



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Senatus Academicus
Thursday 11 August at 2-5pm
Online meeting
Microsoft Teams

AGENDA

FORMAL MEETING OF SENATE

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------|
| 1. | Senate Minutes
1.1 To approve: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minutes of Senate meeting held on 9 February 2022• Report of E-Senate held from 27 April – 11 May 2022• Minutes of Senate meeting held on 25 May 2022 | S 22/23 1 A |
| 2. | Revocation of Honorary Degree
For formal noting and approval | S 22/23 1 B
CLOSED |
| 3. | Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees
For formal noting and approval | S 22/23 1 C |
| 4. | Senate Standing Committees: Membership and Terms of Reference
For formal noting and approval | S 22/23 1 D |
| 5. | Proposal to bring forward External Effectiveness Review
For formal noting and approval | S 22/23 1 E |
| 6. | Guidelines for Senate Committee Papers
For formal noting and approval | S 22/23 1 F |
| 7. | Regulations Experts and Senate Capacity Building
To comment | S 22/23 1 G |

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTING

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------|
| 8. | Senate Exception Committee Terms of Reference and Membership 2022-23
For approval | S 22/23 1 H |
| 9. | Report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee
For comment (previously received for information) | S 22/23 1 I |
| 10. | Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate
For comment | S 22/23 1 J |
| 11. | Report from the Senate Exception Committee
For comment (previously received for noting) | S 22/23 1 K
CLOSED |

12. Update to Senate ex-officio membership
For noting

S 22/23 1 L

Senate

11 August 2022

Senate Minutes

Description of paper

1. The paper provides the minutes of the Senate meetings held on 9 February 2022 and 25 May 2022, and a report of electronic business conducted between 27 April – 11 May 2022.

Action requested / recommendation

2. For approval.

Resource implications

4. None.

Risk management

5. Not applicable.

Equality & diversity

6. Not applicable.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

7. Senate minutes are published on the Senate website: [Senate agendas, papers and minutes](#).
8. Papers and minutes related to meetings of Senate Standing Committees have been circulated via email to Senate members.

Author

Senate Secretariat
August 2022

Freedom of Information

Open paper

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

held online on Wednesday 9 February 2022 at 2pm

OPEN SESSION

This session is open to all members of staff. Approximately 320 members of staff attended.

1. Convener's Communications

The Convener noted the following points

- Professor David Argyle, the Head of the Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, is acting as interim Head of the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine in the absence of Professor Moira Whyte due to sudden severe illness.
- Two new appointments to the Senior Team were announced before Christmas: Professor Kim Graham will be joining the University from Cardiff in the role of Provost, Professor Christina Boswell has been appointed Vice Principal for Research and Enterprise. More recently Professor Iain Gordon has been appointed Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Science and Engineering and (note added in proof since the meeting) Professor Sarah Prescott will join from University College Dublin as Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences.
- The process to appoint a new University Secretary will begin soon, with the intention of having the role filled by the summer.
- An all staff message will be circulated shortly, addressing issues of staff morale, workload, fatigue, uncertainties caused by the pandemic and current and longer term attractiveness of the UK higher education sector, and issues of freedom of expression.
- A new piece of legislation, the National Security and Investment Act, requires universities to register any acquisition of an entity by a foreign collaborator, particularly in relation to areas of concern for national security. The University will assess its responsibilities under this new legislation.
- Legislation (the Foreign Agents Registration Act) is being considered which would introduce a new requirement for university staff who are overseas nationals working in the UK to join a register. The sector has significant concerns this may introduce onerous bureaucracy without significantly improving national security, and there are ongoing discussions in which the University is represented.
- The University has come through two extraordinary years and demonstrated great resilience, maintaining our excellence in teaching and research, and the Convener thanked all staff for their efforts.

In response to questions, the Convener further noted:

- An all staff email will be circulated shortly, commenting on the University position in relation to upcoming industrial action.
- In relation to recruitment of international students, the University is keen to diversify the regions from which international students are recruited, and to improve accessibility for international students from less privileged backgrounds, particularly through scholarships.

- UK association with the Horizon 2020 scheme is still under discussion, and the University and its international partners, along with other Russell Group universities, are actively supporting association as the best outcome.

2. Strategic Presentation and Discussion The Edinburgh Graduate Vision

Attendees received the following presentations.

Introduction

- Colm Harmon, Vice Principal (Students)

Establishing foundations

- Amanda Percy, Programme and Portfolio Manager Curriculum Transformation Programme

Building engagement

- Jon Turner, Director Institute for Academic Development

Insights from our Workstreams and Groups

- Professor Conchúr Ó Brádaigh, Head of School Engineering, Chair Future Skills Workstream
- Professor Tim Drysdale, School of Engineering, Digital Education Workstream

Specific focus on student engagement

- Ellen MacRae, Edinburgh University Students' Association President
- Tara Gold, Edinburgh University Students' Association VP Education

Looking ahead and concluding comments

- Colm Harmon, Vice Principal (Students)

A recording of the presentation and subsequent discussion is available on request from SenateSupport@ed.ac.uk Further information on the Curriculum Transformation project can be found on the [Curriculum Transformation Hub](#).

Key points made during the presentation:

- Work on the 'Edinburgh Graduate Vision' is being undertaken within the Curriculum Transformation (CT) project. This project has been live for 12 months, and builds on discussions and experience within the University, and experiences of curriculum review in universities internationally. The project is fully committed to engaging internally and externally. The 'Edinburgh Graduate Vision' will inform the CT project and is intended as a basis for further dialogue.
- Feedback from students suggests that they feel they are getting training from the best people in their chosen discipline, but that they are less confident in the support they get to navigate the University, and to manage their path through higher education and into what comes next.
- Feedback from students challenges us to consider, in the broadest terms, the possibilities of the four-year Scottish undergraduate degree, the infrastructure of postgraduate taught programmes, and the introduction of micro credentials, short courses and standalone courses. There is a sense that the nature of the university learner is changing. This may create opportunities to introduce greater flexibility, and to encourage students to embrace challenge and creativity in their learning.
- Work in 2021 has focused on considering what values, attributes, skills and competencies we would expect and hope our future students and graduates will achieve. Work in 2022 will focus on how these aspirations will shape the curriculum in terms of design and structure, but also in relation to approaches to

teaching and learning, as well as the systems, processes and infrastructure that support the curriculum.

- Extensive consultation within the University has been undertaken, through the online CT Hub, dedicated events for staff and students, through the Teaching Network, Colleges and Specialist Services, and the Teaching and Learning Conference. The project is now at a point where consultation and communications must broaden to engage as many members of the University community as possible. Staff interested in joining the Curriculum Transformation Forum or in exploring secondment opportunities were encouraged to contact Jon Turner, the Director of the Institute for Academic Development, at j.d.turner@ed.ac.uk
- Consultation on the Edinburgh student vision is ongoing and will run through to late April 2022. This will feed into work on curriculum design principles and architecture.
- Work on 'Future Skills' is ongoing, and is considering discipline related skills, transferable skills, employability and entrepreneurial skills. This workstream will produce a final report in the next month or two.
- Work on 'Digital Education' is ongoing, and is addressing issues of transparency and data governance, the desire to break down divisions between 'on campus' and 'online' students, the environmental impact of online and offline resources and infrastructure, and ensuring online platforms align with University values and aspirations. A key insight is that digital education is not just about delivery mechanisms, and digital education must be built into curriculum design and development.
- The Student Engagement Strategy Group within the CT project have highlighted the importance of student-staff co-creation of the curriculum and of the CT project. Such collaboration and co-creation is vital to students' sense of belonging and engagement, and as such impacts on the student experience and in particular has the potential to positively impact on equality, diversity and inclusion.
- The first cohort of students following the revised curriculum will enter the University in September 2025. This would require the changes to be communicated to external stakeholders by January 2024, and therefore a substantial part of the project must be undertaken and completed in 2023. It is recognised that this will require significant resource.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- The Edinburgh Futures Institute provides valuable examples of the kind of thinking that should inform the CT project.
- Examples of the kind of change that may emerge from the project include major / minor degree models, and further possible models will be developed for discussion. The early years of undergraduate programmes, and the final year of undergraduate programmes, may provide particular opportunities for innovation.
- While it is recognised that students may have some 'change fatigue,' the Student Support review is in its final stages and this is intended to improve how students interact with the University and, it is hoped, will support students in engaging with and benefiting from curriculum change. Furthermore, an intended outcome of the CT project is to simplify and clarify students' experiences of University systems and processes.
- The introduction of University-level courses for all students was raised in early iterations of the project and this remains a possibility but no decision has been made. But more generally it was noted that changes to current Degree Programme Tables cannot be ruled out.

- In relation to how the CT project relates to and is building on existing curriculum review mechanisms and outcomes, consultation with Schools has provided opportunities to feed in their current plans for curriculum development. The project is capturing examples of practises and approaches that have worked across the University, and is engaging with Schools who have recently gone through curriculum reviews locally. The CT project is an opportunity to identify institutional barriers to change and innovation, and an opportunity to begin with 'blue sky' thinking rather than optimisation of current provision as a first step.
- As well as a student vision, there is a need for a 'teacher vision' and a review of the skills and resources teachers will need to deliver a revised curriculum.
- The student vision is intended to encompass postgraduate as well as undergraduate students.
- The need to continue to meet the requirements of external Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies is recognised.
- Members of the CT programme would be very happy to visit Schools to discuss the project.

The Convener thanked the presenters and attendees for a very engaged discussion.

FORMAL MEETING OF SENATE

This section of the meeting is open to Senate members only.

