

## UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

### SENATUS ACADEMICUS

#### Minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2015

*Present:* Principal, Professors Kilburn, Kunin, McGeorge, Hannaford, and Ross, Ms AM Slater, Craig, Coyle, and Gimlin, Mr M Whittington, Skakle, Jolley, Guz, Lumsden, Davies, Wells, Connolly and Masthoff and Shennan, Dr M Ehrenschwendtner, Dr S Lawrie, Professor Lurie, Mrs D Bruxvoort, Mrs L Tibbets, Dr J Lamb, Dr WD McCausland, Dr A Sim, Professor Friedrich, Dr H Pierce, Dr P Ziegler, Dr Y Bain, Dr E Curtis, Ms S Cornelius, Mrs M Stephen, Dr G Sharman, Professor Mealor, Professor Duff, Dr A Simpson, Dr Z Yihdego, Mr S Styles, Dr M Mills, Dr L Bennie, Dr T Argounova-Low, Professor Anderson, Dr J Sternberg, Dr D Lusseau, Dr A Rajnicek, Dr S Tucker, Dr M Delibegović, Dr A Jenkinson, Dr N Mody, Dr D MacCallum, Dr M Cruickshank, Dr L Aucott, Dr C Black, Professor Barker, Dr S Fielding, Dr I Cameron, Dr K Foster, Professor Lee, Dr F Thies, Dr N Hoggard, Dr L Williams, Dr B Timermans, Dr D Ray, Dr K Pilz, Professor Chandler, Professors Akisanya and Kashtalyan, Dr O Menshykov, Dr J Oliver, Dr A Ebinghaus, Dr C North, Dr N Oren, Professor Coghill, Dr R Macpherson, Dr M da Silva Baptista, Dr B Martin, Dr W Vasonselos, Miss Z Howell, Miss A Pavelekova, Mr D Kaminek, Miss A Sharp, Mr C Herbert, Miss A Hay, Miss C Henssen and Miss S Small

*Apologies:* Professors Glover, Haites, MacGregor, Morrison, Baggs, Sahraie, Heys, Brown, Gow and Dr R Neilson, Dr C Kee, Dr D Hendry, Dr M Beaton, Dr P Bishop, Professor Hutchison, Dr A Dilley, Dr A Bryzgel, Dr K Groo, Dr A Lewis, Professor Stollery, Dr M Bain, Professor M Pinard, Dr J Baird, Mrs C Dennis, Professor Johnson, Dr J Barrow, Professor Teismann, Dr D Scott, Professor Ibbetson, Dr K Khalaf, Dr R MacKenzie, Professor M Helfirch, Dr A Venkatesh, Dr J Keifer, Professors MacDonald and Dobney, Professor C Brittain, Miss G Clarke, Mr L Fuller, Mr J Waddell, Miss K Hood, Miss A Sevadjan, Miss D Passinke, Mr I Tashim, Mr F Neldelea, Mr F Archibald and Miss C Christie

#### OPENING REMARKS

- 1.1 The Principal opened the first meeting of the Senate of Academic Year 2015/16 by welcoming all those present, specifically those new elected Senators and the newly appointed student representatives. The Principal, acknowledging that this would be the last meeting for some Senators, including Professors Chandler and Craig, extended his thanks on behalf of Senate to them for their contribution.
- 1.2 The Principal reminded members of the importance of the Senate being a forum for fair, respectful and robust debate. The Principal impressed upon Senators the importance of speaking openly in such debate and stressed the value of the representation of all views.
- 1.3 The Principal noted that attendance had been taken on arrival at the meeting as a consequence of a change to the way in which the Honorary Degree Count would be taken. Senators were informed that feedback had suggested some members were uncomfortable with being required to sign their name on ballot papers. The Senate was informed that, in response to these concerns, an electronic means of voting would be trialled later in proceedings.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 2.1 The Principal moved to the first item on the agenda, the approval of the minutes of the meetings held on 10 June and 3 September 2015. He informed members that a member of the Senate had noted concern with regards to point 37.3 from the minute of 10 June, expressing the view that the Senate had not agreed to move forward with implementation but to await further discussion at the extraordinary meeting before approving structural changes. The member proposed that the minute be amended to read as follows (additions shown in bold):

