SENATE BUSINESS COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Senate Business Committee will be held at **2.00 p.m. on Wednesday 27 September 2017** in **Committee Room 2, University Office**.

Rachael Bernard
Acting Academic Registrar
(r.bernard@abdn.ac.uk)

AGENDA

FOR DISCUSSION

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2016 **SBC17-18:01**

2. Remit and Membership **SBC17-18:02a and SBC17-18:02b**

3. Draft Agenda for the meeting of the Senate on 18 October 2017 **SBC17-18:03**

4. Review of the Operation of the Senate in 2016/17

The Committee is asked to reflect on the operation of the Senate in 2016/17 and to consider whether there may be any ways to further enhance the effectiveness of the Senate.

5. Major Topics for Discussion in 2017/18 **SBC17-18:04**

6. Honorary Degrees Committee membership **SBC17-18:05**

7. Senate Working Group on Policies and Procedures following removal of Colleges from the management structure. **SBC17-18:06**

The Committee is asked to note the report from the Group

8. Annual Report on Institutional-led Review for the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) **SBC17-18:07**

The Committee is asked to approve, for its part, on behalf of the Senate, the Annual Report on Institutional-led Review which is due to be submitted to the Scottish Funding Council by 30 September 2017.

9. Election of a Rector **SBC17-18:08**

10. Annual Senate Survey

The Committee is asked to note that the annual Senate Survey will be conducted in December 2017. By undertaking the survey at this time will permit new senators to have more experience of being a part of Senate before completing the survey.

FOR INFORMATION

11. Senate Elections

The Committee is invited to note the outcome of the Senate elections conducted at the end of last academic year as detailed below:

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

School of Divinity, History & Philosphy

Dr G Hough

School of Education

Dr H Martin

School of Law

Dr P Glover

School of Social Science

Dr A McKinnon

School of Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition

Dr M Brazzelli
Dr J Hislop
Dr A Jack
Dr G Jones
Dr P Murchie
Professor G Nixon
Professor H Wallace

School of Psychology

Dr M Jackson

12. Senate Assessors to Court

The Committee is invited to note that the elections for the four Senate Assessors to Court closes at 5pm on Wednesday 27 September 2017

13. Senate Working Group on the Establishment of Overseas Campuses.

As agreed at the meeting of Senate in June, a Working Group has been established to look further at the processes for the establishment of campuses overseas. The Group will be convened by Dr Tom Rist, with further members as noted below. The Group will meet for the first time on Friday 29 September.

- Language, Literature, Music & Visual Culture: Dr Amy Bryzgel and Dr Tom Rist (Convener)
- Business School: Mrs Lindsay Tibbets and Professor Norman Hutchison

- Divinity, History & Philosophy: Professor Joachim Schaper and Professor Karin Friedrich
- Social Science: Professor David Anderson and Dr Martin Mills
- Biological Sciences: Professor Michelle Pinard and Dr Martin Barker
- Psychology: Dr Emily Nordmann and Dr Margaret Jackson
- Engineering: Professor Maria Kashtalyan and Dr Oleksandr Menshykov
- Geosciences: Dr Brice Rea and Professor Andrew Hurst
- Natural & Computer Sciences: Dr Murilo da Silva Baptista and Professor Benjamin Martin
- Medicine: TBC
- Dean for Transnational Education: Professor Richard Wells

14. County of Banff Bursary Fund

The Committee is invited to note that the Convener approved that Dr Glynn Hesketh should replace Dr David McMurtry as the University's representative on the above Fund.

15. Dates of meetings in 2017/18

The Committee is invited to note the dates of the meetings to be held in 2017/18:

Wednesday 22 November 2017 at 2.00 p.m. in Committee Room 2
Thursday 1 February 2018 at 2.00 p.m. in Committee Room 2
Thursday 29 March 2018 at 2.00 p.m. in Committee Room 2
Thursday 26 April 2018 at 2.00 p.m. in Committee Room 2

S:\Academic Services\Senate\Business Committee\2017-18\27 September 2017\Agenda Sept 17.docx

SBC17-18:01

SENATE BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Notes of the meeting of 17 May 2017

Present: Professor J Kilburn (Convener), Professor N Hutchison, Mr L Fuller Professor K Friedrich, C Kee, K Shennan, Dr D Maccallum, Dr J Lamb, Dr D Lusseau, Dr M Mills, Dr M Da Silva Baptista, Professor M Kashtalyan, Professor H Hutchison, and Dr R Bernard (Clerk)

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs C Inglis, Mr C Anucha, Professors S Heys, P McGeorge, B MacGregor, J Masthoff, Drs J Lamb, D Maccallum, N Oren

377. Minutes

377.1 The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2017.

375. Draft Agenda for the meeting of the Senate on 7 June 2017

375.1 The Committee considered and approved the draft Senate Agenda for the meeting on 7 June 2017. In reviewing the draft agenda, the following main points of discussion were noted:

- The Committee noted that, in addition to the agenda as included in the papers, two questions for the Principal had been received. These related to the booking of teaching rooms for research purposes and a request to publish the Senate Business Committee (SBC) minutes. A response regarding the room booking question had been supplied and it had been agreed that the SBC minutes would in future be published on the website. These responses were sufficient that both questions had been withdrawn.

- In considering the motion proposed regarding the establishment of overseas campuses, the Committee noted that the current process had only recently been approved by Senate (January 2017) and that to establish a working group would be outside the procedure which had created the process. It was further noted that the removal of Colleges from the University structure would result in the role of Schools being more central to any future discussions. The Committee were of the view that it should be acknowledged that issues exist with the process and that further discussion was needed, but that the suggestion to Dr Rist should be that the appropriate route for discussions would be to remit the issues to the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) in the first instance. The Committee agreed this suggestion should be put to Dr Rist.

  Action: Clerk

- The Committee discussed the motion proposed by Mr Styles and noted that the proposed wording regarding ensuring a gender balance may not be entirely appropriate. The Committee agreed that the view of the Athena Swan Group should be sought.

  Action: Clerk

- The Committee further noted that Mr Styles had submitted an additional motion seeking to ensure that Senate meetings were always scheduled for Wednesday afternoons. The reasoning behind the need for the meeting in April

to once again be scheduled on a Monday (the timing of paper circulation, University vacation dates, and the dates of prior and subsequent Senate meetings) had been supplied to Mr Styles and he had subsequently withdrawn the motion.

- The Committee noted that the paper on offer making to rUK students had been discussed widely within the Institution. It was agreed that 'rUK' should be added to the paper's title to ensure clarity regarding the target cohort..

376. Senate Working Group on Policies and Procedures following removal of Colleges from the management structure

376.1 Following discussions at Senate in April, Senate members had volunteered to participate in a working group to review policies and procedures impacted by the removal of Colleges from the University's management structure. Nine Senators volunteered: Professors R Wells, E Pavloskia, H Hutchison, A Jenkinson, C Kee, D Jovcic, M Brown, D Anderson and Ms A-M Slater. The Group will be Convened by the University secretary and will also include Professors P McGeorge and M Ross with Ms D Dyker and Dr R Bernard.

377. Dates of meetings in 2016/17

377.1 The Committee noted the next date of the meetings to be held in 2017/18.

Wednesday 27 September 2017 at 2.00 p.m.
Wednesday 22 November 2017 at 2.00 p.m.
Thursday 1 February 2018 at 2.00 p.m.
Thursday 29 March 2018 at 2.00 p.m.
Thursday 26 April 2018 at 2.00 p.m.

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

Senate Business Committee
(27 September 2017)

SENATE BUSINESS COMMITTEE
(Sub-Committee of Senate)

1. COMMITTEE TITLE

SENATE BUSINESS COMMITTEE

2. DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT

October 2006

3. CONVENER AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AREA

Convener: Senior Vice-Principal
Clerk: Academic Affairs (Registry)

4. PURPOSE

The Senate Business Committee has a primary role to agree Senate agendas. In order to engage Senate in open debate, the Senate Business Committee also identifies for each meeting of Senate at least one major strategic topic for discussion.

The Committee has delegated responsibility from the Senate to approve the appointment of Senate members or representatives to University Committees and the schedule for Senate elections.

5. REMIT: *(To be reviewed annually at first meeting of committee cycle)*

The primary role of the Senate Business Committee is to agree Senate agendas.

In order to engage Senate in open debate and to inform future policy and development by sub-committees for subsequent approval by the Senate, it has been agreed that the Senate Business Committee should identify at least one topic for discussion of a major strategic issue at each Senate meeting. This would not preclude such topics being included on the agenda *ad hoc* in response to, in particular, national consultations and major issues that emerged during the course of an academic year that the University should address.

The Senate Business Committee, in drafting Senate agendas, should also decide, as deemed appropriate whether an external speaker (e.g. from the Scottish Funding Council, the Scottish Executive, Universities Scotland, the Higher Education Academy) should be invited to address the Senate on a topic of current interest or debate within the HE sector.

The Senate Business Committee is also asked to determine the timing of consideration, by the Senate, of annual reports from the Senior Vice-Principal, the Heads of College, the central Vice-Principals and the University Secretary.

6. COMPOSITION AND QUORUM:

- The Senior Vice-Principal (Convener)
- University Secretary
- The Senate Assessors on the Operating Board
- Seven elected members of Senate ~~(two per College (one male and one female) and one from the Business School)~~ elected for a two year term of office

- The Conveners of the following Committees:
  University Committee on Teaching & Learning
  Quality Assurance Sub-Committee of UCTL
  Undergraduate Sub-Committee of UCTL
  Postgraduate (Taught) Sub-Committee of UCTL
  Research Policy Committee
- Dean of the Graduate School
- President of the Students' Association
- AUSA Rep (nominated by Student President)

Quorum: 50%

ACCOUNT TO BE TAKEN OF EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IN MEMBERSHIP

7. MEMBERSHIP

Professor ~~J Kilburn~~M Greaves
Mrs C Inglis
~~Dr N Oren~~Vacant – Senate Assessor on Operating Board
~~Professor N Hutchison~~ Vacant - Senate Assessor on Operating Board
~~Professor S Heys~~Vacant - Senate Assessor on Operating Board
Professor P McGeorge
Dr K Shennan
~~Vacant – Convener of UG Committee~~Professor H Hutchison
~~Vacant – Convener of PG Committee~~ Professor C Kee
~~Professor B MacGregor~~Professor M Campbell (from 1 October)
Professor J Masthoff
Professor K Friedrich – no longer on Senate
Dr M Mills
Professor M Kashtalayan
DR M Baptista da Silva
Professor D MacCallum
Dr D Lurie
Dr J Lamb
Mr ~~C Anuchka~~ L Ogubie
AUSA Rep - vacant

Clerk: Dr ~~G Mackintosh~~R Bernard

8. REPORTING LINE/PARENT COMMITTEE AND INTERFACE WITH OTHER COMMITTEES

Formal reporting line:	Senate
Interface with other committees:	Undergraduate Committee, Postgraduate Committee, Quality Assurance Committee, UCTL, Research Policy Committee

9. FREQUENCY AND TIMING OF MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at least five times per year (September, October, January, March/April and May)
Meetings between 10am – 4pm in accordance with University Policy.