Present: ANDREANGELI Arianna, ANDREW Ruth, ANDREWS Richard, ARGYLE David, BAILEY Matthew, BARANY Michael, BARLETTANI Diego, BENJAMIN Shereen, BENNETT Stuart, BLYTHE Richard, BOND Helen, BOWD Stephen, BRANIGAN Holly, BRENNAN Mary, BRUCE Tom, CABRELLI David, CAIRNS John, CALVERT Jane, CAQUINEAU Celine, CAVANAGH David, CHAN Un Ieng, CHUE HONG Neil, COHEN Shalhavit Simcha, CONNOR Andrew, CONVERY Alan, COOMBES Sam, COOPER Sarah, CRANG Jeremy, CRUZ Juan, CUNNINGHAM-BURLEY Sarah, DANBOLT Jo, DESLER Anne, DIMARTINO Simone, EFERAKORHO Jite, EUSA VP Activities, EUSA VP Education, EUSA VP Welfare, EVANS Mark, FERNANDEZ-GOTZ Manuel, FISHER Bob, FRENCH Chris, FRIEDRICH Daniel, GILFILLAN Stuart, GORDON Iain, GRANT Liz, GRANT Liz, GRAY Gillian, GREWAL Nisha, HALLIDAY Karen, HARDY Judy, HARMON Colm, HARRISON Tina, HAY David, HAYCOCK-STUART Elaine, HECK Margarete, HENDERSON Sarah, HOLT Sophie, HOPGOOD James, HOY Jenny, HUDSON Andrew, HUNTER Emma, IBIKUNLE Gbenga, JACOBS Emily, Jane HILLSTON, JENKINS Kirsten, KENNY Meryl, KINNEAR George, KIRSTEIN Linda, LIKONDE Samantha, LLORENTE PRADA Jaime, LOS Bettelou, MACCALLUM Sam, MACIOCIA Antony, MACKAY Fiona, MACPHERSON Sarah E, MACRAE Ellen, MARSLAND Rebecca, MATTHEWS Keith, MAVIN Emma, MCCORMICK Alistair, MCMAHON Malcolm, MCQUEEN Heather, MEIKSIN Avery, MENZIES John, MIELL Dorothy, MITCHARD Edward, MORAN Carmel, MORAN Nikki, MORLEY Steven, MORROW Susan, MURRAY Jonny, NAVARRO Pau, NICOL Kathryn, NICOL Robbie, NORRIS Paul, NOWAR Silmee, OMAH Ifeanyi, OOSTERHOFF Richard, OOSTERHOFF Richard, PANTOULA Katerina, Peter MATHIESON, PULHAM Colin, REYNOLDS Rebecca, REYNOLDS-WRIGHT John, RICE Ken, RILEY Simon, ROBBINS Jeremy, ROLLE Sabine, SCHWANNAUER Matthias, SCHWARZ Tobias, SEMPLE Robert, SHIELDS Kirsteen, SHIPSTON Mike, SMITH Sarah, SORACE Antonella, STORRIER Rachel, STRATFORD Tim, TAYLOR Emily, TAYLOR Paul, TERRAS Melissa, TERRY Jonathan, THOMAS Jonathan, THOMAS Robert, TRODD Tamara, TUFAIL-HANIF Uzma, TURNER Adam, TURNER Jon, TUZI Nadia, UPTON Jeremy, WAHI-SINGH Pia, WALSH Patrick, WARRINGTON Stephen, WEIR Christopher, WOHRLE Marie-Louise, YILDIRIM Alper

In attendance: NICOL Kathryn, ALLAN Lewis, MACGREGOR Sue

Apologies: ALIOTTA Marialuisa, BALTARETU Iona, CAMERON Ewen, CHAPMAN Karen, COLLINS Kevin, DAVIES Mia Nicole, DAWSON Karen, DU PLESSIS Paul, DUNLOP James,

ELLIS Heather, EUSA VP Community, EWING Suzanne, HIGHTON Melissa, HOLLOWAY Aisha, JIWAJI Zueb, KENWAY Richard, LAMONT-BLACK Simone, MARTIN Catherine, MCARA Lesley, MCCONNELL Alistair, MCLACHLAN Gavin, MORAN Nikki, MORRIS Andrew, NAYDANI Cynthia, PATON Diana, PHILLIPS Claire, POWELL Wayne, ROBERTSON David, SECKL Jonathan, SIMM Geoff, TURNER Neil, WAD Shrikant, WHYTE Moira

3. Welcome to new student members

The student members below were welcomed to their first Ordinary meeting of Senate:

- Nisha Grewel – PGR School Representative (Physics and Astronomy)
- Silmee Nowar – PGT Section Representative
- Marie-Louise Wohrle – PGR Section Representative
- Diego Barlettani - PGT School Representative (Physics and Astronomy)
- Sam Maccallum - PGT School Representative (Biomedical Sciences)
- Shalhavit Simcha Cohen – PGR School Representative (Health in Social Science)

4. Senate members' feedback on the presentation and discussion topic

Senate members were invited to make any further comments on the presentation and discussion topic. The following points were discussed.

- Costs associated with the Curriculum Transformation (CT) project are approved through the standard University process. The Vice Principal (Students) would be happy to provide a paper to Senate at a later date.
- A query was raised as to how the aims of the CT project build on or are linked to what is unique to Edinburgh: in particular, what evidence on current practices within Schools is being gathered and used to inform the project. This question has been raised and discussed by the CT board. Steven Morley made himself available to be contacted for further information about experiences in Edinburgh Medical School.
- It was recognised that some academic staff may not engage with events such as Senate presentations, and the CT team are keen to engage directly with individual Schools to share information about the project. The 'roadshow' approach that was used for the recent Student Support Project was cited as an example of successful engagement.
- There is anxiety in some areas that the CT project may lead to a cull in disciplines. It was affirmed that the project is not about cutting subject areas; the University's breadth of provision is a key positive feature, and there may be substantial benefits from the project for subject areas with fewer enrolments. The Vice Principal (Students) noted this as a key priority for future communications.
- There was concern about the feasibility of developing, designing and approving significant changes to large numbers of courses and programmes within the timeframe indicated by the project timeline. There was also concern about whether and how the University would provide the level of resource that Schools would require to engage successfully with these changes. The Vice Principal (Students) noted that the need for sufficient resource is recognised and that the project must be successful in giving staff confidence that the required resources will be provided.

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

5. Senate minutes

5.1. Approval of the minutes:

- Minutes of the Senate meeting held on 12 October 2021
- Minutes of the Senate meeting held on 12 November 2021
- Minutes of E-Senate held from 12 – 26 January 2022

The minutes were approved as presented. Senate extended their gratitude to Kate Nicol for documenting a challenging set of meetings.

5.2. Matters arising

5.2.1. E-Senate process

Two proposals for managing E-Senate going forward were presented to Senate. Senate supported, via a vote, the proposal in Paper S 21/22 2 C, as amended at the meeting on 12 November 2021. The decision will be implemented by Senate Support.

5.2.2. Presentation and Discussion topics - **selection process** (Senate paper [S 21/22 2D](#))

Senate was given advance notice that it will be consulted on this via email prior to the next Ordinary meeting on 25 May 2022.

5.2.3. Senate Standing Orders (Senate paper [S 21/22 2D](#))

A brief update was provided by the Convener. Minor revisions to the Senate Standing Orders were proposed following the last Senate annual internal effectiveness review. This action will be held back to allow time to consider whether more substantial updates would be desirable, to make the Standing Orders more accessible and support Senate business. Any revision will require consultation with and approval by Senate.

5.2.4. Senate Standing Committees (Senate minutes 12 November 2022, item 2)

A brief update was provided by the Convener:

- This concerns the Senate Education Committee, Academic Policy and Regulations Committee and Senate Quality Assurance Committee.
- At the last Senate meeting, Conveners of the Standing Committees committing to working to improve communications between Senate and the Standing Committees.
- As an initial measure, Senate members will be notified by email when committee papers for SEC, APRC and SQAC are published, and can pass any comments to their College committee representatives.
- In addition, Senate committee conveners will briefly present the regular update on forthcoming committee business.
- Further thought is required on bringing together a group to review what future improvements to the structure / function of Senate Standing Committees may be required, and Senate will be updated in due course.

6. Senate Assessor Election Regulations

To approve

The following points were discussed:

- Court members do not act as a representative of a particular constituency, but speak from their perspective and experience. Therefore, it may be desirable to reserve one role for a professorial staff member of Senate and one for a non-professorial staff member of Senate.
- Whether ex officio members of Senate should be eligible to stand for election, or whether this should be restricted to elected academic staff members. It was noted that this option had not been explored in the paper. Senate resolved via a vote to put this question to a vote.
- There was some objection to the Chair's decision to take a vote on a contentious issue.
- Senate Assessors' term of office on Senate may end during their term of office on Court. However, the Senate Election Regulations allow for this, and in this circumstance, the Senate Assessor continues to be a member of Senate as an ex officio member.
- In the regulations as proposed, student representative members of Senate would not be eligible to stand or vote.
- Postgraduate Research students who are employed as Tutors and Demonstrators and who are members of Senate in that capacity would be eligible to stand or vote, as members of staff.

Senate approved via a vote the following amendments to the regulations:

1. reserve one Senate Assessor position for a member of non-professorial academic staff, and one for professorial academic staff, and;
2. amend the election regulations to state that only elected academic staff are eligible to stand for election as a Senate Assessor on Court.

Senate approved the regulations with the above amendments. The amended regulations will be published as soon as possible.

7. Senate Academic Staff Member Elections 2021/22

To approve and for information

Senate approved the paper.

8. Senate Standing Committees – upcoming business

To note and comment

No comments were received during the meeting. (Note: the meeting had overrun the allotted time).

Some comments were received by email following the meeting. The Senate Standing Committee Conveners responded by email and a summary is provided below. Conveners will note these queries and responses to their committees at their next meeting.

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC)

- A Data Task Group is currently considering retention and progression monitoring data, including data on EDI and awarding gaps, and will report to SQAC in due course.
- SQAC annually review reports on the student discipline and complaints processes. Issues arising are raised with Senate if Senate action is required.
- Student feedback on teaching, learning and the wider student experience is now managed under the [Student Voice Policy](#).

Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)

- Review of the Extensions and Special Circumstances Service (ESC) is ongoing and is interlinked with the work of the Assessment and Feedback Working Group. This work will not be concluded in time for the beginning of the 2022/23 academic year.
- APRC will receive a paper at their March meeting addressing possible interim measures that might be taken, ahead of 2022/23, to alleviate the impact of high numbers of extensions on the marking and moderation process.
- APRC has not to date formally considered any policy adjustments in response to the ongoing industrial action, but will consider any possible future concessions to academic regulations as required.

Senate Education Committee (SEC)

- Optional Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey questions are recommended by the Deputy Secretary Students working in consultation with the Students' Association Sabbatical Officers, and discussed by SEC members with their relevant stakeholder groups. The proposed topic this year is 'Welfare', reflecting the ongoing work taking place on student support. Inclusion of questions on this topic would enable monitoring of responses before, during and after the implementation of the new student support model.
- SEC are in the process of considering proposals for additions to the activity recognised under the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR), and there will be further discussion on this at the SEC meeting in March 2022.
- The Vice Principal (Students) will continue to update Senate on developments in relation to the Curriculum Transformation (CT) programme of work, including through the 'open session' format as at the 9 February 2022 meeting. All proposed changes will be tracked through the appropriate governance channels, including University Executive and Court, with matters of academic consideration being the focus of all three of the delegated Senate Standing Committees with feedback from and to Senate. Court will also consult with Senate as required. Timelines for the CT programme were discussed at the Senate open session on 9 February 2022.

9. Resolutions

To comment

No comments were received.

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTING

10. Research Strategy Group update

To note

The paper was noted

Electronic Senate

Report of Electronic Business of Senate conducted between Wednesday 27 April and Wednesday 11 May 2022

ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL

2. **New Members**

Senate noted the new members.

3. **Resolutions (e-S 21/22 3 B)**

Senate considered the draft Resolutions below and offered no observations.