“Following discussion, the Senate approved the proposals in **principle**, including the draft Resolution, and agreed **to schedule an extraordinary meeting of the Senate**

**to be held in late summer to enable discussion of greater detail related to the structural changes, before deciding their implementation.”**

- 2.2 In response, the Senior Vice-Principal commented that his own view was that the minute reflected the discussion on 10 June 2015 but acknowledged that it was clear that not everyone had understood or heard the concluding statement at the end of the debate. To address this, he proposed the addition of the following note to minute 37.3:

“Note added following the meeting: It was apparent following the meeting that some Senate members were unclear as to the agreed outcome of the debate as expressed in the closing statement by the Chair. The dissent of some Senators from the minuted outcome was acknowledged at the meeting on 4 November 2015.”

- 2.3 In discussion, some members of the Senate raised concerns regarding the lack of clarity regarding which items are for the approval of Senate and those which are not. The Principal agreed the importance of this matter, informing Senators of the consideration of this matter as part of the Senate Effectiveness Review (minute item 5 refers). Comment was also made that the June meeting had been long and outwith the University’s agreed family-friendly hours for meetings. In response, it was noted that it is important in such meetings to allow debate to run as long as required.
- 2.4 A member of the Senate posed a question regarding point 39 from the meeting on 10 June 2015 concerning why this item concerning academic line management was not one for Senate’s approval. It was noted in response that line managers are simply delegates of the head of school whose oversight is already established in contracts and as such the decision to establish the policy was one for management. The comments raised at the meeting of 10 June had been taken on board in finalising the policy and had informed training and job descriptions. It was further queried where the decision not to seek approval by Senate had been taken. In response it was noted that the paper had been discussed by the Senior Management Team and was considered as a management decision to delegate the already approved responsibilities of a Head of School. The Senate Business Committee in approving the Senate agenda had accepted the recommended action set out in the paper.
- 2.5 Following discussion, the Senate approved, following a vote, the minutes of the meetings of 10 June 2015 subject to the addition of the note proposed by the Senior Vice-Principal to minute 37.3 (as detailed in paragraph 2.2 above). The vote being carried by 47 votes for with 18 votes against and 14 abstentions. The minute of the meeting held on 3 September 2015 was also approved.

**STATEMENT BY PRINCIPAL**

- 3.1 The Principal spoke of the current Political context and the publication of the UK Green Paper on Higher Education (HE), expected on Friday 6 November. The Principal acknowledged that it was as yet unclear the extent to which the paper would allow for consultation and comment. The Principal noted the change expected in England to move to one regulator, focussed almost entirely on the student and the student experience. The Principal further highlighted the work to develop the Teaching Excellence Framework in England. The Principal noted the difficulties in gauging the extent of the implications the English approach would have for the Scottish HE sector.
- 3.2 The Principal informed the Senate that the Nurse Review of Research Councils was expected to report on Thursday 19 November. The Principal noted that while the outcome was as yet unknown, he would not be surprised if recommendations included changes to the architecture of Research Councils and a move of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) to one overall research body.
- 3.3 The Principal acknowledged the Chancellor’s Autumn Statement, to be made on Wednesday 25 November, as the reasoning behind the imminent reporting of both the Green Paper and Nurse Review. The Principal noted the likelihood of major cuts for departments in England

including the department with responsibility for Higher Education. Senators were informed that the abandonment of maintenance grants and move to student loans would likely count as a cost saving. The Principal spoke of the implications cuts of this extent were likely to have in Scotland, however, he did note the support of the Scottish Government for HE and their recognition of the HE sector as a major driver of the Scottish Economy.

