

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 MARCH 2024**In Person:**

Rasha Abu Eid, Waheed Afzal, Sanaa Al-Azawi, Joanne Anderson, Euan Bain, Martin Barker, William Barras, John Barrow, Nigel Beacham, Siladitya Bhattacharya, George Boyne, Alex Brasier, Andre Justin Carpio, Alessandra Cecolin, Delma Childers, Sandie Cleland, Chris Collins, Matthew Collinson, Pete Edwards, Nick Forsyth, Karin Friedrich, Peter Henderson, Richard Hepworth-Young, Jonathan Hicks, Gareth Jones, Dragan Jovcic, Kirsty Kiezebrink, Rhiannon Ledwell, Karl Leydecker, Beth Lord, Emily McKay, Andrew Mckinnon, Michelle Macleod, David McLernon, Alan Macpherson, Pietro Marini, Sam Martin, Martin Mills, Jo-Anne Murray, Mintu Nath, Nir Oren, Adelaja Israel Osofero, Graeme Paton, Ekaterina Pavlovskaja, Stuart Piertney, Bettina Platt, Amudha Poobalan, Ann Rajnicek, Brice Rea, Justin Rochford, Joost Rommers, Miles Rothoerl, Thereza Raquel Sales de Aguiar, Karen Scott, Diane Skåtun, Anne-Michelle Slater, Tracey Slaven, Alan Speight, Srinivas Sriramula, Ben Tatler, Steve Tucker, Neil Vargesson, Rebecca Walker, Jennifer Walklate, Ursula Witte, Zeray Yihdego

Online:

Sumeet Aphale, Jason Bohan, Fred Byrne, Irene Couzigou, Marie-Luise Ehrenschwendtner, Muhammad Faraaz Dheen Mohamed, Toni Gibson, Aravinda Meera Guntupalli, Malcolm Harvey, Constanze Hesse, Laura McCann, Catriona Macdonald, David Mcgloin, Doug Martin, Heather Morgan, David Muirhead, Sam Newington, Shane Painter, Joachim Schaper, Charlaine Simpson, John Skåtun, Lorna Stewart, Dawn Thompson, Ilia Xypolia

Apologies:

Finn Abou El Magd, Scott Allan, Lesley Anderson, Simon Bains, Daniel Berg, David Cornwell, Chantal den Daas, Beatriz Goulao, Niels Imrie, Kate Kostick, Mark Kurz, Samantha Miller, Vanessa Mabonso Nzolo, Valerie Speirs, Mary Stephen.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- 35.1 The Principal opened the meeting, welcoming members and noting the number of in-person attendees was lower than usual with more attending online due to the poor weather.
- 35.2 Jo Hicks, School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture (LLMVC) queried whether agenda item 9, (Guidance on minimum course enrolments) on the agenda for academic input, would be returning to a future meeting of Senate for approval or was it included for information and input and not returning for approval.
- 35.3 Karl Leydecker, Senior Vice-Principal confirmed that the item has been included on the Agenda at the request of the Senate Business Committee. The paper had been included in response to that request and there was no intention for it to return to a future meeting.
- 35.4 Tracey Slaven, University Secretary, reminded members of procedures: there were no planned fire alarms; the meeting would be recorded; members were asked to state their name before contributing to discussion and those attending on Teams were asked to use the chat function to state when they wished to ask a question. Members were reminded that the chat itself does not form part of the formal minute, and to remain muted when not speaking. Members were

reminded that, while all staff and students are welcome to attend Senate, only members are permitted to contribute to debate. They were also reminded that, as laid out in the Standing Orders, any motions for discussion must be related to items already on the agenda. Any voting would take place using the auditorium functionality for those in the room and Forms within the chat for those on Teams.

35.5 Senate approved the Agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 14 FEBRUARY 2024

36.1 Karin Friedrich, School of Divinity, History, Philosophy & Art History (DHPA) queried that at minute 26.11 it was stated that it had been agreed that the data being worked on by Planning would return to Senate. She queried if this action was still outstanding.

36.2 Tracey confirmed that the Court paper had been released and that the data pack had been circulated to Senate.

36.3 Brice Rea, School of Geosciences asked for confirmation that Senate had received the paper which went to Court?

36.4 Tracey confirmed that there had been two circulations: the original with the data pack and then the Court Paper. She undertook to ensure the two were tied together.

36.5 With an additional further spelling correction the minutes were approved.

ORAL REPORT FROM THE PRINCIPAL AND UPDATE ON HE SECTOR/UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENTS

37.1 In addition to his written update, the Principal noted that members would be as aware as he was of the current difficult context for the sector. He commented that there seemed to be barely a day passing without another institution announcing shrinkage and job cuts of some kind. He noted how difficult it was for everyone and that the task for the whole university community was to adapt successfully to the different and challenging set of circumstances. He noted that there would be discussions within the meeting, and at future meetings, around how the University might continue to be successful in education and research. He highlighted that there was a lot of this within his report and the various high profile examples receiving media attention recently which were helping to maintain the reputation for quality at the University of Aberdeen. He further noted that the local context continued to be uncertain, ambiguous, volatile and unpredictable. He indicated that the extent of the cut in the teaching grant from the Funding Council remained unknown. It was hoped that this would be made known within the next few weeks. The Principal indicated that it was expected that the news would not be good, but the extent to which the sector's cut would fall on the University was not yet known. He highlighted that news continued to be difficult in terms of student recruitment, in particular international student recruitment across the sector. He noted that the Migration Advisory Committee had been asked, at short notice and at rapid speed, by the UK Government to review the post-study work visa. This was something which was sending a negative message to the international student market and so it should be expected that recruitment in the autumn would continue to be very challenging for the whole sector. The University would need to do its best to secure a better share of a significantly reduced market. He noted the further unknown for the University was how many colleagues would take up the option for supported and voluntary exit from the University. He indicated that a report would be taken on this to Court at its 24 April meeting noting, however, that it would not be until the end of April and beyond that the exact figures would be known and whether those figures were sufficient to deal with the financial challenge.

37.2 The Principal indicated that he had received a very welcome request from some members of Senate for an additional meeting to discuss the implications of the financial recovery plan for teaching and research. He outlined that some potential dates had been identified for the meeting to take place at a time when the discussion might be most productive. The Principal

noted that the earlier the meeting was held, the less well informed it would be possible to be noting, however, the later the meeting was the less opportunity for the advice of Senate to be taken on board.