No. 7/2022: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Energy Systems

No. 8/2022: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Matter and Motion

No. 9/2022: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Ecology

No. 10/2022: Foundation of a Chair of Epidemiological Statistics

No. 11/2022: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Politics and Gender

No. 12/2022: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Politics and International Relations

No. 15/2022: Foundation of a Personal Chair of English Literature

5. **Conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus / Emerita (e-S 21/22 3 C)**

Senate agreed to confer the title of Professor Emeritus / Emerita on those professors listed in the paper.

6. **Communications from the University Court (e-S 21/22 3 D)**

Senate noted the report of the University Court from its meeting held by videoconference on 29 November 2021 and 21 February 2022.

7. **Senatus Academicus (Senate) Election Results 2022 – Academic Staff (e-S 21/22 3 E)**

Senate noted the election outcome of the Senate Elections for Academic Staff members 2022.

8. **College Academic Management Structure 2022/23 (e-S 21/22 3 F)**

Senate noted the College Academic Management Structures for 2022/23.

9. **Report of the Knowledge Strategy Committee (e-S 21/22 3 G)**

Senate noted the Reports of the Knowledge Strategy Committee meetings held by videoconference on 1 February and 22 March 2022.

One comment was received in relation to paragraph 2 of the Sustainable IT report. We talk about greening our IT centres, it is unlikely we will reduce the amount of computation we use, and the cost of that electricity is now increasing further. Most of our machine rooms (I think) jump pump the heat away to the atmosphere. Can an estimate be made for the cost of capturing that for each machine room be made, at the very least it could heat water in the buildings. If we are considering replacing air conditioning with more efficient units, that should be a target?

Senate has relayed this to the Clerk of the Knowledge Strategy Committee.

10. **Report of the Senate Exception Committee (e-S 20/21 3 I) CLOSED**

Senate noted the report of the Senate Exception Committee.

11. **Dates of Meetings of Senate 2022/23**

Senate noted the dates of the Senate meetings in 2022/23.

SENATUS ACADEMICUS

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

Held in-person at Lecture Theatre A, 40 George Square on
Wednesday 25 May 2022 at 2pm

OPEN SESSION

This session is open to all members of staff. Approximately 130 members of staff attended.

11. Convener's Communications

The Convener noted the following points

- The publication of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) gives cause for pride in the achievements of the University, especially for the researchers, technical staff and all staff involved in the submission. The University has emerged well and congratulations were extended to all involved.
- The QS World University Rankings are to be published in June 2022. The University of Edinburgh has risen to fifteenth in the world.
- Professor Moira Whyte, who has been very unwell, has been discharged from hospital and is making excellent progress in her recovery.
- The University is performing well in terms of finance and demand for student places as demonstrated by student application numbers. This is a positive indication of the University's reputation. The Convener noted that there will be ongoing challenges around staff workload, morale and satisfaction and there is a great deal of work being done in this area.
- The Convener extended apologies to colleagues unable to attend the in-person meeting, and noted that requests were received for the 25 May meeting to be held in hybrid format. Efforts to arrange a hybrid meeting were ongoing until the meeting took place, however could not be achieved for the 25 May meeting. The Convener identified that the technology in large lecture theatres was insufficient to facilitate a hybrid meeting, however this will be taken forward ahead of future meetings.
- The Convener also noted the unsuitability of the venue for wheelchair users. The venue had been chosen for its size. Accessibility will be taken into account for future in-person meetings.

The Convener invited questions from the audience and responses to these are noted below:

- The Convener reiterated his apologies to colleagues unable to attend the in-person meeting and the pros and cons of hybrid or fully online meetings will be considered in future. The technology in the large lecture theatres available was insufficient to facilitate a successful hybrid meeting of Senate on this occasion.

12. Strategic Presentation and Discussion

Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) Outcomes and Actions

Attendees received the following presentations.

Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) Outcomes and Actions

- **Introduction and overview of ELIR response:** Professor Tina Harrison, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
- **Update on approach to student support:** Lisa Dawson, Deputy Secretary, Students (interim); Dr Chris Mowat, Director of Teaching, School of Chemistry
- **Update on approach to assessment and feedback:** Dr Sabine Rolle, Dean for Undergraduate Studies, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; Professor Tina Harrison, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance

Key points made during the presentation:

- ELIR is the method used by the Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (QAAS) to review and assess the effectiveness of higher education institutions' approaches to securing academic standards and the quality of the student experience.
- Edinburgh's review took place in February/March 2021, with the final report received in July 2021. Edinburgh received a positive outcome, and the judgement was of effectiveness, which is the highest judgement that can be achieved.
- The University is required to provide an update on the progress against the recommendations made by QAAS by July 2022. The response to the review is being managed by the ELIR Oversight Group, who are responsible for leading and driving forward the recommendations. A draft ELIR Report has been discussed by the Senate Quality Assurance Committee and the University Executive. A copy is also included in the 25 May Senate papers for comment. University Court is responsible for approving the final report which will be submitted to QAAS.
- The two priority recommendations given are Student Support and Assessment and Feedback. QAAS has asked to see demonstrable improvement in these two areas.
- Student Support:
 - ELIR Recommendation: *"make **significant progress** in implementing plans to ensure an effective approach to offering personal student support ... The University should make **demonstrable progress within the next academic year** in respect of ensuring **parity of experience for students and effective signposting to support services and delivery of an agreed and consistent baseline level of provision**. As part of its approach, the University is asked to develop an effective mechanism to **monitor consistency of implementation and allow it to evaluate the impact of these changes on the student experience**."*
 - The University has worked to develop a new student support model in response to the ELIR recommendations. The new student support model will be implemented from September 2022, with the intention that this will be embedded by September 2023.
 - The new model focussed on providing an ecosystem of support, which was endorsed by QAAS.
 - There has already been investment made in supporting students and recruitment is underway to fill professional services roles including Student Advisor and Wellbeing Advisor positions with staff to commence in July/August 2022.
 - Academic Cohort Lead are an academic staff role, which is separate to the support provided by professional services staff. The Academic Cohort lead will provide academic support and develop community within a cohort. There is an assumed ratio of 80-1 however there is flexibility within this. It is up to Schools to plan how they intend to implement the ratio and define cohorts. The Academic Cohort Lead is to consider developing relationship building between students and staff, and facilitate co-curricular, extracurricular or social activities for cohorts.

- Further information is available on the new student support model are available from the [Student Support - Briefing Resources for Schools and Deaneries - Home \(sharepoint.com\)](#).
- Assessment and Feedback:
 - ELIR Recommendation: “*The University is asked to **make demonstrable progress, within the next academic year**, in prioritising the development of a **holistic and strategic approach** to the design and management of assessment and feedback*”.
 - The task group considered assessment, feedback, marking schema and academic year. They focussed on assessment and feedback as the most pressing issues for the ELIR review.
 - A set of Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities have been established for implementation from the 2022/23 academic year. These principles and priorities set the baseline expectation for quality and practice and take a holistic and strategic approach. Principles and priorities were developed against benchmarking across other institutions, especially those who perform well in the National Student Survey.
 - Support for staff in implementing the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities will be developed through building a community of best practice through Director of Teaching networks.
 - Principles and priorities were co-created with students, and guidance for students will be developed. There is a strong emphasis on working with students as partners in developing assessment and feedback.
 - Further information on the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities is available in the Senate Education Committee papers.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- It was noted that the 80-1 ratio for Academic Cohort Leads may be an unmanageable load for staff, it was noted that the new model would reduce interactions with academic staff and may erode the one-to-one relationship between academic staff and students.
It was reiterated that the new model is not trying to fit the current student support model that is in place. The 80-1 ratio is given as a guide and Schools are able to invest further if they wish to. The ratio gives consistency around wellbeing support for students. It was noted that some staff are disappointed that they will no longer have interactions with students as Personal Tutors, however it was reiterated that colleagues will be able to continue supporting students via other roles, for example via interactions via teaching or supervision.
- A question on how QAAS will measure demonstrable progress was received. It was noted that QAAS will determine if sufficient progress has been made from the ELIR Year-on report. Early conversations with QAAS are positive, though if insufficient progress is made then there will be follow up conversations held.
- In response to a question on whether Student Advisors were a professional services or academic role, it was confirmed that Student Advisors would be professional services roles, and training will be focussed on triaging students to seek relevant support. This may involve referring students to meet with the Academic Cohort Lead, or other relevant staff. This will continue to be monitored during the roll-out phase and tweaks will be made as necessary.
- The idea of a Student Support Statement was raised. It was noted that a statement, similar to that of the Personal Tutoring statement, may be beneficial to manage expectations on the support provided by Academic Cohort Leads. It was confirmed that Academic Cohort Leads have flexibility to tailor the approach to the needs of students, the academic layer of support can be responsive and contextualised to the type of student being supported by the Leads.

- Facilitating engagement of students and staff with the Assessment and Feedback guidance being developed was received. It was noted that details around the guidance are still to be confirmed and it is intended that this will be created in consultation with students.
- A question regarding the budget and resource for implementing the student support model and assessment and feedback principles and priorities was received. It was confirmed that work on the Curriculum Transformation project was ongoing, and work is being done to embed the new model into the existing systems.
- It was confirmed that a paper would be presented to Academic Policy and Regulations Committee to relax the fifteen working day turnaround for marking in 2022/23, with emphasis to be on providing useful and meaningful feedback to students.

The Convener thanked the presenters.

Research Excellence Framework 2021

- **Introduction and Overview of Results:** Professor Christina Boswell, Dean of Research for CAHSS and incoming Vice Principal for Research and Enterprise
- **Funding and the Research Excellence Grant:** Ms Pauline Manchester, Deputy Director of Planning and Policy
- **Perspective from Physics:** Prof Ken Rice, Unit of Assessment Coordinator, Physics
- **Perspective from Art and Design:** Dr Kamini Vellodi, Director of Research Excellence, Edinburgh College of Art

Key points made during the presentation:

- An overview of the University's REF submission was received. Edinburgh returned submissions for 28 of the 34 subpanels and there was a significant increase in submissions for 2021 when compared with 2014.
- It was noted that in 2014 Edinburgh included all research in the REF submission, where as other institutions may have included only their highest performing research.
In 2021, all research was to be included for all institutions. This may indicate substantive growth in research at other institutions, though this may not be an accurate reflection of actual growth.
- There was overall growth across the main panels, though not all of this will be substantive growth in research numbers.
- Edinburgh did very well on Research Environment.
- Impact wasn't as glowing, and Edinburgh is now lagging behind institutions that made investment in impact.
- Outputs are just below the Russell Group average, and a focus on fewer and higher quality outputs is important.
- The importance of REF was explained, and it was noted that REF is a source of income, and has reputational importance to attract students, staff and funding.
- The funding received as a result of the REF will depend on how the University performs in relation to Scottish competitors. The Research Excellence Grant is a flexible funding source and the funding received from this grant will be determined by the REF. In a Scottish context, Edinburgh generally performs well and Edinburgh has received 31% of Scotland's total for over 10 year. In 2021-22 the University received £82 million in funding from the Research Excellence Grant.