- 3.4 The Principal updated the Senate on the Aberdeen City and Shire City Deal bid, a bid made to the UK Treasury for an investment based on an economic case. The Principal noted the proposals contained within the economic case including improvements in rail, roads and housing. The Principal also referenced the proposed establishment of Aberdeen as an innovation hub with research input, and significant University involvement, in the areas of (i) Oil and Gas, (ii) Biopharmaceuticals, (iii) Agriculture, Food and Drink and (iv) Computing Science. The Principal expressed his hope that on 25 November the Chancellor would refer to the City Deal bid in a positive way and thanked staff for their contributions to this work to date.
- 3.5 The Principal spoke of the Higher Education Governance Bill expected in Government in the New Year. The Principal acknowledged the potential reclassification of Scottish Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) as public bodies and the issues associated with this, including the loss of Charitable body status and the ability of HEIs to run at a deficit. The Principal noted further implications would include the reduction in Senate members on the Governing body from six to two, however, there would be Union representatives. The Principal informed Senate that the Committee of Scottish Chairs and the Universities and Colleges Union would continue to work with the Government regarding these proposals.
- 3.6 The Principal updated the Senate on the new Strategic Plan and in so doing specifically noted its focus on 'People'. The Principal acknowledged the University's status as an accredited living wage employer, the nine day fortnight proposal and the Health and Wellbeing day scheduled for January. The Principal acknowledged the Teaching and Learning Initiatives contained within the plan and the development of plans at school level.
- 3.7 In drawing his statement to a close, the Principal invited questions from members. One member queried the timing of the Higher Education Governance Bill and its likely impact. In response, the Principal stated he was unsure but anticipated it was likely that the Bill would be considered by Parliament in the early New Year.

## **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

- 4.1 The Principal introduced the item on Health and Safety. He noted the appointment of Naveed Qamar as Director of Health, Safety and Wellbeing and the ongoing work to immerse Health, Safety and Wellbeing into every aspect of work undertaken. Senators agreed to amend the recurring agenda item 'Health and Safety' to 'Health, Safety and Wellbeing'.
- 4.2 The Principal informed Senators of Health and Wellbeing day on 8 January 2016 and the planned initiatives under the strapline 'Because We Care' to be undertaken throughout 2016.
- 4.3 A member of the Senate expressed how impressed they had been in the quick and efficient response to a near miss that had recently occurred. The Principal expressed the commitment of the University to the issue and encouraged Senators to raise any issues they experienced.

## **SENATE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW**

- 5.1 The Senior Vice-Principal introduced the report of the Senate Effectiveness Review (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) The Senior Vice-Principal thanked all those for their feedback and involvement in the review and specifically Dr Gillian Mackintosh for her coordination of the Review. The Senior Vice-Principal reminded Senate that the Scottish Code for Good HE Governance sets out a requirement that such effectiveness reviews are conducted on a regular basis. He further reminded Senate that the Universities (Scotland) Act 1858, and subsequent amendments to that Act, set down the powers of the Senate including the

requirement that meetings are chaired by the Principal. He informed Senate that the review had drawn upon feedback from a wide range of stakeholders and was supported by an external facilitator. In inviting comment on the review report, he reminded members that the review had been overseen by the Senate Business Committee and the report presented was agreed by all members.

5.2 The Senior Vice-Principal also informed members that the Aberdeen branch of UCU had intimated to him that due to insufficient time, the Branch had been unable to formulate a detailed response to the recent consultation on the effectiveness of Senate or attend any of the group meetings.

5.3 The Principal expressed his thanks to those involved in the review and emphasised his personal support for it. He encouraged Senators to engage in open dialogue on the recommendations.

5.3 The Principal noted that a motion to revise Recommendation 8 to state that Senate papers will be published 10 working days rather than 10 days in advance of Senate meetings had been received. The member submitting the motion advised the Senate that the amendment was proposed to provide time for elected Senators to consult with their constituents in advance of the meeting. Members agreed to the proposed amendment with no objections being raised.