10. PUBLICATION OF PAPERS

Cognisance will be taken of the University's Publication Scheme and Agenda papers will be made available on web pages/StaffNet where possible.

11. DATE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE APPROVED/RECORDED BY UMG: tbc .....

SBC17-18:02b

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATE BUSINESS COMMITTEE
(27 September 2017)

SENATE BUSINESS COMMITTEE COMPOSITION POST COLLEGES

1. PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

This is a paper about proposed changes to the composition of the Senate Business Committee following the removal of colleges from the University structure.

This paper is provided for discussion and approval

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Senate Business Committee is invited to approve a revised composition for the Committee

3. DISCUSSION

One of the outcomes of the Senate Effectiveness Review undertaken in 2015, was to include elected members of Senate on the Senate Business Committee (SBC). Currently these as defined as 'Seven elected members of Senate (two per College [one male and one female] and one from the Business School) elected for a two year term of office.' In considering representation on Committees following the removal of the college structure it is suggested that a revised membership should be considered by the committee in question so as to best determine appropriate representation.

The SBC is, therefore, asked to consider the following suggested model for the Committee membership post-colleges.

If the Senate membership is considered along the same boundaries as has been used for the appointment of Senate Assessors to Court, i.e. arts (schools formerly in CASS) and science (schools formerly in COPS and CLSM), the elected membership of Senate, which reflects the make-up of the University, is more heavily weighted towards science (28 arts seats to 51 science seats). If this composition is followed through and applied to the seven seats on the SBC then a possible division is that there are three seats for arts Senators and four seats for science Senators. This would have the effect of maintaining the overall composition of the committee whilst still ensuring representation from across the Senate.

The Committee is invited to discuss this proposed model, or to recommend an alternative, with a view to the revised composition being implemented following Senate on 18 October.

4. FURTHER INFORMATION

Further information is available from Professor Michael Greaves (m.greaves@abdn.ac.uk or 2017) or Dr Rachael Bernard (r.bernard@abdn.ac.uk or 3388)

[14 September 2017] [1 [Open]

SBC17-18:03

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS
Wednesday 18 October 2017

The next meeting of the Senate will be held on **Wednesday 18 October 2017** at **1.00 p.m.** in the **King's Conference Centre**.

A sandwich lunch will be available in the James McKay Hall from 12.30 p.m.

Staff and student members of the University are welcome to attend meetings of the Senate as observers. Those wishing to do so are asked to respect the formal nature of the proceedings and the understanding that no intervention or lobbying will be permitted from non-members who may be invited to leave when items of confidential business are to be considered.

Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of 7 June and 11 September 2017

3. Update from Principal

4. Health, Safety & Wellbeing

6. Report from the University Court

Items for Discussion & Approval

7. Capping resit grades to D3, use in final degree classification and format of resit
Annex A, to follow

8. Overseas Activities

8.1 Proposed Medicine TNE project in Sri Lanka — Annex B

8.2 Proposal to establish an East Africa campus based in Uganda — Annex C

Items for Discussion to Provide an Academic View

9. Policy on Recording Educational Activities — Annex D

Any Other Items for Discussion

10. Opportunity for Senate members to raise any other items of academic interest for discussion.

Items for Routine Approval or Information

11. Items for Routine Approval

11.1 Report from the University Committee on Teaching & Learning

12. Items for Information

12.1 Report from the University Committee on Teaching & Learning

12.2 Formal notification of the change to Composition of Court

12.3 Senate elections

12.4 Appointment of Senate Assessors to the University Court

12.5 Senate appointments

12.6 Annual Senate Survey

Notes

Formal Business and Questions for the Principal

Any member of Senate wishing an item for routine approval or for information to be brought forward for discussion or to propose an amendment to the Minutes of the last meeting or to put a question to the Principal on general matters is asked to email the Acting Academic Registrar no later than by 5.00 p.m. on Monday 16 October 2017, indicating the reasons for their request.

Annex B

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATE
(18 October 2017)

PROPOSED TNE PROJECT IN SRI LANKA

1. PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

1.1 This is a paper about a proposed TNE project with a healthcare education partner in Sri Lanka, the International Institute of Health Sciences (IIHS), to deliver in Aberdeen and in Sri Lanka our five year MBChB in medicine.

1.2 This proposal has been considered by the Senior Management Team on two occasions, firstly in February 2017 at which a project board remit and membership was approved, and again at its meeting on 14 August 2017, at which time permission was given to develop the project and submit for approval through the University's internal committees. The Project Board has met seven times, it has been considered by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) at its meeting on 1 September and Operating Board and Nominations and Governance Committee on 11 September. These committees have agreed to progress the proposal to the next stage that is the meeting of the Senate on 18 October.

1.3 It is intended to submit a final proposal to the University Court at its meeting on 12 December and an update has been submitted to the meeting on 4 October.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

2.1 The Senate Business Committee is invited to **consider** the summary information below and to **note** it is intended to submit the proposal to the meeting of the Senate on 18 October 2017, with a view to seeking approval by the University Court on 12 December 2017.

2.2 This timing is suggested to allow the programme to be launched early in 2018, to enable a full programme of marketing and recruitment to take place from January 2018 in time for the application deadline of 15 October 2018 for a 2019 start.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Background

3.1.1 The delivery of learning and teaching at overseas locations remote from the main Aberdeen campus (transnational education, TNE) is one of six core elements of the University's overarching Internationalisation Strategy and is increasingly important for many parts of the UK HE sector. The School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition's School Plan identifies the development of an international teaching hub as one of its priorities for internationalisation and for income generation. It is within this context that this project is being put forward.

3.2 The Partner and Sri Lanka

3.2.1 In autumn 2016, the University was approached by the International Institute of Health Sciences (IIHS), Sri Lanka, seeking a partnership with a UK University to deliver a medical degree. The University of Coventry, an international partner of the IIHS, had suggested Aberdeen and the personal link came from Sue Richardson, formerly the University's Deputy Finance Director now Finance Director at Coventry.

3.2.2 We were initially impressed with the knowledge and experience of the CEO, Dr Kithsiri and his senior team and especially their grasp of the challenges, possible solutions and advantages of

the project. Subsequent interactions, including a week-long visit to Aberdeen by the CEO and a return visit by Professors Heys and Patey to Sri Lanka, have reinforced this early opinion.

3.2.3 Sri Lanka and the IIHS have been selected as a partner for a number of reasons, some of which are outlined below. The academic and support staff team has extensive knowledge and experience of the country from an earlier project that took place over two years from 2013 -2015. This project is different in concept and builds on several of the areas where much work was done previously. This means we are building on connections, knowledge and research done in some depth, which is still relevant.

3.2.4 There is support from the Sri Lanka government ministries, in country regulators (SLMC for undergraduate and SLMA for postgraduate medical education). The Sri Lanka Medical Education model is based on the UK model and Postgraduate medical education is allied to the influence of the UK Royal Colleges. Many of the senior clinicians are UK trained. GMC accredited programmes are held in high esteem. English language is the language used in schools and universities and in public life. The Sri Lankan A levels are already recognised for UoA MBChB entry requirements. The private schools also offer London A levels. The learning opportunities (including clinical material and environment/facilities) are excellent. Sri Lanka has the highest rates of literacy (96%) and developed healthcare provision in the region.

3.2.5 Public sector healthcare is regulated by the Ministry of Health and the private sector is regulated by the Private Health Services Regulatory Council. Our students would be taught in the private hospital sector. The IIHS has excellent links with the private hospital sector and its current students are trained in private hospitals. In Sri Lanka approximately 55% of the nation's healthcare is delivered within the private sector, the remainder in the public sector. Provision within the private sector continues to grow. During a recent visit, we were able to confirm that the hospital based requirements of the clinical years 4 and 5 could be met in the private hospitals in Colombo and with a further new hospital in Kandy which would be available for clinical placements.

3.3 Due Diligence

3.3.1 In-depth due diligence on the partner has been undertaken and the report has been submitted in confidence to the Project Board and the Governance and Nominations Committee. There are no substantive issues to be followed up and all pertinent questions have been satisfactorily covered.

3.4 Academic Model

3.4.1 The programme would be the same as that offered in Aberdeen and would become recognised by the General Medical Council (GMC). This approach is very different to the previous medical degree project led by Professor David Reid and has a different partner with a different model and which builds on the knowledge gained about Sri Lanka, the region and the demand for medical education. The model proposed would be for an annual intake of 30 students to be recruited, admitted and taught for the first 3 years in Aberdeen starting in 2019. The clinical years, 4 and 5 that are largely taught in hospital settings, would be delivered in Sri Lanka starting in 2022. The balance of time spent in both countries might change over time. This model has financial and educational benefits for the students and gives them an internationally recognised GMC accredited qualification with international career opportunities.

3.5 Business Model

3.5.1 This is based on income from tuition fees only. Fees will be at the international MBChB rate of £28,600 per annum for the three years in Aberdeen and a lower fee, currently modelled on £20K per annum for the two years in Sri Lanka. International benchmarking has been carried out with competitor medical schools actively recruiting in the region to inform the level of fee in Sri Lanka.

3.5.2 The additional costs include two members of staff in Aberdeen (Anatomy and Clinical Skills) and two in Sri Lanka, a clinical and an administrative lead. An operating budget is needed for Quality Assurance visits including by the General Medical Council and for short trips by Aberdeen staff to deliver small elements of teaching best delivered by Aberdeen staff (eg professional practice), to contribute to clinical examinations and to help deliver the clinical staff training. This is smaller than other TNE projects as most teaching will be done under honorary contracts by clinical staff

in Sri Lanka employed by private hospitals. They will have honorary status with the University of Aberdeen and be paid by the IIHS on a sessional basis, as we currently do with our own NHS staff.

3.5.3 The proposed income sharing model is for the tuition fee for years 1-3 to be retained by Aberdeen less a 15% royalty on the year 1 intake for IIHS. Aberdeen will also receive 30% of the tuition fee during the years in Sri Lanka. The proposed split of costs is that each partner is responsible for the costs in-country during the years the students spend there and for any visits their staff undertake to the others' site. By year 5 we will generate £2.805m income for the University and incur expenditure of £800K (from draft plan).

4. STRENGTHS OF THIS TNE PROJECT

4.1 The University is considering a small number of TNE projects. Detailed below are some of the strengths of this proposal.

4.2 The model is for the students to spend the first three years in Aberdeen following the same curriculum as existing students. This gives time to give due preparation to the in-country preparations for their transition to Sri Lanka where they will be taught in private hospitals.