- The REF drives good practice. When compared with 2014, there is an average of 2.5 outputs over 7 years. REF helps to identify gaps in support, identify EDI issues, and provide support for early career researchers.
- Some further analysis on the data collected, including gender representation, will be undertaken.
- Professor Ken Rice spoke to the experience of The School of Physics and Astronomy and noted that the School had suffered from a lack of diversity, and REF had provided an opportunity to examine the School's EDI position. The REF is not a major driver of EDI, however it is key that EDI is assessed in the REF Environment Statement. Positive outcomes from the REF include a fewer outputs and greater inclusivity. Post-REF, there has been an increase in the number of female Chairs with an increase from 1 to 9 chairs held by female colleagues in 2021.
- Dr. Kamini Vellodi spoke to the experience of Edinburgh College of Art (ECA). The REF has been a driver for positive change in ECA, with a range of research types being included in the submission. There was an increase in researchers included in 2021, when compared with the 2014 submission. It was noted that a number of colleagues did not see their work as research, and ECA has a large part-time staff community and many of these colleagues do not produce outputs under the badge of the University. ECA submitted representation of research and included output as process, rather than only works produced.
- The Future Research Assessment Programme review is underway and this will tweak the process the next REF.
- Focus towards the next REF will be on gathering insights on reviewing across panels, enhancing support for impact, understanding inequalities in the submission and strengthening good research culture.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- It was noted that the University adopted a policy to not inform colleagues of their ranking, whereas other universities in the sector and within the Russell Group did share rankings with staff. It was queried whether this policy would be revisited in the future.
The University saw REF as a collective effort and the decision was taken to decouple staff from their outputs in a way that was consistent with the Code of Practice.
It was noted that the way REF was approached by the University enabled the REF to be undertaken with a lower level of anxiety than colleagues at other UK institutions. With the results of REF now available, some institutions are announcing substantial redundancies, it was queried what the University Executive are doing around this.
The approach taken by Edinburgh has allowed for the link between performance and REF to be diluted, though this does not dilute institutional impact.
Universities UK are responsible for taking forward conversations around research concentration.
- The division of funding allocated by the Scottish Funding Council was raised and it was questioned how the budget is divided. The funds received go into an overall budget pool. Data is used to inform the process, however the division of funds is a nuanced process.
- It was noted that the GPA awarded for digital artefacts is higher than books or monographs. It was queried how the results of REF may feed into the digital strategy. This was noted by the presenters.
- It was noted that University systems, including PURE, are underutilised and colleagues were encouraged to use PURE to catalogue and promote research.

- It was noted that the University had some very highly ranked submissions and a very high number of researchers from across disciplines. Congratulations and thanks was extended to all staff involved in REF.

The Convener thanked the presenters and attendees.

A recording of the presentation and subsequent discussion is available on request from SenateSupport@ed.ac.uk.

FORMAL MEETING OF SENATE

This section of the meeting is open to Senate members only.

Present: The Principal, ANDREW Ruth, ANDREWS Richard, BARAKAT Ammir, BARANY Michael, BENJAMIN Shereen, BLYTHE Richard, BOSWELL Christina, BUDD Adam, CAIRNS John, CALVERT Jane, CAQUINEAU Celine, CHUE HONG Neil, COHEN Shalhavit Simcha, CONNOR Andrew, CRUZ Juan, CUNNINGHAM-BURLEY Sarah, DANBOLT Jo, DESLER Anne, DIMARTINO Simone, DONOVAN Kevin, DUNLOP James, EFERAKORHO Jite, FISHER Bob, GORDON Iain, HARDY Judy, HARMON Colm, HARRISON Tina, HILLSTON Jane, HUNTER Emma, KINNEAR George, KIRSTEIN Linda, LORETTO Wendy, MACCALLUM, MacPHERSON Sarah, MARSLAND Rebecca, MENZIES John, MIELL Dorothy, MORAN Nicola, NORRIS Paul, NOVENSON Matthew, NGWENYA Bryne, O BRADAIGH Conchur, OOSTERHOFF Richard, PATON Diana, PULHAM Colin, RICE Ken, RILEY Simon, ROLLE Sabine, SIMPSON Beth, SIRO Reka, SMITH Sarah, TAYLOR Emily, TERRAS Melissa, TRODD Tamara, TURNER Adam, TUZI Nadia, VELLODI Kamini, WEIR Christopher

In attendance: DAWSON Lisa, HAYES Olivia, MACGREGOR Sue

Apologies: ALIOTTA Marialuisa, ANDREANGELI Arianna, ARGYLE David, BALTARETU Ioana, BARLETTANI Diego, BAYNE Sian, BOMBERG Elizabeth, BOND Helen, BRADFIELD Julian, BRANIGAN Holly, BRENNAN Mary, CRANG Jeremy, CRITCHLEY Hilary, DAVIES Mia Nicole, DU PLESSIS Paul, ELLIS Heather, EUSA VP Welfare, EVANS Mark, EVENSEN Darrick, EWING Suzanne, FERNANDEZ-GOTZ Manual, FRIEDRICH Daniel, FRENCH Chris, GENTZ Natascha, GRAY David, GRAY Gillian, GREWAL Nisha, HAYCOCK-STUART Elaine, HEYCOCK Caroline, HIGHTON Melissa, HOLLOWAY Aisha, HOLT Sophie, IBIKUNLE Gbenga, JACOBS Emily, JENKINS Kirsten, JIWAJI Zueb, KENNY Meryl, KENWAY Richard, KHATTAR Medhat, LLORENTE PRADA Jaime, LLOYD Ashley, McARA Lesley, McQUEEN Heather, MACIOCIA Antony, MARTIN Catherine, MATTHEWS Keith, MEIKSIN Avery, MOLE Damian, MORAN Carmel, MORLEY Steven, MORRIS Andrew, MORROW Susan, MURRAY Jonny, NAVARRO Pau, NICOL Robbie, NOWAR Silmee, PHILLIPS Claire, REYNOLDS Rebecca, REYNOLDS-WRIGHT John, ROBBINS Jeremy, ROBERTSON David, ROSS George, SCHWARZ Tobias, SECKL Jonathan, SHAW Jo, SIMM Geoff, SORACE Antonella, STRATFORD Tim, TAYLOR Paul, TERRY Jonathan, THOMAS Robert, TUFAIL-HANIF Uzma, TURNER Jon, WAD Shrikant, WAHI-SINGH Pia, WARWICK Shona, WARRINGTON Stephen, YILDIRIM Alper

The Convener welcomed Senate members to the meeting, and noted that the meeting was not quorate. The Convener confirmed that those in attendance may provisionally deal with such unopposed business as the Convener shall judge to be of a non-contentious character. Such business shall not include the approval of the Minutes of any previous Meeting. All other business shall be held over until the next Ordinary Meeting.

Senate members raised the following points, which were noted by the Convener:

- The presentations were informative, though these take time from the formal meeting and can be pre-recorded.
- A hybrid meeting may facilitate quorum. It was emphasised that Senate has been quorate when meeting in a remote format over the past two years. It was requested that consideration be given to the timing of the meeting to facilitate attendance from colleagues who have caring commitments. It was noted that School commitments, such as School Away Days prevented attendance from some members.
- Members requested that they be able to submit written comments for inclusion in the minutes by email following the meeting as there may be insufficient time to receive these during the meeting.

The Convener confirmed that written comments are welcome, though these may not be included verbatim.

13. Senate members' feedback on the presentation and discussion topic

Senate members were invited to make any further comments on the presentation and discussion topic. The following points were discussed.

- The size of the cohort for student support and the 80-1 ratio identified during the ELIR presentation was noted as a concern. It was noted that large ratios may mean that students would be overlooked, and students would not have the personalised interactions with staff available under the existing Personal Tutor system.
The 80-1 ratio is a guideline and there is opportunity for flexibility around this. The ratios were established following the initial consultation which took place. It was noted that support available under the existing Personal Tutor model is patchy, and emphasis was made that the new model is a *new model* and does not intend to replace or replicate the old, nor remove a relationship between staff and students. Consultation looked at other institutions and the new model is informed by the findings of this.
- There was concern raised that a valuable feature of the existing Personal Tutor system would be lost under the new model, as students will no longer have a compulsory meeting with their Personal Tutor in each semester. It was noted that the compulsory nature of the meeting forced students to engage in a relationship with academic staff, and was an opportunity for students to review their course marks with their Personal Tutor. Meetings would now be by request only.
The new model will provide a consistent and enhanced level of student support and schools have extensive control over how they would like to implement the new system. The aim of the new model is to improve systems of support and local control over this will be available.
- A query was raised regarding whether the right systems are in place.
On the technical systems point, there are some systems still to be put in place and processes still to shift, work on this is in progress.
On the systems contained within the new model. The social aspect and community building are not included in the current student support systems, and data indicates that many students have never met with their Personal Tutor. The new system challenges the premise that a one-to-one meeting is the cornerstone of an academic relationship and empowers the cohort lead to develop the social aspect and support activities around this.
The University is moving to a radically different way of managing student support. The new system moves away from a single point of failure, to a four pillars approach and there is opportunity for students to strengthen and build

relationships. Schools should not be limited by the changes, but find opportunity to build on the new system. Academic Cohort Leads will have the opportunity to build a sense of community, in addition to providing support for professional development.

- Student members were invited to comment on their experience of student support. Student's experiences of the existing system is varied, and it was noted that the one-to-one meetings with a Personal Tutor (PT) at the start of a student's programme helps them to form a good relationship with their PT. It was also suggested that consideration be given to the 80-1 ratio. Some students may benefit from a personalised experience and the new model may be a challenge for students who may feel as though they are "just another number". It was noted that students may also be reluctant to reach out to a staff member they do not know.

Senate members were invited to submit any further comments in writing via email.

Comments received by members via email following the meeting:

- A query was received on the ELIR Outcomes and Actions presentation. Senate approved a draft "direction of travel" for the ELIR response at the 7 October 2021 meeting, and members raised concerns at the time of approval. It was queried what action had been taken to address the concerns raised.
- A concern was raised on the expectation of staff to align teaching practices with the teaching and assessment principles. Specifically, the autonomy of teaching staff to determine the best teaching and assessment practices within their respective fields.
- It was queried how programme-level oversight and coordination would apply to those courses not owned by, or not aligned with, a specific degree programme.
- A comment was received regarding attainment gaps and it was noted that we have been aware of these for some time. It was queried why there is not implementation of evidence-based remedies in the ELIR response, as opposed to further studying and reviewing these.
- A comment was received regarding the comparison of the new Student Advisor roles to "para-academic" roles in the American system. It was noted that para-academic roles are commonly held by staff with postgraduate qualifications relevant to the subjects they support, or in areas of student support and wellbeing. It was queried what evidence demonstrates that UG and PGT students require the transactional support being proposed and introduced under the new Student Advisor position, which does not require postholders to have subject-specific or student support related qualifications.