5.4 There then followed a discussion, the main points of which are summarised below.

- Some members of the Senate expressed their support for the report and its exposure of some of the problems of Senate and the associated proposals of how these should be addressed.
- A member of the Senate queried the Senate membership structure of the Senate Business Committee (SBC). In response it was noted that the Committee had been established following the last Effectiveness Review in 2006 and was composed of the Senior Vice-Principal (chair), Conveners of the University Committee on Teaching & Learning, Undergraduate Committee, Postgraduate Committee, Quality Assurance Committee and the Research Policy Committee, the three Senate Assessors on the Operating Board, the University Secretary and the Student President.
- A member of the Senate expressed concern as to the number of 'ex officio' members of not just the SBC but many of the Senate's sub-committees. Some members of the Senate expressed their support for the SBC becoming more representative.
- A member of the Senate noted the importance of clearly distinguishing between (i) matters for the approval of Senate and (ii) matters seeking academic views by way of the Senate, but for the approval of the University Court. Senators noted the desire for a clear distinction such as this, however, noted that this can be difficult to do in some cases.
- Members of the Senate agreed the appropriateness of the call for a debate and/or vote on any item.
- A member of Senate requested training for new members. This was acknowledged as routinely offered, however, the importance of training both new and existing members was noted and it was acknowledged that the Review report included recommendation around induction.
- One member of the Senate expressed concern as to the items listed on the agenda as 'For Routine Approval' which would not be discussed at the meeting, and the importance of these. The Principal reminded all members that items such as these could be starred in advance of the meeting (all agendas refer) should they wish to discuss these in further detail. The Principal noted that items included had all been discussed at meetings feeding into Senate such as the UCTL.
- One member of the Senate queried the status of membership when a Senator moves School or takes a sabbatical. The Principal noted that good practice in such a scenario would be for the Senator concerned to demit office and stand again, if and when appropriate. It was agreed the process for managing changes to elected membership during terms of office would be clarified through the Review implementation.
- A member of the Senate noted the importance of the committees of the Senate and their associated sub-committees. The member drew the attention to the importance of

extensive discussion undertaken at these meetings, on which all schools are represented, and the importance of these committees in informing and shaping policy development. It was noted that this School membership is drawn from those holding relevant roles (e.g. Directors of Teaching) who are not necessarily also Senators. In response, it was acknowledged it is important that engagement is able to happen effectively across the full Senate process starting with the business discussed at Senate committees and as such the Review implementation would seek to encourage better communication between committee members, Senators and their constituencies. To aid this, papers for all Senate committees would be made available online.

- 5.5 Members were reminded that the Senate Business Committee would lead the work to implement the Review Recommendations and in doing so, it had been agreed to co-opt some elected members to support this work. Senate was informed that three expressions of interest had been received. To address issues of gender balance, expressions of interest from female members would be welcomed with those interested being asked to inform [academicservices@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:academicservices@abdn.ac.uk) by 5pm on Monday 9 November.
- 5.6 In drawing the debate to a close, the amendment to Recommendation 8 (see 5.3 above) was agreed. It was further agreed that the following matters would be referred to the Implementation Group:
- That consideration should be given to the composition of the Senate Business Committee and whether that body should include any elected Senate members.
  - That in regard to the view that Senate is a process which includes the work of Senate sub-committees, that there is a need to ensure the transparency of that process to Senate members.
  - That there is a need for clarity on the operation of Senate regarding when members can call for a vote or raise an item for discussion.
  - That the process for managing changes to elected membership during terms of office should be clarified.
- 5.7 It was agreed that the SBC Implementation Group would oversee the implementation of the Review and, in doing so, would give consideration to those points set out in 5.5 above and would report back to the Senate at its next meeting with a more detailed paper and set of recommendations for approval.

## **STUDENT EXPERIENCE PAPER 2015**

- 6.1 The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) introduced to the Senate a paper reviewing the Student Experience in 2014/15 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Vice-Principal highlighted the breakdown, as provided by School, of performance in a range of undergraduate Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) including Retention, the National Student Survey, Degree class outcomes and graduate destination data. Postgraduate experience information from the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey and the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey was also included. The Vice-Principal acknowledged some excellent practice going on within schools, specifically noting the work undertaken within the School of Education to improve National Student Survey (NSS) returns and within the School of Natural and Computing Sciences to improve retention.
- 6.2 There then followed a discussion, the main points of which are summarised below.
- A member of the Senate noted concern, raised by members of their constituency, regarding the KPIs set around degree classification outcomes (i.e. 20% at 1<sup>st</sup> class, 60% at 2:1) as part of Strategic Plan targets to be met by 2020. Concern was expressed of the potential grade inflation this could lead to and the consequential reputational damage that might incur. In response, the Principal stressed that there

was no instruction that such requirements must be met. Rather it would be important for schools to reflect on how their degrees are performing and the way in which the constituent courses are assessed in consultation with External Examiners, to ensure that marks properly reflect performance.