- 37.3 Tracey Slaven, University Secretary informed Senate of the two dates which had been identified as possibilities. A repurposed date for one and a half hours on Tuesday 23 April in the morning. She noted that this date stepped outside of the Senate Standing Orders. She detailed a second option to hold an additional Senate in its normal Wednesday afternoon slot on 8 May noting that this date may be challenging for student members of Senate given the examination period. Recognising that neither option was ideal, it had been agreed that the choice should be put to Senate and a vote taken.
- 37.4 The Principal invited views on the two proposed dates.
- 37.5 Responding on behalf of the students Rhiannon Ledwell, Vice-President (Education) indicated that the May date was acceptable. Although she acknowledged the benefits of having a meeting prior to Court, she welcomed the opportunity for a full-length meeting in May.
- 37.6 Jen Walklate, School of Social Science indicated the preference within the School to have a whole Senate devoted to the topic and thus the May date was the preferred option.
- 37.7 Martin Barker, School of Biological Sciences suggested that meetings should be held on both dates. He suggested the first meeting could be used for discussions and decisions about what needs to be done and included on the agenda, which could be followed up in the subsequent meeting.
- 37.8 The Principal noted his expectation that the Senate Business Committee (SBC) would undertake this work on behalf of Senate when setting the agenda following normal due process.
- 37.9 Responding Martin noted that it would be a shame to see discussion constrained by time in either of the suggested slots.
- 37.10 The Principal noted the point but stated that the reality was that any slot would be constrained by time.
- 37.11 Joanne Anderson, School of Divinity, History, Philosophy & Art History (DHPA) highlighted the first date fell within week eight of term and was typically a busy day for teaching which would make it difficult for many members to attend and hence her preference would be for the May date which would provide the best opportunity for the most members to attend.
- 37.12 Neil Vargesson, School of Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition (MMSN) highlighted that the May date fell in the middle of exams and so some members might not be able to attend due to invigilation commitments.
- 37.13 Israel Osofero, School of Engineering noted support for both dates. He acknowledged the burden of two additional meetings but with either date there would be many members unable to attend so using both dates would provide extra time for discussion. He suggested that the option for both dates be included in the vote.
- 37.14 Jen Walklate, School of Social Science noted that a relatively extensive agenda had been suggested by the group who had requested the extra meeting, and this could be used as the basis for further discussion.
- 37.15 Tracey acknowledged her appreciation for the input of members with agenda suggestions but noted that the responsibility for agenda setting for meetings was the responsibility of the Senate Business Committee if the agenda moved beyond a single item discussion.
- 37.16 Euan Bain, School of Engineering noted the issues with both dates and asked whether there was a mechanism within governance structures for members who found themselves unable to attend to contribute to the discussions in writing.
- 37.17 In response Tracey confirmed that members unable to attend may convey their views to other members attending, so the views may be shared into the discussion, however there was no

mechanism for a proxy vote in relation to Senate which would require to be quorate. This was one third of the full membership.

- 37.18 Rhiannon Ledwell, Vice-President (Education) made the point that she understood that there was to be an informal meeting of the group requesting the meeting with the Principal to decide on the agenda to be passed to SBC.
- 37.19 The Principal confirmed that there would be a meeting, but this wouldn't decide the agenda. It would be an informal meeting which could inform SBC in deciding the agenda.
- 37.20 Tracey confirmed that in addition to the request for an additional meeting received in advance of the meeting there had been a further request from two members within the room to hold the meeting over two dates. Tracey proposed that a consensus view should be taken regarding the suggestion that meetings be held on both dates, noting the significant opportunity costs to the University associated with that proposal.
- 37.21 Senate indicated that it wished to vote on the option to hold the meetings over two separate dates. A vote was held to determine the preferred option: 23 April 11am-12.30pm; 8 May 1pm – 4pm; or both dates.
- 37.22 When the online and in-person votes were combined Senate voted:

23 April 11am – 12.30pm	20
8 May 1pm – 4pm	36
Both dates	29

The additional meeting was confirmed for 1pm Wednesday 8 May.

- 37.23 Richard Hepworth-Young, School of Natural & Computing Sciences (NCS) asked about promotion applications, on behalf of two constituents. He indicated that they had been told in August that they would receive outcomes in early December and then at the end of November had been told outcomes would be communicated after mid-January. At the end of January, they were told meetings would happen mid-March with communications thereafter. However, having queried again they had been told the meetings were now scheduled for mid-April. He asked if the outcomes from the current processes would be reviewed in light of what had happened in the current year, and would Senate have a role in this? In addition, he queried why applicants had not been kept up to date by the Directorate of People?
- 37.24 Karl Leydecker, Senior Vice-Principal responded indicating that attempts had been made to keep applicants updated and confirmed that the Committees had met. He explained that the overwhelming issue which had delayed outcomes had been problems securing the necessary external evaluations. There remained a small number of outstanding cases, however it was proposed to communicate those outcomes where it had been possible to make decisions in the next few days. The feedback to candidates had been finalised. Unfortunately, there were a few candidates for whom it had not been possible to complete the process. They would be informed of this at the same time; their cases were still ongoing, and it was hoped that the additional evaluations would be attained to permit a meeting to be held in mid-April. He noted that part of the reason for delays had been due to the extreme diligence which had been exercised in ensuring no conflict of interest existed between those giving evaluations and the candidates. On several occasions, despite having the required number of evaluations, they had had to be set aside due to conflicts of interest. He further noted that this would be something which would require to be reviewed going forward as the timescales and work required, including of Committee members, Heads of Schools, and the evaluators themselves was no longer working. He added that many institutions have now moved away from external evaluations for this reason. The time taken was regrettable, but staff had been endeavouring to do the best possible job within the current framework. He undertook to review communications between HR and candidates. A review was always undertaken following the promotion

exercise but, with the current year being the first of the new process, this would be particularly important and would take place once the work of the Committees was complete and all those involved had had the opportunity to reflect on the process.

- 37.25 The Principal noted the problems experienced were similar across the Sector. He highlighted that although many institutions had moved away from requiring external references for promotions to Senior Lecturer they had been retained for Reader and Professorial promotions.
- 37.26 Andrew queried whether Senate would be involved in any review?
- 37.27 Karl confirmed that the review report would be brought to Senate and the Principal confirmed that member of the academic community would be involved in the review, and these may or may not be, Senate members.
- 37.28 Karl further confirmed that the review usually involved the Committees reflecting on the process and seeking views from the candidates and others involved in it. He envisaged that this would be part of the process, the outcome of which would be brought to Senate as had been done previously.
- 37.29 Brice Rea, School of Geosciences noted, in the context of the Principal's update, that the University was still facing a potential fine from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) for under recruitment in the last academic year, and asked if this remained the case given the current financial situation, was it expected that SFC would follow this though?
- 37.30 The Principal confirmed that SFC would do this; their budget for higher education had been cut by £28 million and therefore had no choice but to make the fine referred to.