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

14. Senate minutes (S 21/22 A)

14.1. Approval of the minutes:

- Minutes of Senate meeting held on 9 February 2022
- Report of E-Senate held from 27 April – 11 May 2022

This item was not considered as the meeting was not quorate.

14.2. Matters arising

- 4.2.1 Presentation and Discussion topics – selection process ([Senate paper S 21/22 D](#) - Appendix 1, Suggested actions in response to 2020/21 review)

The Convener and advisers will consider and comment on the suggestions put forward for the presentation and discussion topics for next academic year. Members will be informed of the topics chosen once confirmed.

4.2.2 Senate Standing Committees ([Senate minutes 12 November 2021, item 2](#))

This item will be addressed under Paper E.

4.2.3 Report of Curriculum Transformation Programme costs ([Senate minutes 9 February 2022, item 4](#))

Professor Harmon will circulate an update to members via email.

15. Revocation of Honorary Degree – CLOSED (S 21/22 B)

For formal noting and approval

This item was not considered as the meeting was not quorate.

16. Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees (S 21/22 C)

For formal noting and approval

The Convener of Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC) gave a verbal update on the 17 May meeting of APRC which was held to consider relaxation of regulations under Regulations 70 and 71 of the Taught Assessment Regulations due to disruption from ongoing industrial action. Key points made:

- An unconfirmed minute from 17 May meeting was circulated to members with the 26 May APRC papers.
- APRC agreed there was significant risk of disruption as a result of the industrial action and considered relaxing regulations. All concessions approved were conditional on the proposed industrial action having an impact. Since the 17 May meeting the industrial action has been suspended and it is anticipated that a widespread relaxation of regulations is not required.
- If Boards are impacted by industrial action, then these will be considered by APRC on a case-by-case basis.
- A member raised a query on the volume of external examiner concessions approved, and the reason for these.

The Convener of APRC confirmed that there was a small number of cases of external examiner concessions approved due to external examiner resignations. These have been dealt with on a case-by-case basis and is in line with action taken in previous years. The Convener of APRC agreed to update Senate on action taken in relation to external examiners over the coming weeks.

Some comments received by members via email following the meeting are outlined below:

- A query was raised on the detail included in the annual report and whether this was consistent with effective Senate oversight. Senate Standing Order 22 (b) was referenced.

Senate was invited to approve the annual report by a show of hands. The annual report was opposed and therefore this paper was not approved as the meeting was not quorate.

A motion was moved and seconded to move to item 16 on the agenda, *Proposed Revision to the Sustainable Travel Policy*. The Convener invited members to vote on the motion and this motion was passed. The Convener confirmed that items 7-11 would be considered first, as approval was required ahead of the 2022/23 academic year, and would then move to item 16 on the agenda.

17. Senate Standing Committees: Membership and Terms of Reference (S 21/22 D)

For formal noting and approval

It was noted that minor changes to the titles of CAHSS members included on the Senate Education Committee would be required to align with a recent restructure in the College. These changes would be sent by email following the meeting.

Senate members were invited to raise comments on the paper. The points below were made:

- It was highlighted that there is no Postgraduate Taught representative on the Senate Education Committee.
The Convener of the Senate Education Committee accepted this point and noted that the existing membership is a result of the last review. He would support this addition being made when amendments to the membership can be considered by Senate.

It was noted that the Doctoral College is represented on the Committee.

Members asked to put forward amendments to the paper. It was confirmed that as the meeting is not quorate, amendments could not be considered. A continuation of the previously approved terms of reference would continue in the interim. The Convener proposed that a continuation of the previously approved terms of reference continue until a new set are approved, no objections to this were raised at the time.

18. Proposal to bring forward External Effectiveness Review (S 21/22 E)

For formal noting and approval

The Convener noted that the proposal to bring forward the External Effectiveness Review can be considered, however as the meeting is not quorate the detail included in Appendix 1, including the Terms of Reference cannot be amended or approved by Senate.

Senate members were invited to raise comments on the paper. The points below were made:

- There is limited involvement and contribution to Senate business by student members. The involvement of student members does not appear to be as effective as it could be.
- Concern was raised with the process for conducting the review, including adequate representation of Senate members' views in the review.

Senate was invited to approve bringing forward the external review by a show of hands. The proposal received unanimous support and therefore the proposal to bring forward the external review was approved.

The contents of Appendix 1 including the Terms of Reference, process for appointing an external reviewer and the process for conducting the review, were not considered

because the meeting was not quorate. This detail would be considered at the next quorate meeting of Senate.

19. Court Resolution: Undergraduate and Postgraduate Degree Regulations (S 21/22 F)

To comment

Senate members were invited to comment on the paper. Final approval of the Degree Regulations is a matter for Court.

A member noted that Regulation 24 of the Postgraduate Degree Regulations state that students are expected to attend and participate in-person. It was suggested that flexibility around this point may be of benefit to students. An example was given where students may be required to conduct research abroad or have built valuable connections in their home country which they can utilise in conducting their research.

Some comments received by members via email following the meeting are outlined below:

- It was queried whether the revisions to Regulation 24 of the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Degree Regulations consider the lessons learnt throughout the pandemic and allow suitable flexibility for students who experience barriers to in-person attendance, where suitable accommodations can be made without compromising learning.
- It was queried whether the revisions to Regulation 26 of the Undergraduate Degree Regulations, and Regulation 30 of the Postgraduate Degree Regulations are appropriate matters for inclusion in degree regulations as visa and immigration status are matters for the Home Office.

20. Court Resolution: Amendment to the Blackie Memorial Prize (S 21/22 G)

To comment

Senate members were invited to comment on the paper. Final approval of the Resolution is a matter for Court.

No comments were received during the meeting.

One comment was received by a member via email following the meeting. It was questioned whether the proposal is in line with the University's commitment to move away from casual contracts, and whether an alternative proposal to support a permanent post, or converting a casual post to a permanent post, could be considered.

21. Court Resolution: Personal Chairs (S 21/22 H)

To comment

Senate members were invited to comment on the paper. Final approval of the Resolution is a matter for Court.

No comments were received during the meeting.

The Convener then moved to item 16, the **Proposed Revision to the Sustainable Travel Policy (2021)**.

22. Clarification to Senate Election Regulations for Vacant Elected Positions (S 21/22 I)

For formal noting and approval

This paper will be considered at the next quorate meeting of Senate.

23. Proposal to hold a By-Election to Fill Senate Vacancies (S 21/22 J)

For formal noting and approval

This paper will be considered at the next quorate meeting of Senate.

24. Guidelines for Senate Committee Papers (S 21/22 K)

For formal noting and approval

This paper will be considered at the next quorate meeting of Senate.

25. Regulations Experts and Senate Capacity Building (S 21/22 L)

To comment

This paper will be considered at the next quorate meeting of Senate.

26. Proposed Revision to the Sustainable Travel Policy (2021) (S 21/22 M)

For approval

The Convener noted that the Sustainable Travel Policy did not fall under Senate's remit, and that proposed revisions could not be approved by Senate. However, the paper could be discussed and comments would be collated and fed back to the University Executive for their consideration.

Senate members were invited to raise comments on the paper. The points below were made:

- Members are aware that the Sustainable Travel Policy does not fall under Senate's remit, however efforts to raise concern with the policy and the contracted travel management company elsewhere have been unsuccessful.
- There are severe concerns with the use of a single travel management company for arranging travel and accommodation bookings for an institution of the University's size. Members raised concern with the use of a single travel management company and the monopoly this creates.
- Members highlighted the difficulties in confirming travel arrangements and noted that significant time was spent trying to arrange travel with the contracted company. The service and support received from the travel management company was inadequate.
- Members noted that the travel management company do not take local knowledge into account when arranging travel and there is serious concern with the safety of arrangements made via the service, especially around accommodation.
- A number of members shared their experiences of arranging travel through the contracted company. Members described instances where they were forced to pay for travel and arrangements out of their own pocket, where a preferred travel

route or mode was not taken into account (for example, travelling by train versus by plane), or where there were inflated prices for the journey when compared with self-managed travel arrangements.

- Inflated travel costs will impact on the use of research grants.
- The process for seeking exception from following the Sustainable Travel Policy, or from using the contracted travel company, are time consuming.
- The process for selecting the contracted travel management company was of concern. The Convener confirmed that a standard procurement process was followed for selecting the contracted company.
- Members are in support of having a sustainable travel policy, though hold significant concerns with the use of a single travel management company for arranging travel.
- Members requested that the mandatory requirement to use the contracted travel management company to arrange travel be removed in time for research travel to be taken over summer 2022.

The Convener also noted that an upcoming meeting of the Academic Strategy Group would be discussing the Sustainable Travel Policy and the service being provided by the contracted travel management company. Members were encouraged to feedback concerns and comments to their Heads of School ahead of the meeting. Members were also invited to submit further comments via email.

The Convener thanked members for a useful discussion and this would be fed back to the University Executive and raised at the upcoming Academic Strategy Group meeting.

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTING

27. Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) Report (S 21/22 N)

For comment

Senate members were invited to submit comments on this paper to the author via email.

28. Senate Exception Committee Terms of Reference and Membership 2022-23 (S 21/22 O)

For approval

The Convener noted that Senate are asked to approve a minor change to the membership of the Senate Standing Committee, which is an update to the Student Association representative on the Committee.

Senate members were invited to approve the updated membership.

Members asked to put forward amendments to the paper. It was confirmed that as the meeting is not quorate, amendments could not be considered. The Convener proposed that a continuation of the previously approved terms of reference continue until a new set are approved, no objections to this were raised at the time.

Senate was invited to approve the paper by a show of hands. The paper was opposed and therefore this paper was not approved as the meeting was not quorate.

29. Report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee (S 21/22 P)

For information

Senate noted the report.

30. Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate (S 21/22 Q)

For noting

Senate noted the paper.

31. Report from the Senate Exception Committee – CLOSED (S 21/22 R)

For noting

Senate noted the paper.

The Convener confirmed that any business not considered by Senate would be held over to the October 2022 meeting of Senate. The Convener confirmed that no presentation and discussion would be held before the October 2022 meeting and expressed his disappointment that there would be insufficient time for the presentation and discussion session, which is valued by Senate members and non-Senate colleagues.

The Convener noted the importance of the sustainable travel policy on the ability of colleagues to make travel arrangements required for research being conducted over the summer period.

A requisition for a special meeting was received by the Convener and signed by 12 members as required by Standing Order 2.

The Convener advised that as stated in Standing Order 2, *Special Meetings will not normally be held outside semester*. This is due to difficulties in achieving quorum, equity of involvement of members over the summer period which is generally reserved for research, and involvement of student members in Senate business. Semester 2 concludes on 27 May and it is not expected that a special meeting will be held outwith Semester 2.