- Members of the Senate noted the importance of ensuring high quality teaching as a means of obtaining high level degree classifications.
- A member of the Senate noted Table 1 included within the paper, and raised the importance of the interpretation of classifications not only in isolation, but also in relation to entry tariffs. The recent increase in entry tariff was also highlighted and the potential of this leading to improved outcome was also noted.
- A member of the Senate, representing the School of Education, updated the Senate on the work being undertaken in regards to the NSS. The Senate noted the School of Education's approach to (i) targeting final year students and (ii) working in partnership with students, communicating by means of 'you said we did' feedback in response to concerns raised. Work was also being undertaken to review the placement student experience. The Principal expressed his interest in hearing how this approach helps influence the NSS results.
- A member of the Senate, representing the School of Natural and Computing Sciences, updated the Senate on work being undertaken within the school regarding retention. While acknowledging that the reasons for students leaving won't always be clear, members noted the work of the school in (i) reviewing data, (ii) identifying degree structure to ensure courses are placed and timed correctly and (iii) the importance of dealing with issues on a case by case basis.
- The Principal impressed upon the Senate the importance of continually seeking improvements, even where the quality of teaching can be seen to be very high.
- A member of Senate raised the issue of the potential risk of grade inflation in allowing certain KPIs to affect the structure of teaching quality.
- A member of the Senate requested that the data be analysed on the basis of joint degrees. The Vice-Principal acknowledged the importance of this suggestion.
- A member of Senate raised the issue of value added. It was noted this was a challenge to measure but would be increasingly important with the introduction of the new Teaching Excellence Framework.
- One member queried the flexibility introduced through Curriculum Reform and the variability in subject content this can produce. In response it was noted that marking should be based on what has been studied and it assume certain knowledge.
- A member of the Senate, addressing Employability, noted the high costs associated with employers coming into the Institution to deliver talks to students and the hindrance this can pose to their engagement. This concern was noted.

6.2 In drawing the debate to a close, the Principal thanked members for their contributions to an interesting debate.

### **ADOPTING AN INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT ENGAGEMENT SURVEY**

7.1 The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) introduced a paper (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes) proposing that the University replace its Institutional Student Survey (used annually to seek feedback from all undergraduate except final year students who participate in the National Student Survey (NSS)) with the UK Student Engagement Survey (UKES).

7.2 Some members of the Senate raised concern as to (i) the number of surveys issued to students and (ii) the low response rates often received. The Senate noted that since the move to online Student Course Evaluation Form (SCEF) response rates had dropped, likely as a consequence of the fact students were no longer asked to complete returns in class. Members of the Senate however noted that SCEFs could now be completed on handheld devices such as phones or tablets.

7.3 The Senate agreed that the University should participate in the UKES from 2016. The Senate further did not express a view on the optional scales but did comment that if final year undergraduates were to be included consideration would need to be given to the possible

impact this might have on completion of the NSS. Implementation of the survey and its oversight will be led by the University Committee on Teaching & Learning (UCTL).

### **GRADE POINT AVERAGE**

- 8.1 The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) introduced a paper concerned with work ongoing in the sector regarding the development of a UK Grade Point Average (GPA) to sit alongside degree classification (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The paper proposed that the University pilot the calculation of a GPA for all undergraduate students in addition to degree classification. It was noted this pilot would align with the direction of travel within the sector towards greater use of GPA which would give greater granularity of outcome than degree classification. The Vice-Principal noted that use of a GPA across a student's studies may encourage engagement within pre-honours years.
- 8.2 A member of the Senate expressed concern as to the calculation of more than one GPA and the confusion this may cause. A member of Senate added that the new Common Grading Scale (CGS) had only been in operation for a short time, and the introduction of another measure of performance outcome may not be appropriate at this time. The need for a full evaluation of the pilot options was stressed to inform decision making. It was noted that there would be a need to ensure any additional GPA introduced is transparent and that complexity with the CGS system is avoided, it was further noted that it would be good to look at approaches being taken elsewhere in the sector.
- 8.3 Members of Senate acknowledged the direction of sector travel outwith Scotland and noted that the Teaching Excellence Framework and the associated Green Paper may accelerate the move to a GPA approach. It was also noted that students, particularly international students, are increasingly requesting details of their GPA.
- 8.4 Members of the Senate requested that further information about be brought to a future meeting to enable full evaluation of the proposed pilot scheme.