POINT OF ORDER

- 38.1 Tracey Slaven, University Secretary highlighted that a Senate member (Dr Malcolm Harvey) had raised a point of order in relation to the vote about meeting dates, articulating that none of the options had received a majority of the vote. She indicated she was content with the outcome as articulated, as the option to hold both had not secured a majority, with the majority of those voting choosing a single date and that the preferred date then being 8 May.

HONORARY DEGREE NOMINATIONS

- 39.1 Tracey noted that the planned Honorary Degree vote had been deferred from the meeting in February due to difficulties in accessing the information. Tracey confirmed that she had received no indications of difficulties this time and therefore assumed that Senate was content to move forward with consideration of the nominations.
- 39.2 Following a request for a formal vote on the nominations, Senate voted to approve the candidates proposed by the Honorary Degrees Committee. Candidate details were circulated confidentially by a separate process.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT

- 40.1 Neil Vargesson, on behalf of the Senate Assessors, provided an update on the February 2024 meeting of the University Court. Neil noted that the meeting of Court had been very robust and, at times, challenging. He highlighted that the Financial Recovery Plan had received a lot of input from Court members and there was a lot of discussion around that. He also highlighted that there had been discussion around the importance of Senate and its input to Court. It had been agreed to share the remits of Court and Senate regularly between the two bodies to ensure transparency.
- 40.2 Jen Walklate, School of Social Science, asked a question related to the position of the Senate Assessors and their capacity to act as members of Senate. She noted that in the minutes of the previous Court two of the Assessors had been listed as having a conflict of interest as they

had put their names to a letter from a group of Senate members. She questioned whether being a Senate Assessor precluded members from some actions.

- 40.3 In response, Tracey confirmed that this was not the case. She noted that the Senate Assessors had a challenging role: as members of Senate, they had a responsibility to represent the views of their constituencies in Senate and are entitled to do so. However, as members of Court, the Assessors are Trustees of the University and hold responsibilities in that context under Charity and other laws. The point included in the minute had been made to protect those Senate Assessors in their complex role and to ensure that role was recognised and understood rather than being open to challenge at any future date.
- 40.4 Martin Mills, School of Social Science noted confusion with the implication that being a Senate Assessor on Court was a constant and persistent conflict of interest on Court. He noted that he could not see what the 'interest' was in the context; he understood this in terms of opinions and decisions that individuals had reached as part of their job, but he was unclear how the Senate Assessors in question would have any family or financial or social interests that would conflict with their capacity to take a decision on Court.
- 40.5 Responding Tracey indicated that she would be happy to discuss this subject outside of the meeting. She noted, however, that all members of Court coming from internally appointed routes do have a constant tension which is noted and understood in terms of Court discussions. However, where there might be a particular perception in a specific context this was noted within the minute being discussed. Reporting of this was something that fell within her responsibilities as University Secretary.
- 40.6 Rhiannon Ledwell, Vice-President (Education) noted that a useful and insightful document had arisen as a result of the Court meeting: the institutional failures of process and governance within the consultation. She requested that there be a proper response to the points made in that report.
- 40.7 The Principal sought clarification of how her point related to the Court Report?
- 40.8 Rhiannon argued that the point was directly relevant to everything arising from the Court meeting.
- 40.9 Tracey confirmed that the document being referred to had not been submitted to either Court or Senate formally and expressed her belief that the document had been circulated after Court had met and therefore it would be very difficult for Senate to take a view on it in the current discussion of the Court Report.

REIMAGINING THE CAMPUSES

- 41.1 Senate received a [presentation](#) updating on progress to date with the Reimagining the Campuses project from Professor Peter Edwards, Vice-Principal, Regional Engagement and Morag Beers, Director of Estates and Facilities.
- 41.2 The presentation highlighted that a report was scheduled to be delivered to Court in June which would detail initial findings and make recommendations to inform Estates Strategy and the 10-year Capital Plan. Senate received details of the working methods of the project which had included four Working Groups (Education, Research & Innovation, Inclusive, Accessible & Wellbeing, and Sustainability). The Working Groups' membership had been drawn from across the whole University community and had been supplemented by the work of three Technical Groups (Estates, Digital and Comms & Marketing).
- 41.3 It was reported that to date the project had identified Digital & Data, Estate Configuration (efficiency and consolidation), Flexibility, Alignment with Institutional Goals, Commercial Opportunities (academic & non-academic) and Partnerships as being the key themes.
- 41.4 Following the Presentation the Principal encouraged members to take the opportunity to contribute to the consultation process.