The Convener acknowledged that the Standing Orders do not preclude a meeting from being held outwith Semester, however would consult with the University Secretary to confirm the urgency for holding the next meeting of Senate earlier than the next scheduled meeting in October 2022.

Post-meeting note: after further discussion with colleagues and having received representations from a small number of Senate members it has been agreed that we should take the unusual step of holding a meeting outside term time. This is now scheduled for 11th August and will be held online in order to facilitate attendance by anyone not in Edinburgh on that date.

Senate

May 2022

Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees

Description of paper

1. This is the annual report of the Senate Standing Committees: Education Committee; Academic Policy and Regulations Committee; and Quality Assurance Committee. It reports on the Committees' achievements and use of delegated powers in 2021-22. It also proposes outline plans for 2022-23.

Action requested

2. Senate is invited to NOTE the major items of committee business from 2021-22 and to APPROVE the plans of the Senate Committees for the next academic year.

Background and Context

3. The Senate Standing Committees provide an annual report setting out progress on activities in the past year and seeking Senate approval for their general strategic direction and priorities for the next academic year.

Resource implications

4. The proposed plans for 2022-23 will have some resource implications relating to time spent by members of the Committees and Policy Officers in Academic Services or staff invited to participate in working groups. Some of the resource requirements for wider work of the Committees will be met through existing resources or have agreed funding in place.

Risk Management

5. Each individual strand of proposed activity will be subject to risk assessment as appropriate.

Equality and Diversity

6. Where required, Equality Impact Assessments will be carried out for individual work packages completed next year. It is noted that following discussion of Committee effectiveness in the last academic year, all Senate Standing Committees undertook to place more focus on effective evaluation of E&D dimensions.

Next steps / implications

7. The approved report will be highlighted in the Senate Committees' Newsletter. The Senate Committees will progress the agreed strategic approach during 2022-23 as set out in the report. This report will also be shared with the University Court for information.

Authors

Sue MacGregor, Director of Academic Services
Brian Connolly, Academic Policy Officer
Olivia Hayes, Academic Policy Officer
Pippa Ward, Academic Policy Officer

May 2022

Presenters

Professor Colm Harmon, Convenor of Senate Education Committee
Professor Tina Harrison, Convener of Senate Quality Assurance Committee
Dr Paul Norris, Convenor of Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

Freedom of Information Open

Annual Report of the Senate Committees 2021-22

1. Executive Summary

This report summarises the achievements of the Senate Committees, and their use of the powers delegated to them by Senate, for academic year 2021-22, along with their proposed plans for 2021-22.

2. Introduction

The three Standing Committees of Senate (hereafter referred to as the Senate Committees) are the Senate Education Committee (SEC), Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC), and Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC).

Senate has delegated to these Committees a range of its powers, and these powers are set out in the Committees' Terms of Reference. Links to the Terms of Reference and memberships of the Senate Standing Committees are below:

- [Education Committee](#)
- [Academic Policy and Regulations Committee](#)
- [Quality Assurance Committee](#)

Sections 3, 4 and 5 below provide information on the Standing Committees' activities in 2021/22.

Section 6 sets out proposals for future work. These proposals have arisen from Committee discussions, and discussion at the Senate Committee Conveners' Forum. The proposals are designed to assist the University in pursuing its Learning and Teaching agenda and wider goals and laid out in the University Strategy 2030:

- [Strategy 2030](#)

3. Key Committee and Task Group Activities in 2021-22*

Name of Committee	No. of meetings
Senate Education Committee	5 (one electronic)
Academic Policy & Regulations	7 (two additional, special meetings)
Senate Quality Assurance Committee	5

Name of Task Group	Task Group of:
Personal Tutor System Oversight Group	SQAC
Student Support Services subcommittee	SQAC
Data Task Group	SQAC
Exams Sub-Group	SEC

*Includes meetings scheduled for the remainder of the session.

The remits and memberships of any task groups are available within the relevant Committee pages at: www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees

4. Senate Committees' Progress in 2021/22

Section 4 provides information on progress against the activities proposed in last year's report to Senate. Section 5 provides information on other committee activity in 2021/22.

4.1 Education Committee

Progress with activities proposed in last year's report:

Activity
<p>1. Input into the Curriculum Transformation project</p> <p>Curriculum Transformation was a standing item on Education Committee agendas in 2021/22.</p> <p>Members received a presentation on Curriculum Transformation timelines and the draft 'Edinburgh Student Vision' at its March 2022 meeting, and an update on the Vision consultation at its May 2022 meeting.</p>
<p>2. Ensure effective responses to ELIR recommendations</p> <p>Members received and endorsed the ELIR response action plan at its September 2021 meeting.</p> <p>At its March 2022 meeting, the Committee commented on a paper outlining proposals to develop a holistic and strategic approach to the design and management of assessment and feedback in response to ELIR recommendations. This included consideration of the University's overall approach to assessment and feedback, and assessment and feedback principles aimed at providing a clear set of expectations to bring consistency across the University. An updated version of the principles was brought to the May 2022 meeting for final approval.</p> <p>Education Committee also received, for information and comment, copies of the student experience updates that were taken to University Executive throughout the year.</p>
<p>3. Other matters considered during the year</p> <p>Other key items considered by Education Committee during the year included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Progress with the Doctoral College- The University's involvement in the delivery of microcredentials- Digital Strategy- Academic integrity- Ongoing input into academic year planning in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic (capacity planning, exam diet planning etc.)

4.2 Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)

Progress with activities proposed in last year's report:

Activity

1. Input as required into Curriculum Transformation project (led by Education Committee, carried forward from 2019/20).

The Committee has not yet been required to provide detailed input to this project, although the Committee's experience with regards to the diversification of PGT degree models has been fed into the discussions of the Curriculum Transformation Project. The Committee expects to have greater involvement as at the detailed design and implementation stages, as these are where interaction with academic regulations will occur.

2. Review of Enhancement-Led Institutional Review outputs and take appropriate action as required. (Carried forward from 2019/20).

The committee has not yet been asked to consider any policy or regulation changes as a result of this work. Discussions with relevant colleagues have occurred when the regular work of the Committee has overlapped with points of the ELIR action plan. For instance, APRC discussions around possible changes around coursework extensions and the ELIR response on assessment and feedback

3. Monitor any requirement for longer term regulatory and policy changes as a result of Covid-19 and take appropriate action as required. (Continued from 2020/21).

The Committee has not needed to make any regulatory or policy changes as a result of Covid-19 in 2021-22. The Committee continues to monitor the requirement for longer term regulatory and policy changes as a result of Covid-19.

4. Other matters considered during the year

Other key items considered by Academic, Policy and Regulations Committee during the year included:

- The potential impact of industrial action
- Changes of terminology due to the implementation of the new model of student support
- Short-term adjustments to the policy around extensions and special circumstances
- Minor updates to the Support for Study Policy
- Arrangements for awarding credit to UG students who have a single semester overseas
- Mechanisms for approving courses and programmes offered by EFI

4.3 Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)

Progress with activities proposed in last year's report:

Activity

1. Develop and oversee the implementation of a plan of action in response to the 2021 Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR).

The Committee continues to receive regular updates on the ELIR Action Plan. The University is required to provide a follow-up report to QAA Scotland on actions taken or in progress to address the outcomes of the review one year after the publication of the ELIR reports (15 July 2022). A first draft of the report has been submitted to the University Executive (10 May 2022 meeting), and an update on ELIR actions will be presented to Senate (25 May 2022 meeting). The report will be developed in response to comments from the University Executive and Senate and the ELIR Oversight Group will approve the final version before it is submitted to QAA (with the

proviso that it will need to be endorsed by University Court in October 2022 before the final version can be published).

2. Implement the recommendations from the Digital Maturity report and consider how quality processes and the data that they produce can support the Curriculum Transformation programme.

The Committee is working with Academic Services to develop a SharePoint site to optimize the presentation of quality data/evidence to Schools/Deaneries and encourage greater engagement and traction with quality processes.

3. Continue to examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data in response to the recommendations from Thematic Reviews.

The Committee has driven work to identify awarding gaps across the University via the Thematic Review process (and the Data Task Group established to progress the recommendations of recent reviews) and the annual quality assurance (QA) processes. Schools and Deaneries have increasingly engaged with widening participation (WP) and equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) data to identify any gaps in attainment for different groups of students. However, they have struggled to understand the underlying causes of these gaps or what good practice should be encouraged and cultivated to address them.

The University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) is now undertaking work to determine the underlying causes of awarding gaps and share good practice with Schools to help them address these gaps. The EDIC will explore options to establish a set of expectations or baselines in relation to WP and EDI data (based on the findings of the work to understand the causes of gaps and good practice) to allow Schools to gauge their relative performance. These expectations/baselines will in turn be monitored by the SQAC as part of the School annual reporting process.

The Convenor of EDIC attended the April 2022 meeting of SQAC to consider the roles both committees will have in overseeing the work to determine the underlying causes of the awarding gaps with the aim of establishing and sharing good practice with Schools and Deaneries to help them address these gaps.

4. Engage with quality assurance and enhancement-related aspects of the Scottish Funding Council review of coherent provision and sustainability.

The Committee's focus on the use of quality data (see above) will allow the University to address one of the core principles for the approach to quality assurance and enhancement in the Review report (building on feedback from stakeholders about what is valued in existing approaches): "Evidence-based: data and evidence should inform our understanding of practice and quality assurance, and our plans for enhancement" (page 70). The Committee will receive an update later in this session on the SFC Review and its implications for the University's Quality Framework

5. Implement the recommendations from the review of Course Enhancement Questionnaires (CEQs).

The Committee is monitoring the implementation of the new Student Voice Policy through annual monitoring, review and reporting processes. The Project Board is focused on developing a toolkit to support local collection of end of course feedback (e.g. question banks, different methods of collecting feedback).

5 Other Committee Activity in 2021/22

• Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) Accreditation Committee

The Committee continues to oversee the accreditation of the SRUC programme, 'Environmental Management (BSc)' and the outgoing 'Environmental Resource Management (BSc)'. The Accreditation Committee met in March 2022 and affirmed continued accreditation of the programmes. SRUC's application for Degree Awarding Powers (DAP) has been approved to progress to the scrutiny stage by the QAA Advisory Committee. SRUC has now entered a period of scrutiny which will continue for a minimum of a full year, and there may be an indication of the outcome in Summer 2023.

- The attached Annex sets out any new strategies / regulations / policies / codes that the Committees have approved (the more substantive of which are covered in Section 4 above), along with changes to existing documents.

6 Senate Committees' Priorities for 2022/23

6.1 Planning Context

The year will be planned in the post-Covid context and with continuing attention paid to Strategy 2030. Some ongoing need or preferences for hybrid working will influence the mode of operation and interaction between the Committees and their stakeholders and it is expected that the balance will shift substantially towards in-person/on-campus activity.