4.3 These private hospitals are already established, the hospital management and consultant staff are experienced in teaching students and willing to take more.

4.4 The School has 15 years of experience of ensuring its students are taught to the same level and quality in partner campuses with its Inverness and other Highland and Islands placements and suing the same model as is proposed for Sri Lanka.

4.5 To cope with the additional student numbers, the resource requirement is modest with a small number of additional staff in Aberdeen and Sri Lanka required. Some space modifications are needed, the first is to expand Anatomy and this will be done in November 2017. Others are being addressed.

4.6 The medical programme is accredited by the GMC and in addition to the University's procedures, those of the GMC will be adhered to and Scottish Government permission is being sought although this falls outside the cap on medical student numbers.

4.7 The School has worked with potential Sri Lankan partners on two occasions, the current project and one with private investors three years ago. It has gained a great deal of experience and knowledge about the country, its health and educational systems and the expectations of its government that provides a sound basis for developing a TNE partnership.

4.8 Medical education has an international currency and is in high demand throughout the world. The GMC has recognised this and is supporting several UK medical schools with new projects and others have already established successful ones. There is capacity to extend the University's medical education offering through a TNE project and this model represents a good first project as it has strong risk management.

4.9 There is a clear need and demand for additional medical education programmes in Sri Lanka for the local market and the South East Asia region. The number of medical places in Sri Lanka is capped and the demand from qualified candidates exceeds this. The evidence for this was in the detailed Market Research we commissioned for the earlier project. There is also demand from regional countries including Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Maldives and others.

5. WORKING IN SRI LANKA

5.1 The latest evidence from British Government* indicates the improving situation with respect to developments in social justice, human rights and legislative changes to embed democratic improvements. This recognises that, since 2009, the end of the civil war, Sri Lanka has made significant progress in its democratic processes, in tackling discrimination and promoting human rights and has initiated a Constitutional reform process aimed at ensuring checks on executive power and more equitable ethnic power sharing as well as many other legislative reforms that are now in place and enforced.

5.2 There is still progress to be made and through a medical education programme we can contribute to this.

5.3 Healthcare education is in a unique position to influence changes in society to combat discrimination. The teaching of professional practice, ethics, equality and patient centred approaches all reinforce student outcomes of learning to work with different beliefs, perceptions and orientations that promotes equal treatment for all including minorities of all kinds.

5.4 The Sri Lankan based clinical staff who would teach on our MBChB would be required to undertake the same training as staff in Aberdeen and that would include the University's Equality and Diversity training and the GMC-required Recognition and Approval of Trainers training that includes equality.

5.5 Medicine and other healthcare professions all attract well qualified female candidates who go onto professional careers. This project would further enhance this and contribute to the widening of equal opportunities for women.

6. FURTHER INFORMATION

6.1 Further information is available from Professor Steve Heys, Head of School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition, email: s.d.heys@abdn.ac.uk, telephone: (0)1224 437968.

* References:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/democratic-socialist-republic-of-sri-lanka-human-rights-priority-country-report-2016

Annex C

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATE
(18 October 2017)

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN EAST AFRICA CAMPUS BASED IN UGANDA

1. PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

1.1 This paper sets out a proposal to establish a University of Aberdeen campus in partnership with TNE limited in Uganda and serving as a hub for transnational education recruitment across East Africa. It is a successor proposal to the former initiative in Rwanda.

1.2 This paper is provided for **discussion and approval.**

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

2.1 Court is invited to consider the information provided in the paper and, if deemed appropriate, **approve** the proposal for further consideration by Senate (18 October 2017). The proposal has already been reviewed by both Operating Board and Governance & Nominations Committee on 11 September 2017. Should all necessary approvals be granted, it is proposed to establish the campus for opening in September 2018.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Outcome of earlier Rwanda-based proposal

3.1.1 The University's proposal to establish a campus in Rwanda from September 2017 in partnership with TNE Limited received final approval from Senate on 25 January 2017 and Court on 28 March 2017 (subject to the completion of some further aspects of due diligence with regard to the proposed partner which were subsequently satisfactorily concluded). As reported to both UMG and Court in June 2017, however, there were then important further developments in Rwanda that indicated that the initiative would be unlikely to proceed in its present form – though could be replaced by a similar initiative in a different location and with a later opening date.

3.1.2 The developments in Rwanda that led to this situation began in mid March 2017 when we were informed by our partner that it had been informed that the Rwandan government had very recently completed a review of HE provision and the role of public and private universities and that, with the completion of this review, it was considering all future provision. It was reported that, whilst hitherto fully supportive of the TNE Limited proposal and the partnership with the University of Aberdeen, the Rwandan Government was for now suspending the issuing of any new licences to foreign providers of higher education to establish a campus in Rwanda.

3.1.3 This development was discussed with senior representatives of TNE Limited over the following weeks and in late April 2017, TNE Limited confirmed that it expected no longer to be able to pursue the Rwandan initiative as previously approved by Senate and Court for the following principal reasons:

- The distinct change in the Rwandan Government view of the project;
- A categorical statement by the Rwandan regulatory authority that there would be a moratorium on the parliament issuing new university licenses, despite contradictory statements by other government officials.
- Limitations to be placed on the scope of undergraduate and postgraduate programs in Rwanda.

3.1.4 In addition, a categorical statement was given by the Rwandan regulatory authority that new licenses would only be issued for a restricted range of energy-related academic programmes, alongside a withdrawal of potential Government funding for undergraduate students studying at the proposed campus. As a result, the business case for our Rwandan initiative became unsustainable.

3.1.5 In May 2017 the Dean for Transnational Education met with the Rwandan Education Minister in Kigali who explained the rationale behind their decision. He explained that whilst the Government would be happy to issue a licence for the University to operate it would only do so for a limited range of energy-based programmes due to its view that there was an oversaturation of the market in other areas. The meeting was cordial and he expressed the Government's strong desire to continue dialogue with the University and explore other projects together in the future.

3.2 New proposal to establish in Uganda

3.2.1 The University remains committed to its partnership with TNE Limited which it sees as key to establishing a campus in East Africa as part of a wider internationalisation strategy, recognising the huge potential anticipated in sub-Saharan Africa in the coming years. It has therefore considered alternative host countries for such a campus. In May, the Dean of TNE and the Senior Vice-Principal visited Uganda to explore whether the originally-proposed Rwanda campus might now instead be located there. Uganda, like Rwanda, is economically stable and a member of the East African Community freedom of movement area. It is already seen as a proven inbound destination for higher education in the East African region.

3.3 Market Research and the Ugandan Context

3.3.1 The market research prepared by our partner for the original Rwandan proposal has now been updated to provide additional focus on Uganda as a potential destination and is available for interested readers at the end of the present agenda. As previously, the proposal to establish a campus now in Uganda is founded upon rapid African population growth accompanied by a very high rate of growth in student enrolments across primary, secondary and tertiary education levels.

3.3.2 The population of sub-Saharan Africa grew from 186 million to 856 million people between 1950-2010. As a region, sub-Saharan Africa is currently experiencing the highest rate of population growth in the world. By 2050, sub-Saharan Africa's population will increase to more than 2.3 billion people, and it will have the youngest population in the world. By 2035, the number of sub-Saharan Africans reaching working-age will exceed that of the rest of the world combined. The TNE Ltd market analysis states that African nations are now poised to take advantage of a '*demographic dividend*' – i.e. that by increasing their capabilities and capacities to develop their human capital, they would derive significant ongoing economic growth.

3.3.3 Although tertiary gross enrolment ratios (GER) in the region are low compared to the world average, these GERs are doubling every 10 years. At current population growth rates and GER growth rates, tertiary enrolments in sub-Saharan Africa will increase by a factor of 2.5, from 9.8 million students today, to 24.6 million students by 2025.

3.3.4 Uganda is seen as an ideal location for a campus that will provide to the broader community of East African nations as well as the wider sub-Saharan region of Africa. Amongst members of the East African Community (this includes Kenya, Tanzania, and Burundi. Rwanda and Uganda with freedom of movement between members), Uganda has one of the highest total population growth rates to 2050 at 2.7% (Rwanda 1.7%) and with the growth rate for the 0-24 age group being 2.1% (Rwanda 0.7%). It has high economic growth (6% per annum over the past decade and a liberalised economy with no restrictions on foreign investment or capital movement. It is already recognised as a destination hub for higher education within the region and TNE Limited estimates there are probably more than 20,000 students from other EAC countries studying in Uganda.

3.3.5 Education in Uganda is based on the British System. The Ugandan Government has given high priority to Education and has implemented a number of reform measures to address the issues of access, equity and quality therein. In 2007, Uganda became the first country in sub-Saharan

Africa to introduce universal secondary education and this was extended further in 2012 to include A-level study as well as business, technical, and vocational training.

3.3.6 In 2013, the Ugandan Government launched its Vision 2040 plan to transform Ugandan society and committed to invest heavily in its education system. The Vision explicitly aims to attract top rated universities to establish in Uganda and also seeks to promote international and relevant research with top private companies such as Shell, Exxon-Mobil, Siemens, Microsoft, and Intel facilitated to set up research and development centres within university premises. Uganda has significant mineral resources and is expected to begin oil production in 2020.

3.3.7 The UK and Uganda have strong trade relations, as well as defence and cultural links. The UK Aid programme in Uganda seeks to tackle barriers to equitable, sustainable and inclusive growth, strengthening democratic governance and reducing corruption. The UK is the largest single cumulative inward investor to Uganda and is working with it to protect stability in the region, including through Uganda's leading role in the African Union peacekeeping force in Somalia.

3.4 Commentary on particular issues regarding working in Uganda

3.4.1 The University is of course cognisant of Uganda's troubled past and ongoing issues to be considered if operating there, for example its poor performance on corruption (ranked by Transparency International as 151/176 in world corruption indices whereas Rwanda is 50/176) and its stance on LGBT matters such as the 2014 Uganda Anti-Homosexuality Act. Such considerations arise in much of our international work, including initiatives in and recruitment from countries such as China, India and Saudi Arabia. In all such cases we are clear that the provision of education to citizens of these countries is in itself enlightening and transformational both to their personal development and in the development of their countries when they apply the skills and learning that study has equipped them with. As such, the progressive nation-building benefits of the higher education we offer and the values we spread outweigh the – nonetheless serious – considerations about the ethics of working with certain countries. Transnational education is not solely about the export of education in itself. It is a means for universities to work with developing nations in order to open up opportunities for education that would not otherwise exist and to do so with a population that would be otherwise unable to afford them (i.e. travelling overseas to study). This is therefore to the significant benefit of the country where the transnational offerings are available.

