postponing to May meeting	4
Senators abstaining from vote:	0

The vote being carried, the Principal confirmed discussion of the Online Professional Skills Courses would be deferred to the May meeting.

INSTITUTIONAL RETENTION TASK FORCE

26.1 The Senate agreed, by way of vote, to postpone this agenda item for consideration at the next meeting of the Senate. The outcome of the votes being recorded as follows:

Yes, in favour of postponing to May meeting:	41
No, against postponing to May meeting	2
Senators abstaining from vote:	0

The vote being carried, the Principal confirmed discussion of the report from the Retention Task Force would be deferred to the May meeting.

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN KOREAN CAMPUS & DRAFT RESOLUTION

27.1 The Vice-Principal (Internationalisation), Professor Kunin, provided the Senate with an update (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) on developments in regard to the establishment of a University campus in South Korea for the delivery of postgraduate programmes and CPD courses in offshore-related disciplines, principally in Engineering and Business. He also drew members' attention to the draft Resolution on which approval was being sought. This Resolution set out the management and governance structure of the campus. There followed a short discussion, the main points of which were as follows:

- Dr Mills raised questions regarding whether or not the University should proceed as a consequence of (i) the oil price situation and (ii) previous attempts by Universities to develop offshore campuses, referencing Glasgow Caledonian's campus in New York. Responding, Professor Kunin noted that the campus in South Korea would be based within an industry heavy area, guaranteeing industry links and that the project was being kept under continuous review to ensure its viability. Professor Kunin further noted that the University was not building in South Korea and, as such, the same risk levels did not apply.
- Professor Guz spoke positively of the project, noting the excellent teaching and research facilities, industry links and potential to become self-sustainable within 5 years.
- Professor Kunin informed Senate that the project was an equal partnership and noted the potential opportunities in research links, equipment and facilities for the University.
- Dr Sharman queried the level of risk for the University itself should the project not work. Professor Kunin responded to confirm that the risk was controlled by the fact the University had no capital investment and that investment was being phased in.
- Dr Oliver queried why, when so many US institutions had opted to pull out of Asia and South Korea, the University was choosing to invest. Professor Kunin confirmed that the position across Asia was mixed and this was a very different project to those undertaken by the US.
- Dr Lusseau questioned whether or not there would be opportunity for other Schools to become involved in the project. Professor Kunin confirmed that collaboration with other areas could be explored as the project progresses.
- Dr Ziegler queried the senior management structure, noting that the Chief Operating Officer (CEO) currently reports to the Vice Principal (Internationalisation) and not to the University Secretary. Professor Kunin noted that as the project evolves the model may be normalised, however, for now the close Vice Principal/CEO linkage is helpful.
- Dr Sharman queried whether the programmes would be run in English. Professor Kunin confirmed they would, and that additional language support would be put in place if required.

27.2   Following discussion, the Principal invited members to vote the draft Resolution, the results of which were recorded as follows:

Yes, the resolution should be approved:	37
Yes, the resolution should not be approved:	3
Senators abstaining from vote:	4

The vote being carried, the Principal confirmed that Senate had, for its part, approved the Resolution.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Senate approved and noted the recommendations arising from the meeting of the University Committee on Teaching & Learning held on 14 January 2016.

1. Policy and Procedures on Student Appeals

28.1   The Senate approved, on the recommendation of the University Committee on Teaching and Learning, an amendment to the Policy and Procedures on Student Appeals. The Senate noted the amendment as the addition of appeals against decisions taking by Fitness to Practise Committees to the policy, reflecting the action taken for appeals concerning matters of Student Progress or Student Discipline.

2. Dates and Allocations for June 2016 Graduations

28.2   The Senate noted the dates and allocations for the June 2016 Graduation Ceremonies (copy filed with the principal copy of minutes). Mrs Tibbetts noted the importance of students receiving graduation dates as quickly as possible to allow for travel arrangements etc. The Principal agreed with this suggestion and further noted that second half-session exam dates should also be provided as soon as possible.

3. Green Paper Consultation

28.3   The Senate noted that the UCTL had discussed the implications raised by the UK Government proposals contained in the Green Paper Fulfilling our Potential: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice. The Committee were particularly concerned to note possible changes to the current UK higher education sector which may arise in the future as a consequence of the Green Paper. The Committee agreed that further discussion would be necessary when the UK position became clearer.

4. Introduction of online 'Professional Skills Courses' for all undergraduate students.

28.4   The Senate noted that the UCTL had considered a paper on the Online Professional Skills Courses which had been requested at the last meeting of Senate (4 November 2015). The Committee agreed that the paper provided a good summary of the proposal and that the paper should be forwarded to the next meeting of Senate.

5. Institutionally verifiable co-curricular activities: work-placements and internships

28.5   The Senate noted that the UCTL approved a request from the Careers Service to include four further activities in the 'recognised activity' category for the Enhanced Transcript. The four activities are:

- Careers Service locally sourced and monitored placements (usually summer, but can be at any point of the year)
- Saltire Foundation Summer Placements
- Santander Placements and Santander Internships
- BP Student Tutoring (placements in local primary and secondary schools)

These work-based learning initiatives are institutionally verifiable, demonstrate wider university learning, are not rewarded by academic credit and are not assessed and hence were approved for inclusion on the transcript.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senate approved and noted the recommendations arising from the meeting of the University Court held on 8 December 2015.

1. Resolution [Procedure for Removal of Members of Court]

29.1   The Court had approved a draft Resolution [Procedure for Removal of Members of Court] which had been considered by the Senate on 4 November 2015. A copy of the Resolution is available on the Senate website www.abdn.ac.uk/registry/internal.

2. Senate Effectiveness Review

29.2   The Court had noted a report on the outcome of the Senate Effectiveness Review.

3. Procedure to Revoke Award of an Honorary Degree

29.3   The Court noted that the Senate had approved a procedure to enable consideration of requests to revoke the award of an Honorary Degree.

ELECTION OF SENATE ASSESSOR TO COURT

30.1   The Senate noted that the following recent elections Professor A Akisanya was elected as Senate Assessor for the College of Physical Sciences and Professor N Hutchison was elected as a Senate Assessor for the College of Arts & Social Sciences and the Business School with immediate effect to 30 September 2019.

HAY OF SEATON MEMORIAL LECTURE COMMITTEE

31.1   The Senate noted that the Senate Business Committee approved the appointment of Professor Ehud Reiter, Chair in Computing Science and Vice-President of the Aberdeen Hebrew Congregation, as a member of the Hay of Seaton Memorial Lecture Committee.

AOCB

32.1   The Principal informed members of the Senate that this would be Professor's Kunin's last meeting. On behalf of the Senate, the Principal thanked Professor for all his work and leadership.