- 41.5 Dragan Jovicic, School of Engineering noted that the project report was intended to go straight to Court and expressed the view that he felt it would be important for Senate to have the draft report on its agenda for discussion.
- 41.6 Pete confirmed that the report was to Court, on 19 June but, as there was a Senate in early June, he anticipated a further update for Senate at that meeting if this was agreeable for the Senate Business Committee.
- 41.7 Dragan was supportive of the inclusion of a further update at the June meeting of Senate with the final version of the report being available by circulation.
- 41.8 Andrew Mackinnon, School of Social Science noted that he had attended the consultation on the previous day and that there had been a lot of interesting ideas on display however he noted that he had been struck and horrified by the open-plan offices suggestion. He added that it was his view that this was one suggestion guaranteed to antagonise academic staff at the University, something borne out by history. He was pleased to note that material presented in the slides originated from opinions and hence accounted for the factual inaccuracies. He highlighted one of the slides which had indicated one of the 'cons' of individual offices was reduced productivity and indicated he had no idea where this would have come from as this seemed counter intuitive and contrary to a quick search of the literature. He indicated his view was this was not a direction the University would wish to go. He indicated that he had acted as External Examiner in institutions with shared office spaces and colleagues had indicated that they were unhappy with these shared spaces.
- 41.9 Responding Pete noted that there were arguments both for shared spaces and against them. He highlighted some work done in Australia a few years previously. He noted the dangers of taking a polarised approach with either cellular offices or call-centre open-plan offices. He suggested that there was a need to join cost and efficiency with people and culture and provide a solution suited to the ambitions of the University. He indicated his wish to emphasise that the exhibition had been a show of the suggestions received and not a blueprint of what would happen.
- 41.10 Morag noted that there were approximately 3,500 employees across the University split approximately half and half between academic and professional services staff. She highlighted that for some staff, such as herself, coming to work in a cellular office was quite difficult and it did reduce productivity for those working in teams to deliver things. She noted the need to serve the whole population including the half not engaged in academic type of services. She indicated the need to set a balance of both.
- 41.11 The Principal reiterated that the estate was for everyone in the organisation, and it needed to be acknowledged that different solutions would suit different individuals or groups within the University.
- 41.12 Bettina Platt, MMSN commented that she also found shared office space to be counterproductive for academic work of the kind she carries out personally. She asked for clarification on procedures as specific examples had not been given for comment rather it was a bigger picture of things being looked at and it was very difficult to comment without examples. She observed that there was a very fluid financial situation but no indication of the assets which might be sold to contribute to the financial shortfall and how this fitted into the overall picture.
- 41.13 Pete indicated that, as part of the work, the scope and scale of the estate was being looked at. However, he indicated that it would be very wrong to present hypothetical possibilities for disposals before that decision had been made.
- 41.14 Morag added that every example being looked at would need to follow normal governance processes, some of which are delegated from Court in terms of projects becoming investment proposals. She noted that although most of the estate was owned by the University and within its control, buildings were still subject to Town and Country Planning regulations which meant University proposals were open to public consultation. Every single proposal created, big or small, would have to go through that process and this was not yet the stage that the project was at. She highlighted that the Estates Plan required to fit with the Capital Plan, but this was not

now what it was thought to be 12 months previously. How the University explored partnerships and external funding sources would dictate the processes a project would follow which can't be dictated currently. She noted it would be a long fluid process which would evolve over time, but every step taken would need to go through internal governance procedures with full discussion of all proposals.

- 41.15 Bettina sought clarification of the role of Senate in the process.
- 41.16 Tracey confirmed that Senate was being consulted as part of the consultation process. If there were to be a proposal that impacted significantly on the way in which the academic delivery of the University's work could be taken forward, then that proposal, when formed, would come to Senate for an academic view. She noted that this was not yet the stage in the process that had been reached.
- 41.17 The Principal highlighted the need for the meeting to move on and suggested there might be points which could be taken up with Morag and Pete separately, with the meeting discussing only points vital to all.
- 41.18 Jen Walklate, School of Social Science noted the implication in governance terms that Senate will find out what is happening once it has been decided. She stressed that any plans going to Court should also come to Senate who should have all the information in order to determine what was pertinent to the academic community and what was not.
- 41.19 The Principal confirmed that this was exactly what Morag had just indicated.
- 41.20 Euan Bain, School of Engineering noted that it was possible to see from the history of the information gathering in the consultation process, that the Group had been out to everyone who wished to comment and get involved and noted that this was a good process but that there were also a group of individuals which any project must consult. He indicated that the Director of Education in his School did not recall having been invited explicitly to contribute on matters relating to Education. He asked whether within the consultation framework provision had been made to consult with specific groups, for example, Directors of Education, Directors of Research, Disability Coordinators and Heads of Schools.
- 41.21 Responding with regard to the Education consultations, Kirsty Kiezebrink, Dean for Educational Innovation confirmed that when the Working Group had been set up, representation had been sought from the Directors of Education as it was not practical to include all twelve on the Group. Two Directors of Education were members of the Group with the expectation that they would consult with, and feedback to, their wider group. Additionally, the academic representatives on the Group were drawn from different schools from the Directors to maximise the disciplines represented on the Group.
- 41.22 Acknowledging the workload issues across the Institution, Euan commented that it was unrealistic to place reliance on two individuals to feedback to groups of 12 or 13 and it did not guarantee things getting done. He suggested that the Group needed to be proactive in scheduling these discussions to ensure that they took place.
- 41.23 Pete confirmed that the model outlined by Kirsty for the Education Working Group was the same as the Research & Innovation Group which had included relevant school representatives who were expected to reach out into their networks. He confirmed that part of the purpose of the open consultations had been to give School Directors and other academic colleagues opportunity to comment or present their ideas. In addition, all materials had been made available online to the University community with the intention of gathering feedback from everyone who wished to contribute.
- 41.24 Drawing the discussion to a close, the Principal highlighted that every effort was being made to make plans available to as many as possible, however he noted that it was not possible to compel individuals to comment if they did not wish to.

**OPEN DISCUSSION OF THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT
IN OUR ACADEMIC SETTING**

- 42.1 The Principal detailed that the Senate Business Committee had decided that it would be appropriate to hold an open discussion on the Israel-Palestine conflict in the University's academic context.
- 42.2 Sanaa Al-Awazi, Postgraduate Student Representative gave details of the motions that AUSA wished to raise. The Principal determined that it would be appropriate for Senate to have its discussions before returning to consider any motions that were brought forward.
- 42.3 Sanaa detailed that during the previous six months there had been a relentless onslaught against the people of Palestine with the destruction of Gaza City to rubble. She noted that the destruction and famine was now regarded as genocide and had resulted in the death or displacement of 2.3 million Palestinians. She highlighted the destruction had been indiscriminate and had targeted not only homes and infrastructure, but also vital centres of education. She noted that universities were meant to be sanctuaries of learning and places where minds are nurtured and futures are shaped, however in Gaza these institutions have become targets for destruction, leaving a trail of devastation in their wake. The values held dear of human rights, justice and equity were universal and transcended borders and ideologies. She suggested that as guardians of these values we must not fail to speak out against oppression and injustice wherever it might occur. She urged that the lessons of history were not forgotten and the struggles of those who fought for freedom and justice remembered. She urged Senate to vote in favour of the motion to support and show solidarity with Palestine, to stand on the right side of history and uphold the values that define us and to pave the way to a future where knowledge, justice and peace prevailed.
- 42.4 Alessandra Cecolin, DHPA, noted the importance of freedom of speech and stressed the need for demonstrations not to be regarded as hate marches. She noted as an historian working on the history of the Israel Palestine conflict, she wanted to ask that the University remains a place where freedom of speech is protected in relation not only to Palestinian voices, but also to Israeli and Jewish scholars who were also critical of what was taking place in Gaza. She commented that she was disappointed to report several examples of what had happened to her students, and herself, when she had invited a Palestinian scholar to speak which very much suggested that freedom of speech was not always really granted. She stressed the importance of reiterating the maintenance of the principles of freedom of speech. She reminded Senate that the University was a multicultural environment including many Palestinian and Jewish members and they could sometimes feel intimidated and unable to speak up and discuss issues which were ongoing in Gaza. Alessandra noted the words of Stuart Hall 'The University is a critical institution or it is nothing'.
- 42.5 Thanking Alessandra for articulating these important values, the Principal noted that the University had responsibilities and obligations towards freedom of speech and asked Tracey to provide a reminder of the current legal position.
- 42.6 Tracey reminded Senate that the University had a direct and statutory responsibility to uphold academic freedom in relation to critical thought and debate. The University existed within a wider society where freedom of speech within the law was supported, noting this needed to be contextualised to ensure members of the community were supported while ensuring freedom of speech did not slide into a situation where individuals were being harassed or targeted as a consequence, something she did not expect to see within the context of the University. She further noted that many individuals were impacted directly and there was a need to be aware of circumstances for individuals. She expressed support for the debate while remaining aware of the constraints.
- 42.7 Andrew McKinnon, School of Social Science queried who had the responsibility for determining who was permitted to speak and under what conditions. He highlighted that a colleague in Social Science had been told that they could not give a presentation to the Palestinian Society and that it was off-limits. He had been unable to find further information on this. He suggested