3.4.2 Though there clearly are serious considerations in working in a country such as Uganda, we must also recognise that there are positive developments and indicators of long-term change for the better. Whilst Uganda has had the same President since 1986, democratic elections and multi-party politics were restored in 2005 following a referendum. As mentioned above, the Government's Vision 2040 is a plan to transform Ugandan society and consolidate the tenets of good governance. It sets out aims to strengthen constitutional democracy; protection of human rights; the rule of law; free and fair political and electoral processes; transparency and accountability.

3.4.3 The Ugandan Government has further taken a number of measures to deal with corruption and to strengthen the policy, legal and regulatory framework to support transparency and accountability. Uganda is a signatory of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) as well as of the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption since 2004. In 2008, it established a specialised anti-corruption court and anti-corruption and anti-money laundering legislation was enacted in 2013.

3.4.4 Whilst Article 21 of the Ugandan Constitution - covering "Equality and freedom from discrimination" - guarantees protection against discriminatory legislation for all citizens, the 2014 Uganda Anti-Homosexuality Act attracted international attention for its hardening stance against the LGBT community. However, though being approved by Parliament and passing into law, the Act was subsequently ruled as invalid by the Constitutional Court of Uganda. We recognise that there are specific concerns that colleagues may have about the potential of working in Uganda – for example with regard to LGBT rights/equality and freedom of speech – in all cases the University will respect the wishes of any member of staff who does not feel able to participate in the project and/or to visit Uganda.

3.4.5 More generally, though concerns remain, progress has been made in the area of human rights with Uganda establishing a Human Rights Commission, setting up a Human Rights Committee in parliament and human rights desks in key institutions. It has also encouraged a vibrant media sector, with nearly 200 private radio stations and dozens of television stations and print outlets.

3.4.6 At a meeting with the Senior Vice-Principal and the Dean for Transnational Education, the British Council Business Development leader in Kampala indicated his organisation's willingness to assist us in what they considered a "valuable and far-sighted venture". Whilst recognising issues around corruption did exist in the country, he stated that in his experience it could be overcome particularly by using Government bodies such as the British Council to ensure attempts to induce inappropriate payments were swiftly overcome. He expressed a keen willingness to act in this regard and to be involved in the initial licencing process and start-up phase of the project.

3.4.7 A risk assessment for the project has been completed and is attached at Appendix A. Should the project be approved, a project board (similar to the board established for the Rwanda project) will be set up to monitor risk on an ongoing basis.

3.5 Proposed legal agreement with TNE Limited

3.5.1 Subject to minor changes still required at that time, the legal agreement for our establishment of a campus in Rwanda in partnership with TNE Limited was approved by the March 2017 meeting of Court. The agreement has been updated with those minor changes and edited also to reflect a Uganda-based operation rather than a Rwanda one. It will shortly be signed by the University to enable our partner to make progress in Uganda for example in making preliminary applications for approval from the appropriate regulatory authorities. However, as set out in clause 2.1.1 of the agreement, the future of the project and the continuance of the agreement is conditional upon approval being given by Court and Senate for the project to proceed in October 2017. The current very advanced draft of the agreement is available for interested readers at the end of the present agenda.

3.6 Proposed programme rollout

3.6.1 The proposed programme rollout for the Ugandan initiative is attached at Appendix B. All relevant Heads of School have engaged with the rollout for the launch undergraduate and postgraduate programmes and the Dean for Transnational Education, along with other senior colleagues, will visit Schools to engage directly with staff on the proposal. We recognise that there is a particular challenge for the Business School in delivering 2 of the 4 initial rollout postgraduate programmes at a time when it is also committed to deliver in Qatar and Korea. We are discussing potential solutions to this issue – for example through revision to the business model, the setting of minimum numbers for programmes to run and/or sharing the teaching with our partners. The Business Plan attached at Appendix C details the costing and capacity considerations that have been made/forecast for the delivery of the proposal.

3.7 Business Plan

3.7.1 As with the Rwandan project, the basic premise for transnational education in Uganda is that the delivery partner (i.e. TNE Ltd) invests the capital initially to lease premises and then to purchase land for the construction of purpose-built facilities. They employ both the academic teaching staff and professional service staff. The partner University (i.e. the University of Aberdeen) is fully responsible for the curriculum and quality assurance aspects of the provision as it is its degrees which are awarded. Overall management of the campus is a joint responsibility between the delivery partner and the University. The University will employ a senior academic to oversee the operation, either based full time in-country, or as a minimum being present in-country on a monthly basis. All associated facilities, such as laboratory equipment, IT, etc. are provided by the partner to a specification agreed with the University. Student fee income is split, reflecting the investment put in by the partner, but meaning that there is no initial financial investment by the University other than staff time and associated travel costs.

3.7.2 The financial model for the proposed relationship with TNE Ltd sees the University receive 10% of the undergraduate fee income and 50% of the postgraduate fee income, the latter higher figure reflecting our delivery, initially at least, of the postgraduate provision. In addition, the University

would receive 10% of income from the Foundation Programme in the first 2 years of operation, reducing to 5% thereafter.

3.7.3 Whilst the business model for the Uganda project is the same as that originally proposed for Rwanda (subject to ongoing discussion about the delivery of postgraduate business provision as mentioned above), the actual forecasts will have changed due to changes in programme rollout and student numbers.

3.7.4 We have used the proposed rollout provided by TNE Limited to model the University's expected net income from the project, i.e. after cost deductions and allowances for contingencies, in exactly the same way as was done for the earlier Rwanda proposal. Full calculations can be provided on request. The following table shows the likely annual surplus/deficit for the Uganda proposal modelled against 3 recruitment scenarios relating to share of target recruitment actually achieved. As for the Rwanda project, we believe a prudent approach is to choose the 75% scenario as that which we plan for. This scenario sees the project move into annual surplus by 2022 after making a cumulative deficit of £1.5m to 2021. This cumulative deficit would be recovered by 2024 with significant annual surpluses, rising from £1.2m to £3.2m thereafter over the planning period to 2032.

Annual Financial Surplus Summary Based on Recruitment Levels

Year	Recruitment Level	Recruitment Level	Recruitment Level
	Neutral	**Optimistic**	**Pessimistic**
	75%	**100%**	**50%**
	Scenario 1	**Scenario 2**	**Scenario 3**
	£000's	**£000's**	**£000's**
2018	-383	-293	-472
2019	-442	-190	-722
2020	-460	-56	-930
2021	-260	323	-955
2022	99	849	-777
2023	559	1,451	-459
2024	929	1,972	-239
2025	1,226	2,393	-61
2026	1,507	2,756	85
2027	1,678	3,001	149
2028	1,952	3,325	291
2029	2,245	3,672	448
2030	2,550	4,048	603
2031	2,887	4,466	779
2032	3,213	4,905	961
Total	**17,300**	**32,622**	**-1,299**

3.7.5 As in the Rwanda proposal, there is scope in the Uganda initiative for the partner in future to deliver some or all of the PGT provision, thus reducing our income from this (as well as our inputs) from 50% of the total fee income to potentially 15%. As with the Rwanda forecasts, this is not included in the present forecasting of the outturn and could significantly impact income to the University if it came to pass.

4. FURTHER INFORMATION

4.1 Though we regret the change of circumstances that rendered the Rwandan project unviable, and we recognise that Rwanda was a perhaps unique location in Africa, we nevertheless feel that Uganda actually offers more chance of success for the project as it is already a proven

international destination for education. Much of the work that was undertaken for the Rwanda project – for example the due diligence on the partners, financial modelling and agreement negotiation, is wholly transferable to the new Ugandan proposal. This paper concentrates on where the proposals differ -essentially the challenges of working in Uganda rather than Rwanda – and sets out how we see these challenges being mitigated.

4.2 Further information is available from Professor Sir Ian Diamond, Principal and Vice-Chancellor (ian.diamond@abdn.ac.uk, ext. 2135), Professor Richard Wells, Dean for Transnational Education (r.wells@abdn.ac.uk ext. 2920) and Dr Stephen Hill, Transnational Manager (s.hill@abdn.ac.uk, ext. 2075).

[14/9/17[v1] [Closed]

Annex D

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATE
(18 October 2017)

POLICY ON RECORDING EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

Members of the Committee are asked to consider the attached Policy on Recording Educational Activities.

This paper is provided for discussion and approval.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Committee is invited to approve the proposed policy.

3. DISCUSSION

The Committee is invited to consider the draft policy, as attached. This draft document has been prepared on the basis of practice in operation at other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and, as such, members of the Committee are invited to consider it with regards practice specific to the University. As a consequence of the HR implications of the proposed policy, members of the Committee are informed that an agreed draft will need to be considered by the University Management Group (UMG).

4. FURTHER INFORMATION

Further information is available from Professor P McGeorge (mcgeorge@abdn.ac.uk or extension 2228) or Rachael Bernard (r.bernard@abdn.ac.uk or extension 3388).

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

POLICY ON RECORDING EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

BACKGROUND

1. This document sets out the University's policy on the recording of educational activities. Educational activities may include lectures, laboratory demonstrations, presentations or other academic teaching and student assessments.

2. The use of mobile devices, multimedia management capabilities, lecture capture technology, social media and online learning platforms are transforming the potential use of audio and video recordings for educational purposes.

3. Recording of educational activities is becoming an expectation for many students and is becoming widespread across national and international higher education.

4. There are considerable educational benefits to recording for educational purposes, including:

    - Flexible learning – anytime and anywhere access to learning materials, at the student's own pace;
    - Multi-modal learning – providing learning materials in multiple formats to suit individual learning preferences;
    - Deep learning – ability to evaluate and contextualise learning materials over time
    - Innovations in pedagogy - for example the use of recorded material for viewing in advance of lectures to create space for more interaction within lectures;
    - Accessibility – particularly useful for students with special educational needs or whose first language is not English;
    - Practicality – ability to pause, repeat and/or revisit complex learning materials to increase understanding.

5. Recordings are an important part of the University's strategy to enhance the quality of the student experience and the University anticipates it becoming as normal as providing handouts or slides. The technology has multiple possible uses, such as short recordings for students to watch before seminars, recordings to help students on option choices and capturing events and lectures.

6. The University has conducted a successful pilot of lecture capture and recordings of students for assessment.

7. The University recognises and acknowledges that:

    - Not all teaching styles are suitable for capture, e.g. where there is use of whiteboards, chalk boards etc. or if there is a high degree of student participation;
    - Recording is not intended to replace student contact time and is provided to enrich the student experience;
    - A requirement for staff to change their preferred teaching style for the purpose of recording may be detrimental to the student experience and is not encouraged.

RECORDING AND OPT-OUT

8. Where University supported recording facilities are available, automated recording technology will (subject to paragraph 9 below) automatically record all lectures (including anything displayed on the projector) and make these recordings available to all students registered on the course concerned.