6.2 Education Committee

Activity
Curriculum Transformation
Student Experience – ongoing input into matters being taken forward by University Executive
Enhancement-led Institutional Review – ongoing response to outcomes of 2021 ELIR, particularly around assessment and feedback
Doctoral College developments
Academic Integrity

6.3 Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

Activity
Feed into the Curriculum Transformation Programme and support discussion around this.
Continue to support policy changes required as part of the new Student Support model.
Support the review of the Support for Study policy to ensure this remains fit for purpose, particularly in the context of changes resulting from the new Student Support model.
Support a review of coursework extensions and special circumstances policies, taking account of the recommendations of the ESC Review (conducted during 21/22).
Develop a timeline for undertaking the scheduled periodic review of policies which were delayed due to external factors.

6.4 Quality Assurance Committee

Activity
Oversee the implementation of a plan of action in response to the 2021 Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR).
Implement the recommendations from the Digital Maturity report and consider how quality processes and the data that they produce can support the Curriculum Transformation programme.
Continue to examine data and methodological options for the systematic monitoring of retention, progression, and attainment data.
Continue to monitor the implementation of the Student Voice Policy via annual quality assurance processes.
Engage with the QAA and Universities UK review focused on strengthening the external examining system.

Annex – new regulations/policies/codes, and reviews of and amendments to existing regulations/policies/codes, approved by Senate and its Committees during 2021/22

New and updated policies, regulations and guidance will be published on the Academic Services website in due course: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/policies-regulations/new-policies> (currently showing updates for 2021/22. 2020/21).

Senate Committee	Name of document	Type of change (New / Revision / Deletion / Technical Update / Reviewed and no changes made)
SEC	Open Educational Resources Policy	Revision
SEC	Policy for the Recruitment, Support and Development of Tutors & Demonstrators	Revision
SEC	Academic & Pastoral Support Policy	Review underway to take account of changes to the Student Support model
SEC	Virtual Classroom Policy	Minor revision to take account of changes to the Student Support model
SEC	Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy	Review (ongoing)
APRC	Undergraduate Degree Regulations 2022/23	Reviewed and approved at APRC in March 2022.
APRC	Postgraduate Degree Regulations 2022/23	Reviewed and approved at APRC in March 2022.
APRC	Support for Study	Reviewed and approved at APRC in March 2022.
APRC	Authorised Interruption of Study	Reviewed to take account of changes to the Student Support model.
APRC	Course Organiser: Outline of Role	Reviewed to take account of changes to the Student Support model.
APRC	International Student Attendance and Engagement Policy	Reviewed to take account of changes to the Student Support model.
APRC	Performance Sport Policy	Reviewed to take account of changes to the Student Support model.
APRC	Programme and Course Handbooks Policy	Reviewed to take account of changes to the Student Support model.
APRC	Protection of Children and Protected Adults	Reviewed to take account of changes to the Student Support model.
APRC	Undergraduate Progression Boards Policy	Reviewed to take account of changes to the Student Support model.
APRC	Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies Procedure	Reviewed to take account of changes to the Student Support model.

Senate

11 August 2022

Senate Standing Committees: Membership and Terms of Reference

Description of paper

1. Senate Standing Committee Membership and Terms of Reference for 2022/23.

Action requested / recommendation

2. The Membership and Terms of Reference are presented to Senate for approval.

Background and context

3. Under the Senate Standing Orders (22a), Senate may appoint Committees and delegate powers to these committees. Senate approves the membership of these committees annually.
4. Senate currently delegates powers to three Standing Committees: Senate Education Committee (SEC), Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC), and Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC).
5. The membership and terms of reference for SEC, SQAC and APRC were most recently reviewed and approved by Senate in [June 2021](#). This followed a detailed review of these committees in academic year 2018/19 (see [Senate paper C, 29 May 2019](#)).
6. Senate Standing Committees report to Senate annually. These committees feed into and out of College level committees (Undergraduate Education, Postgraduate Education, Quality Assurance) and specialist Support Services (the Institute for Academic Development, Careers Service, Student Recruitment and Admissions, Student Systems) via the committee members. In many cases, therefore, the committee roles are ex officio, to ensure that committee members have the appropriate knowledge, expertise and responsibility / accountability to fulfil the committee remit. All committees include student representation.
7. Senate members who are not included in the Senate Committees' membership may have opportunities to contribute to the work of these committees as co-opted members or as members of working groups.
8. Senate members receive notification via email when papers for Senate Standing Committees are available. Members are encouraged to feed into Standing Committee's by sharing comments or feedback with either their College representative, or in their absence, the relevant Standing Committee Convener.
9. Two diagrams are appended below for information.
 - a. University Court and Senate Committee structure (extracted from the [University Committees](#) webpage)
 - b. An overview of the Senate and College Committee structure

Discussion

10. The Committee membership for Senate Education Committee is in the document below.

11. Since the last meeting of Senate, the Senate Academic and Policy Regulations Committee (APRC) have confirmed the Convener and Vice-Convener of APRC for 2022/23.

12. The Committee membership for Senate Quality Assurance Committee is in the document below.

13. A minor change to the remit of SQAC is proposed for 2022/23, and this change is marked in red in the document below.

14. The Senate Standing Committee webpages will be updated with membership once all positions are confirmed.

Resource implications

15. No amendments with resource implications are proposed.

Risk management

16. Effective academic governance assists the University in managing risk associated with its academic activities.

Equality & diversity

17. The composition of the Senate Committees is largely determined according to defined role-holders (e.g. defined Assistant or Vice-Principal, Director of a defined Support Service or delegate) or as representatives of particular stakeholders (e.g. a College or the Students' Association). The membership of these Committees is therefore largely a consequence of decisions taken elsewhere to appoint individuals to particular roles. Ensuring that appointment processes support a diverse staff body is part of the broader responsibility of the University.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

18. The Senate Standing Committees' Membership and Terms of Reference are communicated via the Academic Services website: <https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees>

19. Senate Standing Committees are subject to an annual internal review process, and this is reported annually to Senate.

Authors

Olivia Hayes Academic Policy Officer
August 2022

Freedom of Information

Open

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Education Committee Terms of Reference

1. Purpose and Role

- 1.1. The Education Committee is responsible, on behalf of Senate, for taught and research student matters, particularly strategy and policy concerning learning, teaching and the development of curriculum.

2. Remit

- 2.1. Promote strategically-led initiatives and university-wide changes designed to enhance the educational experience of students and learners.
- 2.2. Promote innovations in learning, teaching and assessment, embrace new teaching methods and consider cross-cutting themes such as research-led and technology-enhanced learning, digital and information literacy, education for employability, internationalisation and lifelong learning. Consider and promote local developments or initiatives with substantial implications for University learning and teaching strategy, policy, services or operations.
- 2.3. Oversee policy relating to students' academic experience and proactively engage with high-level issues and themes arising from student feedback.
- 2.4. Give specific consideration to instances in which the experience of one particular cohort of students or learners (undergraduate, postgraduate taught or postgraduate research students, and those involved in non-standard programmes) may diverge from that of others.
- 2.5. Anticipate and prepare for new opportunities and likely future developments in learning and teaching for all cohorts of students and learners.
- 2.6. Consider the implications of the Committee's work and its decisions in the context of external initiatives and compliance and legal frameworks, particularly in relation to equality and diversity.

3. Operation

- 3.1. The Committee reports to Senate, acting with delegated authority to take strategic and high-level policy decisions.
- 3.2. The Committee may bring matters to the attention of the University Executive as required.
- 3.3. The Committee will meet at least four times each academic year and will interact electronically, as necessary.
- 3.4. The Committee will follow a schedule of business set prior to the start of the academic year and which is agreed through consultation with Senate, the Conveners of the other Senate Committees, and other relevant members of the community.
- 3.5. From time to time, the Committee will establish working groups or commission individuals to carry out detailed work under the Committee's oversight.

4. Composition

Role	Term	2022/23 membership
Vice Principal for Students (Convener)	Ex Officio	Professor Colm Harmon
Assistant Principal Academic Standards & Quality Assurance	Ex Officio	Professor Tina Harrison
2 x senior staff members from each College with responsibility for learning and teaching		<p>Professor Sabine Rolle, Dean of Education (CAHSS)</p> <p>Dr. Lisa Kendall, Director of Academic and Student Administration (CAHSS)</p> <p>To be confirmed - Learning and Teaching representative (CSE)</p> <p>Professor Patrick Walsh, Director of Teaching, School of Biological Sciences (CSE)</p> <p>Professor Jamie Davies, Dean of Taught Education (CMVM)</p> <p>Dr. Sarah Henderson, Director of Postgraduate Taught Education (CMVM)</p>
1 x senior staff member from each College with responsibility for postgraduate research		<p>Professor Laura Bradley, Dean of Postgraduate Research (CAHSS)</p> <p>Dr. Antony Maciocia, Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE)</p> <p>Dr. Paddy Hadoke, Director of Postgraduate Research and Early Career Research Experience (CMVM)</p>
1 x Edinburgh University Students' Association, Vice-President Education	Ex Officio	Sam Maccallum, Vice-President Education, Edinburgh University Students' Association
1 x member of the Edinburgh University Students' Association permanent staff	Ex Officio	To be confirmed, Edinburgh University Students' Association Academic Engagement Coordinator
1 x postgraduate research student representative		Marie-Louise Wohrle

1 x Head of School from each College chosen by the Heads of College		To be confirmed – Head of School, CSE Professor Jo Shaw – Head of School, CAHSS Professor Mike Shipston, Dean of Biomedical Sciences (CMVM)
Director of Academic Services, or nominee	Ex Officio	Dr. Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services
Director of Institute for Academic Development, or nominee	Ex Officio	Dr. Velda McCune, Deputy Director Institute for Academic Development
Director of Student Recruitment & Admissions, or nominee	Ex Officio	Rebecca Gaukroger, Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions
Director of Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division of Information Services, or nominee	Ex Officio	Melissa Highton, Director of the Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division of Information Services
Director for Careers & Employability, or nominee	Ex Officio	Shelagh Green, Director of Careers and Employability
Up to 3 co-options chosen by the Convener	Up to 3 years	Marianne Brown, Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling Sian Bayne, Personal Chair of Digital Education

4.1. The Convener can invite individuals for specific meetings or agenda items.

4.2. Substitution of members (i.e. due to inability to attend) shall be at the discretion of the Convener of the Committee.

5. Responsibilities and Expectations of Committee Members

5.1. Be collegial and constructive in approach.

5.2. Attend regularly and participate fully in the work of the Committee and its task / working groups. This will involve looking ahead and consulting / gathering input in order to provide the broad spectrum of thoughts and opinions which are necessary for proper consideration of the area being discussed.