that the policy on this needed to be clarified and how it would be decided. He noted that in this particular instance, it had related to someone with relevant expertise to the topic they had been asked to speak on. He suggested a need for greater clarity on the relevant policies and where the associated red lines were.

- 42.8 The Principal confirmed that the relevant policies could be recirculated and noted his concern to hear of the case and asked that he be sent further details.

[Clerk's Note: The requirement for universities to uphold Academic Freedom is laid out in [Part 2 of the Higher Education Governance \(Scotland\) Act 2016](#). The University [Events and Speaker Policy](#) articulates University commitments.]

- 42.9 Zeray Yihdego, School of Law noted that the topic was very difficult for the University Senate to debate and consequently he had received a lot of comments from colleagues. One colleague had shared the view that the University should support the recently passed resolution of the UN Security Council which called for an immediate ceasefire. It also called for immediate humanitarian assistance for the people of Gaza. It also called for the release of Israeli hostages. He noted that it was not appropriate to remain quiet about the situation and there was a need to say something in line with the UN position. Another colleague had expressed a different view and suggested that it would not be appropriate to pass any motion in favour of a particular position as the University needed to be careful of the politically sensitive situation. He noted his personal view that the safest option was to remain silent, but he did not think that this was a more sensible and morally justified option for the University. He suggested that cognisance needed to be paid to the position taken when Russia had invaded Ukraine. He noted that Senate had been firm in its position in showing solidarity with the people of Ukraine. He highlighted humanitarian disasters had affected both sides in this conflict, however, the situation in Gaza with respect to the killings and starvation mostly affecting women and children should not be ignored by the University. Another colleague had stressed the need for openness and for discussion within academic circles in the form of workshops and of balanced scholarly discussions. There should not be fear of talking about this and he would support this view strongly.
- 42.10 Noting the articulate views expressed by Zeray, the Principal suggested the views were shared by many: a position should be adopted and there should not be fear associated with doing so provided all parts of the community, staff and students, were respected.
- 42.11 Bettina Platt, MMSN shared the opinion just expressed and agreed that the University should not stay silent as a precedent had been set in terms of Ukraine. She noted an issue in terms of who decides which conflicts the University selected and commented on in terms of the wars going on throughout the world. Should it be what is close geographically or when staff and students were affected directly? She noted the extent of suffering in the world and queried how it was possible to even come close to making a difference. She noted added difficulties in this context, due to the complexities of the conflict, and that to choose the correct words to do justice to what was happening was not something she would wish to do personally. She summarized her questions as being how should the University get the words right, and how should the conflicts selected be chosen?
- 42.12 The Principal noted that the questions raised were the same ones that even supranational organisations struggled with. The Principal asked Tracey if there was anything in terms of process that might help answer the questions raised.
- 42.13 Tracey noted that the points made were very strong and that it was imperative that the University upheld its values. She highlighted this was one of the reasons why, in the aftermath of considering the situation in Ukraine, the University had moved to a position of supporting those suffering as a result of international conflict regardless of where that was. The University had put in place both staff and student fellowships recognising, however, that this had a small impact in the face of all the current challenges around the world. In terms of the decisions around where the University took a position and articulated its voice, it was a matter that really should be discussed with Court, however, it was absolutely appropriate for Senate to have the debate and articulate its views but the fundamental question around how, when and in which

circumstance was incredibly difficult and was always likely to be driven by the extent to which the University had direct community engagement.

- 42.14 The Principal added that it was also by the depth of the concern, on any global issue, that affected the community.
- 42.15 Rasha Abu Eid, MMSN shared her opinion as someone who came from that part of the world and as someone who understood the value of education for Palestinians. Displaced Palestinian families who had lost everything had to rebuild their lives from scratch relying on their education and therefore families invested everything in their children's education. She noted therefore that it was not a surprise that 86% of Palestinians complete their basic education, broken down to 78% of males and a remarkable 94% of females according to a UNICEF Palestine education fact sheet. During academic year 2022/23 there were 214,081 students enrolled in universities and university colleges in Palestine and that included 80,568 in the Gaza strip (Central Bureau of Statistics, Palestine). She noted that despite over a decade and a half of besiegement, Gaza had developed higher education institutes that had graduated doctors, dentists, pharmacists, lawyers, engineers, nurses, teachers and scientists who not only contribute to their own communities but spread their knowledge worldwide in the diaspora. They contribute to human knowledge through scholarship and publication. She noted that it was heart wrenching to see higher education infrastructure being destroyed: The universities that trained the healthcare workers who refused to abandon their patients despite facing their own demise; the institutions that trained the engineer who modified engines to run on used frying oil in the absence of petrol; the schools that educated the teenager who used scrap material to generate electricity for the tent he was forced to live in. For Palestinians education was a lifeline. They learned to survive. With the targeted destruction of their infrastructure, they needed support to rebuild their higher education institutes and knowledge systems. For more than five centuries the University of Aberdeen's foundational purpose had been 'open to all and dedicated to the pursuit of truth in the service of others'. Over this long history it had provided support to students and academics in crisis regardless of their race, ethnicity and religious belief, the most recent of which had been to colleagues in Ukraine where two motions were passed in Senate in 2022. She noted her genuine hope that this would extend to Palestinian students and academics who were facing one of the most extreme crises in recent history.
- 42.16 Nir Oren, School Natural & Computing Sciences (NCS) noting that he was aware he was oversimplifying to state that in the case of Ukraine there had been a 'good' side and a 'bad' side which, from that point of view, made it relatively simple to pass a motion. However, in the current case, he noted his condemnation of the actions being taken by Israel but as acknowledged by all who had spoken, it was a complex situation in terms of the historical nuances. He suggested that it would be very possible for Senate to agree that injustices were taking place in Israel and Palestine and across the world and condemn those. He noted, however, that he would not be comfortable for Senate to pass a motion blaming one side or the other. He expressed concern about some of the emotive and very personal messages that had been heard during the meeting which seemed to be moving to blame one side or the other without dealing with the historical nuances. He stressed the need to be very careful in what was said, noting that everyone would condemn injustice, but he noted the need to be careful in going too far with this.
- 42.17 Martin Mills, School of Social Science highlighted the depth of the humanitarian crisis whilst recognising that, unlike a drought or famine, the humanitarian crisis was the result of policy. The policy by a specific government rather than a nation. As noted earlier he commented that there were many crises around the world that go unreported in the UK. He noted that, as a specialist in Tibet, he had watched a civilisation, a religion and a culture gradually be eradicated in front of his eyes. It had not made the press, but it had been occurring throughout his lifetime to a similar effect, but this was not often talked about. He noted, however, his view that the motions passed by AUSA were worth reading in depth and further noted that Senate had previously adopted the Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism and suggested that everyone present at the meeting should read that in detail as a nuanced document which detailed what