9. If a lecturer feels his/her course may not be suitable for recording he/she is encouraged to engage in discussion with the Head of School or his/her nominee to establish whether any of the opt out reasons as set out below pertain. If it is established that his/her course is not suitable for recording the course will not be scheduled for recording. If the University has an overriding legal obligation to provide a recording (e.g. a student with a disability needs to make a recording as part of the 'reasonable adjustment' process), opt out will not be permitted.

10. Opt out of a course will be appropriate if a large proportion of the unit's lectures:

    - Contains confidential or personal information;
    - Is commercially or politically sensitive;
    - Includes such a degree of interaction with students that recording is not viable; or
    - Is delivered in a way that makes recording unsuitable, e.g. extensive use of whiteboard or chalk board.

11. There may be other valid reasons why opt out may be appropriate. These should be discussed with the Head of School or his/her nominee.

12. If part or the whole of an individual lecture is not suitable for recording as indicated above, a lecturer may manually stop a recording at the start or at any other point of his/her lecture or edit out the relevant sections before the lecture is made available to students (see Section 13 below). However, until further notice, lecturers may opt out for any good reason (except where the University has an overriding legal obligation to provide a recording) provided that they notify their Head of School of their reasons for opting out. Reasons given by lecturers for opt out will be monitored and the University will review the proposed opt out policy in the light of the experience gained.

13. Except for the purposes of student assessment, any student not wishing to be recorded should notify the lecturer at the start of the lecture.

14. Video recording will only be available to staff on request and is subject to availability.

RECORDING NOTICE

15. Staff and students will be informed in advance if the University intends to record educational activities. Reminders will appear in the form of notices in the rooms in which recording will take place. There will be a final reminder in the form of a red light on the lectern indicating the recording has commenced.

EDITING

16. Lecturers will have the opportunity to review, edit and approve a recording for a period of two working days before the recording is made available to students via MyAberdeen. Separate arrangements will be made for part time staff. If the lecturer does not review edit and approve the recording within that time period the relevant recording will automatically be made available to the students, unedited. However, where there is good reason, the lecturer may recall a recording once published and edit it at a later date.

SAFE KEEPING

17. All recordings will be password protected and accessible via MyAberdeen. The recordings will only be accessible by students registered on the relevant course or University staff who have authorised access, such as programme coordinators and system administrators.

18. Recordings will normally be made available to students for the duration of their programme

of study.

19. Unless the lecturer agrees or requests otherwise (e.g. for the purposes of peer review) the recordings will only be used by the University for educational purposes and not for any performance management purposes.

20. Subject to paragraph 14, unless a staff member obtains the University's prior written agreement or the University obtains the staff member's written agreement, recordings may not be made publicly available by any means, including by virtue of external publication, whether on the web or otherwise.

REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS

21. As with other services reasonable adjustments will be made for disabled students including but not limited to the provision of subtitling.

TAKE DOWN

22. If a member of staff becomes aware that any defamatory, inaccurate or infringing material is included within a recording or any other reason why it would be expedient for the University to recall a recording, it must be withdrawn.

CONSENT AND DATA PROTECTION

23. Subject to the right to opt out set out in paragraphs 9 and 10, staff and students are deemed to consent to (i) the University recording and making the recordings available in accordance with this Policy and the staff and students grant the University an irrevocable licence to use their rights in any performance for the purposes set out in this Policy; and (ii) the processing of personal data in accordance with the University's Data Protection Policy.

24. Recordings of 'sensitive personal data' require the express consent of the staff or students being recorded. Sensitive personal data means data that is identifiable and contains any of the following information: racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or other similar beliefs, trade union membership, physical or mental health, sexual life or the alleged commission of a criminal offence.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

25. In accordance with the University contract of employment the University will own all rights in any recordings (including rights in the sounds made). This does not include performance rights which the staff and students will continue to own but in respect of which they have granted a license to the University under paragraph 20 above.

26. The University will endeavor to acknowledge the lecturer as the author and performer of the recording. To the fullest extent permitted by law all other rights of the lecturer in the recordings are waived.

27. Staff must comply at all times with copyright legislation relating to their lectures and educational activities. Staff are encouraged to make use of creative commons content in their lectures wherever practicable.

VISITORS

28. Express (opt-in) consent is required for the recording of external visitors speaking at events and a consent form must be completed. This includes the recording of sensitive data when notice of recording is not sufficient; express consent to be recorded is required from all

those involved in recordings.

STUDENT ASSESSMENT

29. The University may make recordings of students for the purposes of assessment. Paragraphs 13 to 15 inclusive of this Policy will not apply to any such recordings.

STUDENT RECORDING OF LECTURES

30. The University may allow students to record lectures, lab demonstrations, presentations or other academic teaching.

31. The School will inform students if they do not have permission to record lectures, presentations or lab demonstrations.

32. Unless students need to do so for any disability related reasons students **may not record**:

    a. any seminars or tutorials; or
    b. any events where members of the public are present or in which fellow students actively participate

    without obtaining the prior consent of the lecturer at the beginning of each such seminar, tutorial or event. This is because recording the seminar or tutorial may well also capture identifiable students and/or members of the public and they would each need to give their consent to their being recorded.

33. Any recording made by a student must only be used as a personal aid for study purposes. Students may not share, publish or otherwise make the recording available in whole or in part to any other person. Students must delete the recording as soon as they cease to be a student of the University.

34. Recording devices must be kept with the student at all times and may not be placed on the lectern/lab table unless required for any disability related reasons.

35. If the University supplies or makes recordings of lectures or other academic teaching available to students:

    a. the University will own the copyright and all other intellectual property rights in the recordings; and
    b. the recordings must only be used by the student as a personal aid for study purposes. The student may not share, publish or otherwise make the recording available in whole or in part to any other person.

36. Students must delete the recording as soon as they cease to be a student of the University.

FURTHER INFORMATION

- For any queries relating to Data Protection please contact the Data Protection Officer (dpa@abdn.ac.uk).
- For any queries relating to Learning and Teaching please contact Academic Services (academicservices@abdn.ac.uk).

KEY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

LEGAL

- An overview of the legal position in relation to the recording of educational activities can be found in the JISCLegal Guidance Document.
- More information about copyright at the University can be found on the University's Library webpages.

SUPPORTING STUDENTS

- More information about the University's policies on Supporting Students can be found in the University's Academic Quality Handbook.

SBC17-18:04

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATE BUSINESS COMMITTEE
(27 September 2017)

TOPICS OF MAJOR STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE

Background

1. Recommendation 2 of the 2006 Senate Effectiveness Review Working Group relates to topics of major strategic importance, as under:

   "That, in order to engage Senate in open debate and to inform future policy development by sub-committees for subsequent approval by the Senate, at least one topic should be identified (possibly at the start of each academic year) for discussion of a major strategic issue at each Senate meeting. This would not preclude such topics being included on the agenda ad hoc in response to, in particular, national consultations and major issues that emerged during the course of an academic year that the University should address. [Topics would be suggested by the Senate Business Committee, which would also decide, as deemed appropriate, whether an external speaker (e.g. from the Scottish Funding Council, the Scottish Executive, Universities Scotland, the Higher Education Academy) should be invited to address the Senate on a topic of current interest or debate within the HE Sector]."

2. Recommendations 12 and 13 of the 2015 Senate Effectiveness Review further proposed:

   "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."

   And

   "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)."

3. The following topics have already been identified as being of importance for 2017/18:

Senate Meeting	Main items for discussion
October	Capping of Resit Results Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) update
December	Learning analytics Student Experience report ELIR update
February	Student engagement project pilot outcomes ELIR Update
April	ELIR Update
May	Draft ELIR report

Action Required

4. The Committee is asked to discuss further possible topics for inclusion on the five Senate meetings for 2017/18.

Further Information

5. Further information is available from Dr Rachael Bernard, Acting Academic Registrar, on ext. 3388 or r.bernard@abdn.ac.uk

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

Senate Business Committee
(27 September 2017)

HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

1. PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

This is a paper consider membership of the Honorary Degrees Committee

This paper is provided for discussion and approval

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Senate Business Committee is asked determine the elected Senators to be members of the Honorary Degrees Committee.

3. DISCUSSION

One of the outcomes of the Senate Effectiveness Review was a revision to the composition of the Honorary Degrees Committee. The Senate agreed that:

> *'…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'.*

As a result of this change there are currently eight vacancies for Senators on the Committee. Elected members of Senate who were interested in taking up a role on the Honorary Degrees Committee were asked to respond indicating this.

It is proposed that the four elected Senate members who are already members of the Committee continue for a further two years in order to provide some continuity within the Committee. The Senate Business Committee is, therefore, asked to appoint nine members of the Honorary Degrees Committee (HDC) from the list of elected senators (below) who indicated an interest, to serve as members of the HDC for four years. The remit and composition of the HDC is provided as Annex A.

Dr Gareth Jones	Reader, Applied Health Sciences
Dr John Lamb	Lecturer, Management Studies
Oleksander Menshykov	Senior Lecturer, Engineering
Professor Paul Nimmo	Theology
Dr Rachel Shanks	Senior Lecturer, Education
Dr Allan Sim	Senior Lecturer, Management Studies
Mrs Mary Stephen	Senior Lecturer, Education
Mr Scott Styles	Senior Lecturer, Law
Dr Neil Vargesson	Senior Lecturer, Medical Sciences
Professor Heather Wallace	Applied Medicine
Professor Phil Ziegler	Divinity

4. FURTHER INFORMATION

Further information is available from Professor Michael Greaves (m.greaves@abdn.ac.uk or 2017) or Dr Rachael Bernard (r.bernard@abdn.ac.uk or 3388)

[14 September 2017] [1 [Open]

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

(Committee of Senate)
(July 2014)

1. COMMITTEE TITLE

HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

2. DATE OF ESTABLISHMENT

1963

3. CONVENER AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AREA

Convener: Principal & Vice-Chancellor
Clerk: Academic Affairs (Registry)

4. PURPOSE

The Honorary Degrees Committee's primary purpose is to consider nominations for honorary degrees and make recommendations to the Senate.

5. REMIT: *(To be reviewed annually at first meeting of committee cycle)*

The Honorary Degrees Committee's primary role is to consider nominations for honorary degrees and make recommendations to the Senate. Ultimate approval of decisions on whether to offer honorary degrees to a particular candidate rests with the Senate.

The Honorary Degrees Committee also, from time to time, reviews the University's practices and procedures in regard to honorary degrees and makes recommendations to the Senate, as appropriate.