### **STUDENT POPULATION 2015/16**

- 9.1 The University Secretary introduced the paper on the Student Population 2015/16 providing a high-level analysis of the student population at the end of the third week of teaching (week ending 11 Oct 2015) (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). The Senate noted the information provided in the paper and in particular noted that the student population had grown overall in all categories except RUK postgraduate taught students although it was noted that the level of growth fell short of that which had been anticipated.
- 9.2 Members of the Senate further noted that challenges remain in regard to widening participation and that the University had fallen short of its target for students from the 20% and 40% most deprived areas. The Senate further agreed to request formally that the Scottish Government review its definition of the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) to take account of rural areas rather than solely focusing on urban factors.

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

The Senate approved and noted the recommendations arising from the meeting of the University Court held on 30 September 2015.

#### **1. Procedure for Removal of Members of Court from Office: Draft Resolution**

- 10.1 The Senate approved, for its part, the Resolution to establish a Policy and Procedure for Removal of Members of the University Court (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes). In doing so, it was noted that legal advice was being sought on the Procedure detailed in

Appendix 2 to the paper and that while not for Senate's approval, any amendments made would be notified to Senate.

## **2. Draft Resolution on Reform of Academic Structure**

- 10.2 The Senate noted that the Court had formally approved the Resolution which formalised the creation of the Business School as a standalone entity separate from the three Colleges. The Court also received and noted a summary of the Senate's extraordinary meeting of 3 September 2015.

## **3. Code of Practice on Student Discipline**

- 10.3 The Senate noted that the Court had approved the revised Code of Practice on Student Discipline.

## **4. Annual Report on Institution-led Review of Quality 2014-15**

- 10.4 The Senate noted that the Court had approved the Annual Report on Institution-led Review of Quality 2014-15 and the Annual Statement of Assurance to the Scottish Funding Council.

## **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 21 October 2015.

### **1. Introduction of Online 'Professional Skills Courses' for all Undergraduate Students**

- 11.1 The Senate noted the proposed inclusion of the Careers and Employability Course (a zero credit course available online through MyAberdeen) as a compulsory course for all new undergraduates from 2016/17. Following discussion of this proposal, it was agreed that consideration of the matter would be deferred to the February meeting to allow more detail to be provided on the rationale and implications of the proposals in terms of student workload.

### **2. Proposed Moderation Procedures for 2015/16**

- 11.2 The Senate considered proposals to establish Moderation Procedures to ensure appropriate minimum criteria for marking, and moderation of marking, are clearly stipulated. It was noted that one member had submitted a proposed amendment to section 4.4 of the draft procedures to ensure appropriate quality control in situations where in double marking a major disagreement of two or more alphanumeric grades occurs between markers. He proposed the addition of an additional bullet point to section 4.4 as detailed below:

“Notwithstanding the three points above, if a change to the mark of a student selected for second marking would move that student above or below any student not second marked the change shall not be made.”

- 11.3 The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) in response noted that he had spoken with the member concerned and thanked him for his helpful comments. Following their discussion, he proposed that section 4 of the draft Procedure be replaced with the text below:

“4.1 For those assessments that are 100% second marked and the grades awarded by the two markers agree within one alphanumeric grade, e.g. B1 and B2 or C1 and B3, the student should be awarded the higher of the two grades.

4.2 Where moderation is applied (rather than 100% second marking), any outcome of the moderation process should be applied to the full cohort and not just to the sample used for moderation.