was and was not antisemitism with the latter being developed with specific reference to academic freedom to debate and discuss these issues in academic context. He reminded members that this was an established agreement and that the agreement required reading in detail.

- 42.18 Rhiannon Ledwell, Vice-President (Education) commented that a safe space needed to be created for students and academic colleagues to be able to express themselves. She highlighted that this had not yet been achieved. She noted that individuals perceive they were being censored and students had not been able to write about the topic in projects and academics had not raised it in class. She suggested that something practical needed to come from the situation, to explicitly state how the University was supporting and facilitating discussion of the topic and ensure that it was received by everyone in order to create a safe space.
- 42.19 The Principal noted that it had been emphasised again, that freedom of speech within the law was a value upheld by the University. He suggested that if there were individuals who felt that their right to freedom of speech had been suppressed, he would like to meet and talk with them in order that they might be supported appropriately.
- 42.20 On behalf of a member online experiencing technical difficulties Tracey conveyed the contribution: they noted that the proposed motion presented an opportunity to decolonise conversation on campus and include a more inclusive space for Palestinian voices. They noted that the University campus included the Qatar campus which had a large number of Arab and Palestinian students. The testimonials from Qatar campus students highlighted a troubling disparity in the University's response to troubles in Palestine and expressed concern that students had faced censorship and accusations of antisemitism there and had difficulties organising events in support of their homeland while in Qatar. It was further noted that while students in Qatar had been able to actively and easily able to show their solidarity with Palestine, it should be in the interest of allowing student voices to be heard. It was also suggested that there had been double standards in the response from the University when this crisis was compared with Ukraine.
- 42.21 The Principal reiterated again his desire to meet with anyone with direct evidence of suppression of legitimate freedom of speech. He then indicated that Senate would move to considering the motions.
- 42.22 Sanaa Al-Awazi, Postgraduate Student Representative noted that the seeds sown determine the future harvest. If Palestinians were shown love this would be returned in the future. If support were shown this would ensure hatred would not accumulate. If support were shown for rebuilding the educational system, it would provide hope and partnership and positivity.
- 42.23 Tracey confirmed she would read the motions as submitted and reminded members that there was also the opportunity for motions to be raised from the floor if there was a wish to do so or to raise any amendments. Tracey detailed the first motion noting that a voting form would be available within the chat for those attending online. The first motion:
- Senate condemns the systematic destruction of Palestinian educational institutions and knowledge systems.
- 42.24 Brice Rea, School of Geosciences noted that he had grown up in a country with bombs and death, and that aspect was straightforward. However, he noted that the motion stated that there was a process of 'systematic' destruction of something and, as Senate was evidence-based, he suggested that there was no evidence to support the use of 'systematic' in the motion.
- 42.25 The Principal reminded Brice that the option existed to vote against the motion or to abstain.

42.26 When the online and in-person votes were combined Senate voted:

In Favour	56
Not in Favour	6
Abstentions	18

42.27 Tracey detailed the second motion:

Senate calls upon the University to take action to:

- (i) To commit to Palestinian academic and knowledge workers during the time of crisis and its aftermath by promoting and extending scholarship arrangements for Palestinian students and arguing for financial support to rebuild Palestinian educational infrastructure;
- (ii) To investigate and commit to further ways of further extending support to Palestinian students, academics and knowledge workers in Gaza including, but not limited to, possible partnerships.

Tracey clarified that Senate was being asked to agree to call on the University, and that the University would then need to consider that ask from Senate. At that point there would not be a formal commitment from any party.

42.28 When the online and in-person votes were combined Senate voted:

In Support	42
Not in Support	30
Abstentions	30

42.29 Tracey detailed the third motion:

Senate expresses support for academic freedom and condemns censorship of legal expressions of solidarity with Palestine.

42.30 It was suggested by Nir Oren, and seconded by Karin Friedrich, that the motion be amended to cover not just Palestine.

42.31 Tracey detailed the amended motion as:

Senate expresses support for academic freedom and condemns censorship of legal expressions of solidarity.

42.32 An alternative form of words was provided by Karin Friedrich who suggested that it become an expression of solidarity with both sides of the debate.

42.33 Tracey suggested that there might be an agreed alternative motion and reminded Senate that amendments were always voted on prior to original versions. The amended motion was detailed as:

Senate expresses support for academic freedom and freedom of expression in relation to discussion of this and other conflicts within the UK legal framework

42.34 Alessandra Cecolin requested that the motion be amended to include reference to the Israel/Palestinian conflict given this was where the debate had commenced. She noted there was an issue of freedom of speech for academics working within this field.