6. COMPOSITION AND QUORUM:

Convener: Principal

Membership: Senior Vice-Principal
~~Heads of College~~
Vice Principal (Teaching & Learning)
Vice-Principal (Research & Knowledge Exchange)
Vice-Principal (People)
University Secretary
12 Members of the Senate, on a gender balanced basis, appointed by the Senate Business Committee for a four year term of office
President of the Students' Association

Quorum: 50%

ACCOUNT TO BE TAKEN OF EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IN MEMBERSHIP

7. MEMBERSHIP

Principal
Professor ~~J Kilburn~~M Greaves
Professor ~~P Hannaford~~P McGeorge
~~Professor B MacGregor~~Professor Marion Campbell

Professor M Ross
Mrs C Inglis
~~Mr C Anuchka~~Mr L Ogubie
Professor J Masthoff (appointed in 2014/15)
Professor I Guz (appointed in 2012/13)
Professor P Mealor (appointed in 2008/09)
~~Professor M Campbell (appointed in 2014/15)~~
Other members to be appointed

Clerk: Dr ~~G Mackintosh~~R Bernard (Registry)

8. REPORTING LINE/PARENT COMMITTEE AND INTERFACE WITH OTHER COMMITTEES

Formal reporting line:	Senate
Interface with other committees:	N/A

9. FREQUENCY AND TIMING OF MEETINGS

Two meetings per year in advance of meetings of the Senate.
Meetings between 10am – 4pm in accordance with University Policy.

10. PUBLICATION OF PAPERS

Cognisance will be taken of the University's Publication Scheme

Papers are confidential and are not made available.

11. DATE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE APPROVED/RECORDED BY UMG: tbc .....

SBC17-18:06

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

Senate Business Committee
(27 September 2017)

WORKING GROUP ON POST-COLLEGE STRUCTURES

1. PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

This is a paper about changes being made to structures following the removal of colleges from the University.

This paper is provided for **information**

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Senate Business Committee is invited to note this paper.

3. DISCUSSION

Following the decision of Senate to form a working group to look at structures following the removal of colleges from the University's structure, a small group was convened by Professor Kilburn (for full membership see below).

The group met and agreed some general principles to be applied when structures following colleges are being considered:

- All staffing policies to be considered on the basis that Head of College will be replaced by a Vice Principal. All staffing policies to be considered by PNCC as formal route for routine approval.

- The necessary expertise on a committee is best determined by the committee itself. However as a general rule, all Institutional committees with the current membership expressed as 'one member from each college' to become 'one (or two) members from arts and social sciences and one (or two) members from science, engineering and medicine'. All revised committee memberships will follow the usual formal routes for routine approval.

- All routes of appeal previously made to a Head of College, will be made to the appropriate vice-principal.

- School governance structures to be determined by schools, but with an identified point of contact identified for teaching & learning, research etc

In addition the group considered some specific issues, which are summarised in Annex 1 below. Annex 1 is not intended to be an exhaustive list, but indicates that generally matters are in hand within the appropriate areas. Clearly, the group recognises that some discussions are still ongoing particularly around issues relating to activities which were previously funded through college budgets. It is, however, recognised that, broadly, appropriate structures are in place and that any outstanding issues are best concluded by discussions within committees, schools and professional services as appropriate.

4. FURTHER INFORMATION

Further information is available from **[**to include both the author and the person attending the meeting to present or respond to questions on the paper**]**.

Annex 1

Activity	**Response**
Induction for new students	Taught students: UG & PG Deans Research students: Graduate School
Research ethics induction & training	R&I will take on the functions related to ethics that recently sat with PPG: development of policy, processes and structures, oversight of reviewing activity and school health checks, and oversight of training. Training will remain based in CAD but will be included as a requirement for PGRs as part of the global induction Schools will take on what was recently delivered largely at College level: ensuring awareness and compliance with institutional processes and policy. (see also response below)
Understanding of ethics different between schools	Schools that run their own ethics committees, such as Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition (CERB, RINH and others), Psychology, will continue to do so. The Research Policy Committee agreed that the CASS and CoPS Ethics Committees should continue to operate with their current remits and memberships (given they broadly represent groups of schools with some common interests), until we have completed the process of building a common process and web interface that is capable of processing and directing ethics applications for all research areas. It is anticipated that all policy questions around research governance will be then be handled through the Research Policy Committee. All Schools will be required to nominate ethics reviewers and enable and support ethics training for staff and PGR students (and PGTs where appropriate). A standard health ethics health check for schools was approved and is being rolled out with a 2 year schedule of dates for school. There is a common question set and process which should help to address the differing understanding of ethics among schools.
College oversight of courses & programmes	UG and PG Deans
Promotions	New promotions procedures – now a less bureaucratic process. Heads of College replaced by Vice-Principals in the process; Promotion Sub-committee to be VP People or SVP
Final probation meetings	Vice-Principal?
Business continuity plans	School plans being updated to take account of College plans in line with guidance issued by Planning. Until school plans are ready, the College plans should be used.
College Teaching and Learning awards	VP L&T with UG and PG Deans.

Employer engagement – specific issue for CASS	Careers Service considering a mechanism for monitoring
College provided advice and support for externally funded research	Advice and general support for grants is provided via R&I and the school level Business development Officers. However, when institutional /financial or in kind support is required for externally funded projects, this now needs to be a school matter (as budget holders) or a strategic investment matter, but agree a process of how to consider is required. In the past this was a role of college to broker or secure institutional commitment for major bids or interdisciplinary bids. At the moment R&I would be flagging to Schools to approve as part of the cover sheet sign off Colleges also often delivered an initial evaluation and filter for funding calls that required institutional approval or where only a limited number of applications can be submitted. Much of that is now delivered through R&I, and co-ordinated by one of the BDOs or through the Graduate School, and supported by the Deans of Research.
Sign off of research cover sheets	Processes for amending sign off of cover sheets have been considered and will be part of the revised Res Gov Framework, and will remove the college layer. The higher levels are still going to SVP and Finance Director for approvals. A new electronic approval system has been trialled in the School of Medicine, Medical Science and Nutrition with the aim to roll out across all school.
REF support	REF support has already moved away from a college basis to the relevant REF panels and Units of Assessment, with Deans of Research responsible for the individual panels. Likewise each of the Deans have oversight for the cross panel activity (ie Impact, Environment and Outputs). Each of the schools have nominated their REF leads, including contacts for impact. This process has been operating for 17/18, with the panel meetings taking place.
Approvals & escalations for the finance system	
PG Student representation at Senate	To be determined by AUSA
TRAC meetings	Checking with Convener (Phil) to see what his views are on the representation of the schools within the group
Appointment of undergraduate Students' Progress Committee conveners	Deans – UG + Quality
PGT Scholarships	PG Deans
Honorary Degrees Committee	Vice Principals for Research, Teaching & Leaning and People

SBC17-18:07

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

Senate Business Committee
(27 September 2017)

ANNUAL REPORT ON INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW OF QUALITY, 2016/2017

1. PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

Members of the Senate Business Committee (SBC) are asked to approve the attached Annual Report on Institution-Led Review of Quality, 2016/2017.

This paper is provided for approval.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

The report is due to be submitted to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) by 30 September 2017; the SFC permit the signed Annual Statement of Assurance to follow later if necessary, due to the timing of governing body meetings. The SBC is invited to approve the annual report.

3. DISCUSSION

An 'Annual Report on Institution-Led Review of Quality' is required by the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) as a condition of grant to ensure (i) that provision is of an acceptable quality and (ii) that all institutions have an appropriate strategy for quality enhancement. SFC guidance states that the Report should include the following:

- A list of subject areas that were the subject of internal reviews during the academic year.
- A list of subject areas that were the subject of review by other bodies (eg professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRBs)) during the academic year.
- The ways in which support services were included in the review process.
- The role and nature of student involvement in the review process.
- The outcomes of subject review, indicating whether provision was approved and, if not, what actions are being taken to address issues raised.
- The key messages deriving from and action taken as a result of monitoring and analysis of performance indicators and other collected data.
- Any significant issues relating either to development needs or to the identification of good practice the institution has identified as a result of the review process.
- A forward plan or calendar of future reviews for the following academic year.

The University's governing body must provide the SFC with a signed 'Annual Statement of Assurance' (Appendix I). This is a statement that confirms that the University's governing body has considered and is satisfied with the arrangements the University has in place to maintain standards and assure and enhance the quality of its provision.

The 'Annual Report on Institution-Led Review of Quality' must show that the University's provision is of an acceptable quality and that it has in place an appropriate strategy for quality enhancement.

4. FURTHER INFORMATION

Further information is available from Professor P McGeorge (mcgeorge@abdn.ac.uk or extension 2228) or Emma Hay, Academic Services, Registry (e.hay@abdn.ac.uk or extension 3610).

13 September 2017 [Version 1] [Open]

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

ANNUAL REPORT ON INSTITUTION-LED REVIEW OF QUALITY
ACADEMIC YEAR 2016/2017

1 SUBJECT REVIEW AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

1.1 INTERNAL TEACHING REVIEW

The University of Aberdeen's process for periodic subject review is termed 'Internal Teaching Review' (ITR). A fundamental feature of the University's quality assurance procedures since 1994, the process has continually evolved to reflect ongoing changes in the external and internal drivers for quality assurance and enhancement. Schools are subject to ITR every sixth year, with the review covering the previous five years. Under the existing ITR process, documentation submitted by Schools includes a Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and an action plan identifying points for improvement. The Final Report resulting from an ITR is a constructive commentary that identifies specific commendations and recommendations. Schools are required to provide a formal Response to the Final Report, considered by the University's Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). Schools are also required to provide a One-Year Follow-up Report indicating the progress made. All Final Reports and Responses are published on the University's web pages.

As part of the University's ongoing wider review of its quality mechanisms, the existing ITR process and associated documentation have been carefully considered and, following extensive consultation, amended for introduction as a pilot exercise in 2017/2018. The process to be piloted follows the introduction of a revised Annual Course Review (ACR) process (introduced in 2012/2013) and an Annual Programme Review (APR) process (introduced in 2014/2015). Designed to allow Schools to draw upon the ACRs and APRs they have completed and the External Examiner feedback received, during the period of review, it is hoped the process will provide for a greater enhancement focus and to reduce the bureaucratic burden of ITR on Schools.

The revised process will ask Schools to submit (i) a Critical Analysis (CA), allowing Schools particular contexts to be set out clearly, and have a clear focus on (i) enhancement and (ii) reflection on effectiveness throughout and (ii) a Curriculum Map detailing how programmes address Subject Benchmark Statements and have changed in line with revised statements. The final report resulting from ITR will consist of two parts; Part A will be a QAC report identifying the QA findings, highlighting good practice, commending initiatives worthy of sharing across the institution or which might be considered institution or sector leading, and highlighting areas for development. Part B will consist of a jointly-devised action plan. Schools will be asked to provide an update on the progress of this plan by way of one year follow up report. The report and action plan will be considered by the QAC and posted to ITR webpages.