- 4.2.1 The role of the moderator is to assure themselves that the marks that they would have applied to the sample are in broad agreement with the marks awarded by the first marker (e.g. generally within one alphanumeric grade per assessment). If there is broad agreement then the marks awarded by the first marker should stand.
- 4.2.2 Where there is not broad agreement then the moderator should discuss this with the first marker and an action agreed (e.g. moving the marks for the entire cohort upwards or downwards as appropriate). See Annex.
- 4.2.3 Where, during moderation, a potential anomaly in the mark of an individual assessment is identified then this should be discussed with the first maker. Critically any change to scripts as a result of the moderation process should be applied across the full cohort and not just to one or all of the sampled scripts.
- 4.2.4 Where it is not possible to reach agreement via moderation then the full cohort should be double marked.  
[Note Annex referred to in 4.2.2. will be developed and included alongside the Procedures in the Academic Quality Handbook]"

11.4 The inclusion of paragraph 3.3. regarding the requirement for 100% second marking where a single piece of coursework constitutes the whole assessment for a course was also queried by a Senator. It was noted that this was included to cover situations when using moderation rather than second marking where there is a greater risk of an anomalous mark arising. It was proposed that such moderation may be required where the component contributes at least 30 credits to the overall degree class.

11.5 The Senate approved the draft Moderation Procedures subject to the amendments set out in 11.3 above.

### **3. Dates and allocations for November 2015 graduations**

11.6 The Committee noted the dates and allocation for the November Ceremonies as summarised below, approved by the Convener of the University Committee on Teaching & Learning during the summer:

**Thursday 26 November at 11.00 a.m.**

Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Engineering, Education and Natural & Computing Sciences.

**Thursday 26 November at 3.00 p.m.**

Higher and First Degrees in the Business School, Schools of Language & Literature and Social Science.

**Friday 27 November at 11.00 a.m.**

Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Divinity, History & Philosophy, Law and Geosciences.

**Friday 27 November at 3.00 p.m.**

Higher and First Degrees in the Schools of Biological Sciences, Medical Sciences, Medicine & Dentistry and Psychology.

### **4. Centre for Academic Development Report 2014/15**

11.7 The Committee considered the Centre for Academic Development Annual Report for Academic Year 2014/15. The Committee acknowledged the quality and extent of the work highlighted in the report's content. The Committee agreed that the Report should be made widely available and be disseminated to colleagues within the Colleges as appropriate.

## **5. Students' Association recognition of roles for the transcript**

- 11.8 The University of Aberdeen's Co-Curricular Award, STAR was included from 2013/14 on the University Transcript as the initial 'accredited' co-curricular activity within enhanced transcript developed as part of Curriculum Reform. At that time it was agreed that the Students' Association (SA) would bring forward proposals for SA activities that would be included as 'recognised' activities on the transcript. The SA has since developed a robust method for recording these activities and therefore UCTL approved a proposal for a pilot scheme aimed at structuring the recognised roles, starting with the Academic Representative System with a view to this information being included on transcripts from the current academic year.

## **6. Updates to the Guidance notes on Fitness to Practice for student in Medicine and Dentistry (Academic Quality Handbook Appendix 5.17c)**

- 11.9 The Committee approved changes to Appendix 5.17c of the Academic Quality Handbook required to take account of the inclusion of students registered for the Postgraduate Diploma in Physicians Associate Studies (PA); and to align the appeals processes with the mainstream University appeals process.

## **7. Change to Off-Campus Study Form**

- 11.10 On the recommendation of the Postgraduate Committee, the Committee approved the proposal that the off campus study form be revised so that the default assumption is that full fees will be charged, unless the Head of School authorises a reduction.

## **PROCEDURE TO REVOKE AWARD OF AN HONORARY DEGREE**

- 12.1 The Senate approved, on the recommendation of the Honorary Degrees Committee, the draft procedure to revoke the award of an honorary degree (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

## **REMIT AND COMPOSITION OF SENATE 2015/16**

- 13.1 The Senate noted the Remit and Composition of Senate for 2015/16 (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

## **SENATE ELECTIONS**

- 14.1 The Senate noted the appointments made in the recent Senate elections (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).

## **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

- 15.1 The Senate noted, for its part, that the Senate Business Committee had approved the appointment of members to Senate Committees (copy filed with the principal copy of the minutes).