42.35 Tracey confirmed the amended motion as:

Senate expresses its support for academic freedom and freedom of expression in relation to this conflict and others within the legal frameworks of the UK

42.36 When the online and in-person votes were combined Senate voted:

In Support	62
Not in Support	8
Abstentions	14

42.37 Tracey confirmed that the normal process in Senate when, having held a vote on an amendment and where that was passed, a vote on the original would not normally be held. However as there had already been a request from the floor for a specific motion including direct mention of Gaza and so in the context of the motion passed which referred to 'this conflict and others'. The proposal was made and seconded and the motion was therefore:

Senate expresses support for academic freedom and freedom of expression in relation to the conflict taking place in Gaza and the wider region.

42.38 When the online and in-person votes were combined Senate voted:

In Support	43
Not in Support	15
Abstentions	19

REVISED MODERATION PROCEDURES

- 43.1 Steve Tucker, Dean for Quality Assurance and Enhancement introduced the proposed changes to the marking and moderation procedures being proposed by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) following a review of those procedures.
- 43.2 Karin Friedrich, DHPA commented that she was unclear what was meant by 'moderation'. She noted that in the humanities, with lots of essays and longer pieces of work which do not generate tick-box work, moderation requires a close-look, and the proposed changes would result in an increased amount of work rather than, as suggested, a decrease. She stressed that she was not referring to second marking but simply moderation of essays requires some reading which would increase workload.
- 43.3 The Principal clarified that Karen had not meant to imply that any disciplines within the University required work that was only ticking boxes.
- 43.4 Responding, Steve confirmed that one of the aims intended for development alongside the procedures, would be specific guidance and examples of how moderation might be undertaken. These would follow for the implementation of the procedures.
- 43.5 Jen Walklate, School of Social Science noted that she had found the second section of the paper very difficult to read and understand and requested this was looked at. She further asked whether, in the case of several small assessments, moderation should be occurring between each assessment or should it be overall in the block. She also asked how the new procedures would take account of instances of where the disparity is one CGS point but also a disparity between class and grade band.
- 43.6 Steve replied confirming the intention that moderation was carried out at levels one and two of all assessments which count for fifteen percent or more towards the overall grade. At levels three and above moderation should occur for everything counting for ten percent and above.

Where each assessment counted for less than ten percent, the requirement was fifty percent of the total. In instances on the grade boundary, discussions at QAC had centred around the current guidance which indicated that, in cases where the two markers disagreed the mark, that of the first marker should stand. QAC had felt that it would be more appropriate for the higher of the two marks to be adopted. In terms of the grade point boundary, Steve noted that the Committee had concluded that using the higher mark would be less influential now the University was using a GPA approach rather than the previous grade spectrum approach.

- 43.7 Nir Oren, NCS noted his view that guidance on moderation, discipline by discipline, was critical. He further noted his concern that the proposed approach for the grade boundaries, at least in his discipline, would lead quickly to grade inflation. He noted that where this occurred in the current system the two markers were required to meet to agree a mark and he suggested that the proposed approach was a recipe for grade inflation.
- 43.8 Steve confirmed that this was something that would receive further consideration.
- 43.9 Jo-Anne Murray, Vice-Principal (Education) clarified the distinction between moderation and double marking using the example of the External Examiner whose role was not to adjust individual marks on a piece of work rather their role was to look for consistency across the process and that was where a sample is used. Double marking was used for larger pieces of work where there was significant emphasis of an individual item. From her experience the proposed process was common throughout the sector, and she was not aware of grade inflation being an issue however she undertook for further data analysis on this if that would provide reassurance. She noted the point around the need for discipline specific moderation guidance and asked why there was perceived to be a need for this.
- 43.10 Responding, Nir noted that the sciences often have assessments which are multiple choice or have a right/wrong answer with no discretion involved. He suggested the moderation changes seemed to be a blanket requirement which were unnecessary, particularly where something was marked by computer.
- 43.11 Jo-Anne agreed that where there was a right/wrong answer it required a sample approach just to ensure accuracy and she agreed that this would be something which would be looked at.
- 43.12 Karen Scott, MMSN noted the document required all assessments to be marked anonymously and queried whether MyAberdeen had been adjusted to accommodate this? She commented that in the previous year students had been told marking would be anonymous, but MyAberdeen had listed names.
- 43.13 Steve confirmed that this point had been raised and that, in discussion with the Centre for Academic Development (CAD), assurance had been given that the ability to mark anonymously did exist withing MyAberdeen. He confirmed that CAD were in the process of creating specific guidance on this topic which would be circulated in due course.
- 43.14 Karen also queried the double marking requirement at honours level. Where the exam questions were worth almost as much as the thesis would these no longer require to be double marked?
- 43.15 Steve confirmed that these would be subject to moderation but would no longer require to be double marked. He also noted, in response to the point made by Nir (minute 43.7 refers), that defined right/wrong answers would not require moderation just checking that the grade distribution appeared in line with expectations.
- 43.16 Will Barras, LLMVC, in the context of essay-based disciplines such as his, noted the proposals were clearly a reduction in workload as currently all work had to be moderated with work at honours levels worth 40% or more having to be second marked. The key difference he identified was second marking only being required for a dissertation or for postgraduate theses, where there is a robust process for two markers agreeing a mark. He noted that in the run up to the discussions at QAC, and the School Education Committee, the School had had a lot of feedback from colleagues. He had a statement from one of the School's Exams Officers concerned about the work to be moderated. The individual had said 'moderation was about

confirming the accuracy, consistency and fairness of the marking' and their External's feedback on this was that this did not require double marking and if time could be saved on double marking more time could be spent on the quality of comments made, the balance between praise and instruction, the degree to which the markers comments matched the mark, rather than it being a process of catching individuals out by doing double marking where it is not always required. He agreed that the process did have the potential to reduce workload but that this required, as others had noted, some guidance on what was required for moderation. He suggested that this was something that School Education Committees, in conjunction with QAC representatives, could maybe play a part in. He noted the process should be about ensuring accuracy, fairness and consistency while keeping workloads manageable.