1.2 STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNAL TEACHING REVIEW

Students are a central part of the University's ITR process and to the wider quality processes within the University. The University requires Schools to encourage their students to be involved in the preparation of their SED, and to make the Final Reports and School Responses available to their students. ITR panels meet with all levels of undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students studying within the School that is under review, as well as with students who undertake the role of Class Representative or School Convener.

The University has a longstanding partnership with the Aberdeen University Students' Association (AUSA), and all ITR panels include a student member of Senate, who is a senior representative from AUSA with responsibility for academic affairs. This student panel member receives training alongside staff panel members and plays a full role on the panel, usually taking the lead when the panel meets with students.

Student members also form part of any Panel considering validation or accreditation as part of our collaborative activities with other institutions.

Under the pilot ITR process for introduction, students will continue to play an integral role in all aspects of the review process, with an even greater emphasis on helping students prepare for their participation in the review.

1.3 INTERNAL REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

ITR includes the review of professional services as a fundamental part of the process. Panels meet support staff from within the School under review and topics addressed by the reviewing panel, cover services provided by the central Professional Services departments such as the Centre for Academic Development (CAD), Student Advice and Support, the Registry, Library, Estates, and IT Services.

Specifically, the SED asks Schools to consider the ways in which they have interacted with the various professional service departments and to comment on whether there is anything further these support agencies could do to assist Schools in promoting high quality learning and continuous quality enhancement. Comments on professional services in ITR reports are considered by the QAC and responses and action plans sought from the relevant areas of Professional Services, as appropriate.

Under the pilot process, the review of professional services will remain an integral part of the process and panels will continue to meet with support staff from the School. Any comments on professional services will be considered by the QAC and responses and action plans sought from the relevant Professional Services department as appropriate.

2 INTERNAL TEACHING REVIEWS, 2016/2017

2.1 REVIEWS UNDERTAKEN IN 2016/2017

During academic year 2016/2017, Internal Teaching Reviews (ITRs) were conducted in the School of Psychology (October 2016) and in the Business School (November 2016).

2.2 SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY, OCTOBER 2016

The ITR panel considered Psychology to be a successful, well-organised and thriving School. The panel commended the quality of teaching and learning in the School, expressing confidence in the rigorous maintenance of academic standards, and the work of the School in ensuring students are well placed to pursue other scientific or professional interests as a result of the transferable skills and knowledge afforded to them during their studies.

The panel observed the commitment of the School in ensuring the continual enhancement of teaching and learning provision, noting the implementation of innovative teaching methods and responsive nature of the School to the needs of the student body. The panel commended the strong relationship between the School and its students and the importance placed on their input and feedback.

The panel also commended the School's use of a range of teaching methods including (i) traditional methods, such as lectures, and (ii) innovative methods, such as a 'flipped classroom' where students watch a recorded lecture before taking part in a workshop-type class, and the subsequent exposure of students to a multifaceted teaching model. The panel noted the positive responses of students to this approach, encompassing a range of student needs and preferred teaching styles. The panel also acknowledged the use of small group teaching across undergraduate and some elements of postgraduate provision. The panel noted mixed feedback from the student body with regards to the success of these and recommended the School take forward their own identified action, to clearly express the function of these groups to students.

The panel commended the introduction of innovative teaching and assessment formats as a means of encouraging group work but also as an effective means of teaching and assessing very large level 1 classes.

The panel commended the open and receptive attitude of the School to amending and aligning course outcomes, teaching methods and assessment. They recommend the continued review of courses in this way.

The panel noted further examples of good practice including the Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) scheme operated across levels 1-3 of the undergraduate degree programme and the Psychology Internship Programme providing enhanced work-based learning opportunities.

2.3 BUSINESS SCHOOL, NOVEMBER 2016

The ITR Panel recognised the Business School as being committed to delivering a high standard of teaching and learning and maintenance of academic standards. The Panel acknowledged that the School was facing challenging circumstances, although staff were keen and proactive to resolve issues in an efficient manner, and placed the student's interest at the forefront of all decisions and processes implemented.

The Panel commended efforts made by School staff, academic and administrative, amongst whom there was evidence of a keen sense of collegiality and support. The Panel welcomed the positive response towards the School from undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students.

The Panel commended innovative teaching practices within the School, for example, the development of online teaching, use of the Thomson Reuters Eikon flagship trading floor and the use of video clips in MS 3055 New Product and Service Development and MS3050 New Venture Creation which provided flexibility for students. The Panel felt that the alternative ways of teaching combined the use of advanced pedagogy and technology.

The Panel recommended that the School undertake a review of the feedback given to students, both hand written and provided on MyAberdeen, to ensure consistency across the School. The Panel commended the School for encouraging other forms of feedback other than Student Course Evaluation Forms (SCEFs). The Panel recommended that mid-term feedback questionnaires be used more widely across the School to ensure consistency.

The Panel commended the School's engagement with employability skills across all programmes and the strong working relationship with the University Careers Service.

The Panel noted School membership of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for Scotland's Enhancement Themes Steering Committee for the First Year Experience and Student Transitions Enhancement Themes but recommended the School more actively ensures that good practice shared at such events or organisations be brought back and integrated to the School's teaching and learning practices.

The Panel noted several areas of good practice within the School, however, the Panel noted that these areas of good practice tended to be discipline-specific and there seemed to be limited cross-fertilisation of ideas across the School as a whole. The Panel therefore recommended that the disciplines could work more closely together and share best practice.

2.4 OUTCOMES OF INTERNAL TEACHING REVIEWS

The panels of both ITRs conducted during 2016/2017 were satisfied with the academic standards and the overall quality of learning opportunities provided, and that appropriate systems of course and programme review were in place. There were no significant issues identified in relation to (i) development needs or (ii) the identification of good practice at the institution.

All undergraduate and postgraduate degrees offered by the School of Psychology and the Business School were recommended to the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) for revalidation.

Recommendations made by the ITR panels in their Final Reports focus on the enhancement of aspects of provision, and highlight specific areas for commendation or recommendation. Schools are asked to consider these and provide a formal Response, stating relevant actions to be taken or fully considered reasons should the panel's recommendations be thought to be inappropriate. The Final Reports and School Responses are considered by the University's QAC, and particular areas of good practice or of concern are reported to the University Committee on Teaching & Learning. During academic year 2016/2017, the QAC reviewed the reports and responses thereto, of the Schools of Divinity, History and Philosophy and Psychology and the Business School together with the one-year follow up reports of the School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition. The one-year follow-up reports from the School of Psychology and the Business School, reviewed in 2016-2017, will be considered by the QAC in 2017-2018.

The process of the consideration of reports by the QAC and the reporting of particular areas of good practice or concern to the UCTL will continue under the new pilot process.

2.5 FORWARD PLAN OF INTERNAL TEACHING REVIEWS, 2017–2018

During academic year 2017–2018, an ITR piloting the revised review process, (section 1.1 above refers) will be conducted in the School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture. The review will take place in March 2018.

Details of forthcoming ITRs can be found in Appendix III.

3 REVIEWS BY PROFESSIONAL, STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BODIES, 2016/2017

During 2016/2017, reviews by professional and statutory bodies were conducted across the University's Schools as follows:

3.1 BUSINESS SCHOOL

(i) The Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) confirmed their continued satisfaction and the agreed extension of accreditation of all undergraduate and postgraduate degrees in Real Estate and Rural Surveying in 2016. The next review by the RICS will take place in Spring 2018.

(ii) The Designated Degree of Master of Arts in Accountancy, Degree of Master of Arts in Accountancy and Degree of Master of Arts in Accountancy-Finance were awarded continuing accreditation by the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA) during 2016. Such reviews are undertaken on an annual basis and will therefore be expected again in 2017.

(iii) The Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA) approved the Designated Degree of Master of Arts in Accountancy, Degree of Master of Arts in Accountancy and all joint variants thereof, for continuing accreditation in 2016. As with the ACCA, reviews are undertaken by the CIMA on an annual basis and will therefore be expected again in 2017.

3.2 SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

The General Teaching Council Scotland (GTCS) accredited the Postgraduate Certificate in Into Headship in 2016.

3.3 SCHOOL OF LAW

The Chartered Institute of Arbitrators (CIArb) accredited the LLM in Dispute Resolution in 2016. The accreditation is valid until July 2019.

3.4 SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, MEDICAL SCIENCES AND NUTRITION

(i) As reported in the 2015/16 return, the division of Dentistry has been visited by the General Dental Council (GDC), each year since the inception of the new Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS)

programme, as is the normal practice for a new programme. The last visit from the GDC to Aberdeen was in May 2016. In October 2016, the division received confirmation that the inspectors recommended that the Aberdeen BDS is sufficient for registration with the GDC as a dentist.

(ii) The MSc in Medical Physics was, in September 2016, accredited by the Institute of Physics and Engineering in Medicine (IPEM). Initially receiving accreditation for one academic year, this was extended for a further two academic years following the implementation of changes required by the accrediting panel.

(iii) The Association for Nutrition (AfN) last reviewed the MSc in Human Nutrition in September 2016. Further review will take place in September 2017.

Details of the reviews undertaken by Professional, Regulatory and Statutory Bodies in 2016/2017 can be found in Appendix II.

4 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

All Schools are required to provide an account of registrations (including admissions, progression and retention), degrees awarded, course pass rates, and first destinations of leavers during ITR, with course registrations and pass rates considered annually as part of ACR and APR processes. The University Committee on Teaching and Learning (UCTL) and Senate consider reports that monitor registration and retention.

The University pays close attention to non-continuation data particularly amongst our full-time undergraduate population. On an annual basis, non-continuation data is analysed in detail and considered by Senior Management and Schools, with regard to level of study, student domicile, incoming qualifications, and entry route (summer school, access, clearing).

The University continues to collect and make extensive use of data from students. These data include survey and focus group data obtained for specific purposes. The University routinely collects data from a variety of sources including the National Student Survey (NSS), the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) and the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES). Data at individual course level is obtained through ongoing quality enhancement and assurance processes, including the University wide Student Course Evaluation Form (SCEF) and Staff-student Liaison Committees.

The University's School Planning process led by the senior Vice-Principal also reviews a range of metrics with associated action planning on a quarterly basis with the Senior Management Team (SMT). This includes all relevant QA metrics together with benchmarking data such as degree classification, retention, admission and recruitment. Inclusion of this data and analysis within the ITR process, together with the metrics analysed within the ACR/APR process, meets SFC expectations regarding assuring the quality and standard of our teaching provision without Schools having to provide additional information.

Following review of the outcome of two years of pilots by the Higher Education Academy we also adopted the United Kingdom Engagement Survey (UKES) with level one and level three undergraduates in 2016. To make the best use of these data to enhance the student experience responsibility for the collection and analysis of the NSS, PTES, UKES, and PRES is centralised in the University's Centre for Academic Development (CAD). The centralisation of such collection and analysis has enabled a consistent approach to the analysis and dissemination of performance indicators, associated staff development activities, and the facilitation of support for evaluation of the student experience and pedagogical research. Targets for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) derived from these surveys are now integrated into the school planning cycle and Heads of School are asked to submit action plans on the basis of the data drawn from these surveys.