- 43.17 The Principal commented that it was helpful to have received the powerful example of workload reduction as well as the helpful suggestion for guidance during the implementation phase for different disciplines and schools.
- 43.18 Alex Brasier, School of Geosciences, suggested that it would be helpful to have guidelines on how to record what happened during the moderation process. He noted this was something that had been requested by External Examiners in order that they were able to receive confirmation that work had been moderated and this recorded. Whether this is emails between staff or some way within MyAberdeen it would be helpful.
- 43.19 Steve noted that such discussions were ongoing with CAD who had examples and potential template in addition to functionality in MyAberdeen which might be adapted to fulfil this purpose.
- 43.20 An elected member commented that within their school there was an exam record moderation sheet that was required to be completed and that this contributed more to workload as it required a list of moderated scripts by ID number, average grades and grade distributions and a record of any changes to marks made. She suggested a course with 100 students with moderation of 10-15% a further half day filling in the form so this must be kept proportionate.
- 43.21 Responding Steve acknowledged that the form referred to was school-specific and there were lighter touch ones which might be used.
- 43.22 The Principal stressed the need to ensure that layers were not being added within the Institution which added the workload.
- 43.23 Aravinda Guntupalli, MMSN welcomed the proposal to align processes and benchmark against the sector and noted colleagues had raised queries around the single CGS point and noted that she would feedback Steve's response on this. She noted that when she had moved to Aberdeen the marking process had seemed more hectic than that used elsewhere but she asked, in connection with new courses: when a course was new it was double marked – what would happen to new courses would they continue to be double marked?
- 43.24 Steve confirmed that the proposed process would apply to all courses but noted they were a minimum standard so if there was a requirement within the school or a feeling within a course team or school to monitor in this way, they would be welcome to do.
- 43.25 Sam Newington, DHPA, noted that discussion within the School Education Committee had suggested that a tighter distinction was needed between moderation and second double review which seemed slightly fluid. As had been noted by others there was a need for procedural clarity on this.
- 43.26 Steve confirmed that this had been noted and would be addressed in the final version.
- 43.27 Ekaterina Pavlovskaja, Head of School of Engineering welcomed the workload reduction proposed by the policy. She noted that, from the perspective of Engineering, automatically granting the higher of the two grades for double marked work may lead to grade inflation and suggested this might require further attention and asking people to meet and agree might be a more appropriate way forward.

- 43.28 Steve noted that it had been discussed that even a single CGS point difference should require discussion and the committee had noted that this would result in a huge number of discussions and so the Committee had been seeking to balance the workload savings with the process, as far as possible, but he stressed the discussion could be continued.
- 43.29 Matthew Collinson, NCS noted that within Computing Science a double marking procedure which seemed identical to the proposal, was used and this worked well and received frequent commendations from External Examiners. However, looking at a spreadsheet of what was being done he observed that close to 200 double marking jobs across a three-week marking period shared between 15 people were being done. He confirmed that these things took longer than one hour to mark at a time of peak workload. He had been hoping to get his department to move in the opposite direction from a workload perspective. He suggested careful thought needed to be given to the impact on individual disciplines and their workload over a very tight timescale.
- 43.30 Rhiannan Ledwell, Student President (Education) noted that there was some concern amongst students that marking, and moderation procedures were becoming less robust and asked if there were any data around how many grades actually changed based on procedures currently.
- 43.31 Steve confirmed this was not collected institutionally although individual schools might hold it. Steve sought to reassure students in terms of standards, that the proposal was a shift to align with the rest of the sector and not a lowering of standards to be below those expected across Scotland and beyond.
- 43.32 Jo-Anne added that the process was about the internal processes but there was still the External part of the process that looked across the system for consistency. She noted there were several checks in place for this and the proposal did genuinely bring the University in line with the sector. In addition, she expressed her thanks to everyone who had contributed to the work on this as there had been a huge amount of work and consultation, with the driver being to look at workload and alignment with others in the sector.
- 43.33 The Principal queried with Steve when the process was scheduled to come into effect.
- 43.34 Steve confirmed that as the proposal would have to return to Senate in June and so would not come into force until the new academic year. Steve confirmed the original aim had been to have the new policy in place ahead of the May diet.
- 43.35 The Principal noted his regret that it would not be possible to bring in something workload reducing and in alignment with sector norms that was also QAA compliant.
- 43.36 Pietro Marini, MMSN noted that there seemed to be general agreement in the room and asked if there was any way it could be brought in more quickly and was it possible to approve the process now rather than waiting until the future.
- 43.37 The Principal confirmed that it would be possible to get approval at the meeting and take account of discussions as part of the implementation phase if a vote were proposed and seconded.
- 43.38 Martin Barker, School of Biological Sciences noted concern within his school that there was still a lot of work to be done on the policy and procedures. He noted the schools understanding that the lowering of the threshold for moderation would actually increase the workload rather than decrease it. He added that the University was being encouraged to reduce the number of assessments so inevitably each assessment would become worth more and therefore cross the threshold for moderation. Referring to the point made by Ekaterina (minute 42.26 refers) discrimination by one CGS point and deferring to the higher marker where the higher marker may be less familiar with the work they are marking appeared troubling.
- 43.39 The motion to hold a vote was seconded by Aravinda Guntupalli attending online.
- 43.40 Tracey clarified that the vote would be to temporarily set aside the Standing Order requiring items to be considered at Senate twice before reaching a decision. It would have to be a two-stage vote.

43.41 When the online and in-person votes were combined Senate voted:

Yes	36
No	39
Abstain	2

43.42 The Standing Orders were therefore not set aside, and the proposal would be returned to a future meeting.

OMNIBUS RESOLUTION

- 44.1 Steve Tucker, Dean for Quality Assurance and Enhancement introduced the Omnibus Resolution which captured edits to the regulations governing undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees. He noted that a further resolution would be brought to a future meeting to capture ongoing discussions around some postgraduate research regulations. Included within the changes in the resolution, were those required to effect the change from Half-Session to Term as recommended as part of the change approved previously by Senate to the academic year structure. He highlighted that there were updates to the guidelines for the award of compensatory credit and new regulations governing the introduction of the Master in Science (MSc) in Counselling Psychology.
- 44.2 Jen Walklate, School of Social Science noted that the document still included some references to sessions and also suggested that Regulation two would benefit from some clarification. She undertook to take this up with Steve after the meeting.
- 44.3 Martin Mills, School of Social Science queried why the regulations were being changed back to terms again.
- 44.4 Steve confirmed that this was to reflect the previously approved change in the structure of the academic year which replaced half-session with term.
- 44.5 The Resolution was approved by consensus.
- 44.6 The Principal noted that the remaining agenda items would be brought to the next meeting of Senate.

ROUTINE BUSINESS

SENATE ELECTIONS

- 45.1 Senate noted the timeline approved by the Senate Business Committee for the forthcoming Senate Elections

UEC REPORT TO SENATE

- 46.1 Senate noted the routine report from the University Education Committee

URC REPORT TO SENATE

- 47.1 Senate noted the routine report from the University Research Committee

QAC REPORT TO SENATE

- 48.1 Senate noted the routine report from the Quality Assurance Committee