Data obtained during 2016/2017 demonstrates greater use of the new grading scale and that the University awarded more First and Upper Second Degrees than ever (85%). The University has the highest number of graduates either employed or in further study (98%), with our highest number ever going into further study (35.6%), though we need to work hard to overcome challenges around

graduate level employment (40.6%). University of Aberdeen graduates do very well against the sector in terms of median salaries. Our non-continuation rate is the best we have achieved (4.7%). We are seeing our highest number apply for and achieve HEA fellowship (82 in 2016). Our NSS scores are also continuing to improve.

5 ONGOING DEVELOPMENT

- Enhancements to the University's online course selection system, MyCurriculum, and the registration process as a whole.
- Discussions have been initiated across the University's Committee structure, including the Undergraduate Committee, Postgraduate Taught Committee, Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and University Committee on Teaching and Learning, with regards to the way the University reassesses students who have failed courses. It is hoped discussions will consider alternative forms of resit assessment.
- The University is actively investing in ways of identifying students with known characteristics that might place them at greater risk of non-continuation. A pilot using Unique Insights (an external analytics company) during the first half session of 2016/17 has revealed that our data is not yet robust enough to interrogate more fully, and thus we have agreed to be included in a JISC retention/engagement consultancy pilot with a view to developing our proactive approaches in this area.
- We are investing heavily in developing our portfolio of online programmes across a range of disciplines notably Business, Health, Education and Engineering. These programmes are a mix of fully online provision and more blended approaches and cover postgraduate taught degree programmes and short courses. This is a key component of our recently developed Digital Strategy, and it is hoped will address the needs of many students by offering a more flexible way to study. We are also developing more appropriate support systems to register, induct and support online learners.
- The University is in 2017/18, piloting a Policy on Academic Flexibility, designed for any student seeking to apply for flexibility in their studies as a consequence of their involvement in High Performance Sports.
- The consideration of a proposed policy, setting out guidelines for the recording of Education Activities.
- Actively developing a Learning Analytics policy that will facilitate the early identification of students in need of additional support and opportunities for enhancement of learning.
- The introduction of a Lecture Attendance Monitoring pilot, to aid early identification of students with limited engagement.

Professor Peter McGeorge
Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching)
University of Aberdeen

Further information is available from Miss Emma Hay, Academic Services, Registry, University of Aberdeen, Regent Building (F18), Regent Walk, Old Aberdeen, Aberdeen, AB24 3FX e: e.hay@abdn.ac.uk t: 01224 273610

APPENDIX I

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

UNIVERSITY COURT
(04 October 2017)

ANNUAL STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE, 2016–2017,
TO THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL

On behalf of the governing body of the University of Aberdeen, I confirm that we have considered the institution's arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for academic year 2016/2017, including the scope and impact of these. I further confirm that we are satisfied that the institution has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision. We can therefore provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at this institution continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

Signed for and on behalf of the University Court of the University of Aberdeen,
at: Aberdeen
on: the 4th day of October 2017

by: .....

[name and designation of the signatory]

APPENDIX II

SCHEDULE OF REVIEWS BY PROFESSIONAL AND STATUTORY BODIES
ACADEMIC YEAR 2016/2017

Accrediting Body	Accredited Programme(s)	Review Last Undertaken
Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA)	Designated Degree of Master of Arts in Accountancy Degree of Master of Arts in Accountancy Degree of Master of Arts in Accountancy (all joint variants)	2016/2017
Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)	Designated Degree of Master of Arts (MA) in Accountancy Degree of Master of Arts (MA) in Accountancy Degree of Master of Arts (MA) in Accountancy-Finance	2016/2017
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS)	Degree of Master of Arts (MA) in Real Estate Degree of Master of Arts (MA) in Real Estate (all joint variants) Postgraduate Taught Programmes in Real Estate and Rural Surveying	2016/2017
CIArb	Degree of Master of Laws (LLM) Dispute Resolution	2016/2017
Association for Nutrition	Degree of Master of Science (MSc) in Human Nutrition	2016/2017
IPEM	Degree of Master of Science (MSc) in Medical Physics	2016/2017
The General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS)	Postgraduate Certificate in Into Headship	2016/2017

APPENDIX III

SCHEDULE OF FORTHCOMING INTERNAL TEACHING REVIEWS

	School	Academic Year Review Period
AY 2016/2017		
Autumn (Oct 2016)	Psychology	2011/2012 – 2015/2016
Autumn (Nov 2016)	Business	2011/2012 – 2015/2016
AY 2017/2018		
Spring (Mar 2018)	Language, Literature, Music & Visual Culture	2012/2013 – 2016/2017
AY 2018/2019		
Autumn (Oct 2018)	Biological Sciences	2013/2014 – 2017/2018
Autumn (Oct 2018)	Engineering	2012/2013 – 2017/2018
Spring (Feb 2019)	Natural and Computing Sciences	2013/2014 – 2017/2018
Spring (Mar 2019)	Education	2011/2012 – 2017/2018
Spring (Mar 2019)	Law	2013/2014 – 2017/2018
AY 2019/2020		
Autumn (Oct 2019)	Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition	2014/2015 – 2018/2019
Spring (Feb 2020)	Geosciences	2014/2015 – 2018/2019
AY 2020/2021		
Autumn (Oct 2020)	Social Science	2014/2015 – 2018/2019
Spring (Feb 2021)	Divinity, History & Philosophy	2015/2016 – 2019/2020
AY 2021/2022		
Autumn (Oct 2021)	Psychology	2016/2017 – 2020/2021
Autumn (Nov 2021)	Business	2016/2017 – 2020/2021
AY 2022/2023		
Spring (Mar 2022)	Language, Literature, Music & Visual Culture	2017-2018 – 2021-2022

APPENDIX IV

THE UNIVERSITY'S ARRANGEMENTS TO MAINTAIN STANDARDS AND ASSURE AND ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF ITS PROVISION

The University Committee on Teaching and Learning (UCTL) has strategic oversight of all aspects of teaching and learning and the wider student experience. This includes responsibility for the assurance of the quality of the University's educational provision (particularly in relation to the design, implementation, evaluation and review of mechanisms for quality assurance), for the enhancement of the quality of teaching and learning, and for the safeguarding of academic standards. The UCTL is a joint committee of Senate and Court and reports to both regularly. It is chaired by the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) and its membership consists of the Deans of Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate provision, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean for Quality Assurance and Enhancement, and the Conveners of UCTL Task Forces (Retention, Feedback and Assessment and Positive Outcomes), with senior representatives from the Directorates of Academic Affairs and Student Life. The UCTL considers reports from three sub-committees, the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC), the Undergraduate Committee and the Postgraduate Taught Committee. The UCTL devolves responsibility to the QAC for the operational oversight and monitoring of the mechanisms that assure the quality and maintenance of standards across all taught provision, including postgraduate taught elements of research provision. The regular monitoring and oversight of the operation of these mechanisms by the QAC is reported to the UCTL, and UCTL have overall responsibility for assuring these, implementing any changes to address significant issues and/or to enhance the provision. UCTL then reports on its activity to Senate and the Court, and the Court thereby has opportunity to consider these arrangements and satisfy itself of their sufficiency. The mechanisms include the following:

Internal Teaching Review (ITR) is the University's system of periodic review of Schools' teaching and learning provision and the process by which a Schools' programmes are revalidated. ITR provides a formal opportunity for Schools to reflect on and critically evaluate learning and teaching provision and for the University to satisfy itself that quality and standards are being maintained and that issues are being addressed.

Annual Course and Programme Approval (SENAS): Course and programme proposals are submitted via SENAS forms which are designed to ensure conformity with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF), European qualifications frameworks, and QAA guidelines for programme specifications. School SENAS forms are considered to ensure alignment with School policy and resource; QAC reviews SENAS to ensure conformity to institutional regulations and practice, and compliance with the QAA Quality Code and SCQF.

Student Feedback on taught courses is gathered primarily via an annual online 'Student Course Evaluation Form' (SCEF) exercise, and twice-yearly 'Staff–Student Liaison Committee' (SSLC) meetings. Research student feedback is collected via annual questionnaire and six-monthly monitoring reports and forms a component – along with External Examiner comments – of our Annual Course reviews. Whilst the expected, *and minimum*, methods for Schools to gather student feedback are the SCEF exercise and SSLCs, Schools are encouraged to consider different and innovative methods to give students the opportunity to provide feedback. Several Schools have courses which make use of mid-term SCEF to identify any issues which could be acted upon before the course ends, whilst others hold student focus groups and informal feedback sessions to allow students to express any concerns or raise issues with the staff throughout the academic year. Large level 1 courses often use Personal Response System (PRS) handsets to get immediate feedback on how the course is going and our School of Education provides opportunities for students across all Education programmes to contribute online to a synchronous student forum via our VLE as a means of eliciting further student feedback.

External Examiners play a major role in verifying standards and monitoring the quality of our provision. Examiners report annually, with their Reports and Responses to them by the Heads of School being considered by the QAC before being returned to External Examiners. Heads of School are asked to consider External Examiners Reports and feedback as part of the ACR and APR exercises.

The University's **Degree Regulations** specify the criteria for our awards. Specific assessment policy and practices are set out in the University's Academic Quality Handbook (AQH) and conform to the SCQF and QAA Quality

Code. The University employs a number of mechanisms related to ensuring the standards of its awards, including clear guidelines in regard to the procedures to be followed in instances of student misconduct (including plagiarism), medical and other extenuating circumstances; and student appeals.

SBC17-18:08

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

Senate Business Committee
(27 September 2017)

RECTOR'S ELECTION 2017

1. PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

This is a paper about **the upcoming Rector's Election taking place in November 2017.**

This paper is provided for A*pproval*

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Senate is asked to approve the change of Returning Officer for this election and the composition of the Election Committee outlined below.

3. DISCUSSION

Following the recent change in Senior Vice Principal, Professor Jeremy Kilburn will be replaced by Professor Michael Greaves as Returning Officer for the upcoming Rector's Election. Traditionally this role is carried out by the Senior Vice Principal.

Additionally Senate is asked to approve the composition of the Election Committee who will oversee the Election process and resolve any issue or conflicts during the nomination and election period. The suggested composition is:

Professor Margaret Ross
Professor Peter McGeorge
Mrs Caroline Inglis
A nominated student senator from AUSA.

4. FURTHER INFORMATION

Further information may be obtained from Rachael Bernard (r.bernard@abdn.ac.uk or ext. 3388) or Nicholas Edwards (n.edwards@abdn.ac.uk or ext. 2963).

[20 September 2017] [version 1] [Open]