5.3. Take collective and individual ownership for the issues under the Committee's remit and for the discussion and resolution of these issues. In taking ownership of the work of the Committee, members should take steps to ensure that they are empowered to take decisions on behalf of academic and managerial colleagues.

5.4. Be committed to communicating the work of the Committee to the wider University Community

Approved by Senate September 2019

The University of Edinburgh
Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee
Terms of Reference

1. Purpose and Role

- 1.1. The Academic Policy and Regulations Committee is responsible, on behalf of Senate, for the University's framework of academic policy and regulation, apart from those aspects which are primarily parts of the Quality Assurance Framework.

2. Remit

- 2.1. Oversee the development, maintenance and implementation of an academic regulatory framework which effectively supports and underpins the University's educational activities.
- 2.2. Ensure that the academic regulatory framework continues to evolve in order to meet organisational needs and is responsive to changes in University strategy, and in the internal and external environments.
- 2.3. Scrutinise and approve proposals for new or revised academic policy or regulation, ensuring that policy and regulation is only introduced where it is necessary, and that all policy and regulation is suitably accessible to its intended audience.
- 2.4. Act with delegated authority from the Senate on matters of student conduct and discipline.
- 2.5. In taking forward its remit, the Committee will seek consistency and common approaches while supporting and encouraging variation where this is beneficial, particularly if it is in the best interests of students.
- 2.6. Consider the implications of the Committee's work and its decisions in the context of external initiatives and compliance and legal frameworks, particularly in relation to equality and diversity.

3. Operation

- 3.1. The Committee reports to Senate, acting with delegated authority to take decisions regarding the regulatory framework for the University's educational activities.
- 3.2. The Committee may bring matters to the attention of the University Executive as required.
- 3.3. The Committee will meet at least four times each academic year and will interact electronically, as necessary.
- 3.4. The Committee will follow a schedule of business set prior to the start of the academic year and which is agreed through consultation with Senate, the Conveners of the other Senate Committees, and other relevant members of the community.
- 3.5. The Convener, or Vice-Convener will have delegated authority, on behalf of the Committee, to make decisions on student concession cases, and this business may be conducted electronically where appropriate.
- 3.6. From time to time, the Committee will establish working groups or commission individuals to carry out detailed work under the Committee's oversight.

4. Composition

Role	Term	Draft 2022/23 membership
3 x senior staff members from each College with responsibility for academic governance and regulation, and maintaining and enhancing the quality of the student experience at all levels		<p>Dr Paul Norris, Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) (Convener)</p> <p>Dr Jeremy Crang, Dean of Students (CAHSS)</p> <p>Rachael Quirk, Head of Taught Student Administration and Support (CAHSS)</p> <p>Professor Tim Stratford, Dean of Learning and Teaching (CSE)</p> <p>Stephen Warrington, Dean of Student Experience (CSE)</p> <p>Dr, Adam Bunni Head of Academic Affairs (CSE)</p> <p>Dr. Deborah Shaw, Dean of Students (CMVM)</p> <p>Professor Jamie Davies, Dean of Taught Education (CMVM)</p> <p>Philippa Burrell, Head of Academic Administration (CMVM)</p>
1 x senior staff member from each College with responsibility for postgraduate research		<p>Kirsty Woomble, Head of PGR Student Office (CAHSS)</p> <p>Dr Antony Maciocia, Dean of Postgraduate Research (CSE) (Senate member)</p> <p>Dr Paddy Hadoke, Director of Postgraduate Research and Early Career Research Experience (CMVM) (Vice-Convener)</p>
1 x Edinburgh University Students' Association sabbatical officer	Ex Officio	Sam Maccallum, Vice-President, Education
1 x member of the Edinburgh University Students' Association permanent staff		Charlotte Macdonald, Advice Place Manager, Students' Association
1 x member of staff from Student Systems and Administration	Ex Officio	Sarah McAllister, Scholarships and Financial

		Support Team, Student Systems
1 x member of staff from the Institute for Academic development		Professor Cathy Bovill, Senior Lecturer in Student Engagement
1 x member of staff from Academic Services		Dr. Kathryn Nicol, Head of Governance and Regulatory Framework Team
1 x member of staff from Information Services' Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division		Ms Karen Howie, Head of Digital Learning Applications and Media
Up to 3 co-options chosen by the Convener	Up to 3 years	To be confirmed, Edinburgh University Students' Association Academic Engagement Coordinator

4.1. At the final meeting of the academic year, the Committee will identify a Convener and Vice-Convener for the Committee from amongst its membership, to serve in the following year.

4.2. The Convener can invite individuals for specific meetings or agenda items.

4.3. Substitutions of members (i.e. due to inability to attend) will be at the discretion of the Convener of the Committee.

5. Responsibilities and Expectations of Committee Members

5.1. Be collegial and constructive in approach.

5.2. Attend regularly and participate fully in the work of the Committee and its task/working groups. This will involve looking ahead and consulting/gathering input in order to provide the broad spectrum of thoughts and opinions that are necessary for proper consideration of the area being discussed.

5.3. Take collective and individual ownership for the issues under the Committee's remit and for the discussion and resolution of these issues. In taking ownership of the work of the Committee, members must take steps to ensure that they are empowered to take decisions on behalf of academic and managerial colleagues.

5.4. Be committed to communicating the work of the Committee to the wider University community.

The University of Edinburgh

Senate Quality Assurance Committee Terms of Reference

1. Purpose and Role

- 1.1 The Quality Assurance Committee is responsible, on behalf of Senate, for the framework which assures standards and enhances the quality of the student learning experience.

2. Remit

- 2.1 Oversee the delivery and enhancement of the University's quality assurance framework, ensuring that it meets external requirements.
- 2.2 In partnership with Edinburgh University Students' Association, ensure effective student engagement and representation of student voices in the University's quality framework.
- 2.3 Maintain oversight of the outcomes of the quality assurance framework, ensuring that actions are addressed, and support the sharing of good practice.
- 2.4 Promote the quality assurance framework as an important part of the University's activities and ensure that the outcomes inform relevant University business.
- 2.5 Support the University's engagement with external quality requirements and activities, including: Enhancement-Led Institutional Review, the UK Quality Code, and responses to consultations and initiatives.
- 2.6 Identify areas for innovation and enhancement of the student experience and ensure that these inform Senate Education Committee's policy development.
- 2.7 Consider the implications of the Committee's work and its decisions in the context of external initiatives and compliance and legal frameworks, particularly in relation to equality and diversity.
- 2.8 **In relation to academic collaborations with partner institutions: maintain oversight of development, approval, monitoring and review / renewal processes; receive annual reports on activity and identify any areas where action is required to maintain academic standards and the quality of the student experience.**

3. Operation

- 3.1 The Committee reports to Senate, acting with delegated authority to take decisions in the area of quality assurance and academic standards.
- 3.2 The Committee may bring matters to the attention of the University Executive as required.
- 3.3 The Committee has the following sub-committees:
- Student Support Service Sub-Committee - with delegated authority for monitoring the quality assurance of student support services in relation to the student learning experience
 - School Annual Quality Report Sub Group - with delegated authority to review reports and prepare recommendations for consideration by the Committee
- 3.4 The Committee will meet at least four times each academic year and will interact electronically as necessary.
- 3.5 The Committee will follow a schedule of business set prior to the start of the academic year which is agreed through consultation with Senate, the Conveners of the other Senate Committees, and other

relevant members of the community.

- 3.6 From time to time, the Committee will establish working groups or commission individuals to carry out detailed work under the Committee's oversight.

4. Composition

Role	Term	2022/23 Membership
Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance		Professor Tina Harrison, Academic Standards and Quality Assurance (Convener)
An external member from within the Scottish Higher Education sector with experience in quality assurance	3 years (with no reappointment until 4 years has elapsed)	Professor Leigh Sparks, Deputy Principal, University of Stirling
College Deans of Quality (or equivalent)		To be confirmed, Dean of Quality (CMVM) Dr Paul Norris, Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval (CAHSS) Professor Linda Kirstein, Dean of Education Quality Assurance and Culture (CSE)
1 x member of staff from each College with experience of and an interest in quality assurance at a School level		Dr Gail Duursma, Director of Quality, School of Engineering (CSE) Dr Jeni Harden, Director of Quality, School of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences (CMVM) Dr Katherine Inglis, Director of Quality Assurance & Enhancement, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (CAHSS)
1 x Edinburgh University Students' Association sabbatical officer		Sam Maccallum, Vice-President, Education
1 x member of the Edinburgh University Students' Association permanent staff		To be confirmed Edinburgh University Students' Association Academic Engagement Coordinator
1 x member of staff from the Institute for Academic Development		Olivia Eadie, Assistant Director and Head of Operations and Projects, Institute for Academic Development
1 x member of staff from Academic Services		Nichola Kett, Academic Policy Manager, Academic Services

Up to 3 co-options chosen by the Convenor	Up to 3 years	Marianne Brown, Head of Student Analytics, Insights and Modelling
---	---------------	---

4.1 The Convenor can invite individuals for specific meetings or agenda items.

4.2 Substitutions of members (i.e. due to inability to attend) will be at the discretion of the Convenor of the Committee.

5. Responsibilities and Expectations of Committee Members

5.1 Be collegial and constructive in approach.

5.2 Attend regularly and participate fully in the work of the Committee and its task / working groups. This will involve looking ahead and consulting / gathering input in order to provide the broad spectrum of thoughts and opinions which are necessary for proper consideration of the area being discussed.

5.3 Take collective and individual ownership for the issues under the Committee's remit and for the discussion and resolution of these issues. In taking ownership of the work of the Committee, members must take steps to ensure that they are empowered to take decisions on behalf of academic and managerial colleagues.

5.4 Be committed to communicating the work of the Committee to the wider University community.

August 2022

SENATE

11 August 2022

External Effectiveness Review

Description of paper

1. This paper proposes to bring forward the next External Effectiveness Review of Senate to 2022-23.

Action requested / Recommendation

2. For approval

Background and context

3. The Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance was introduced on 1 August 2013 and includes a Main Principle covering externally-facilitated effectiveness reviews. The revised version of the Code published in 2017 states this requirement as follows:

49. The governing body is expected to review its own effectiveness each year and to undertake an externally facilitated evaluation of its own effectiveness and that of its committees, including size and composition of membership, at least every five years. As part of these processes or separately, the effectiveness of the academic board (also known as Senate, Senatus Academicus or academic council) is expected to be reviewed similarly. These reviews should be reported upon appropriately within the Institution and outside. Externally facilitated reviews should be held following any period of exceptional change or upheaval (allowing suitable time to see the effects of changes made), the usual timetable for externally facilitated review being brought forward if necessary in these circumstances.

4. The University undertakes an annual review of the effectiveness of Senate and its committees. In addition to these annual reviews, in 2018/19, the University held an externally-facilitated review of Senate and its Committees with the aim of improving the effectiveness of their operation. In 2018/19 the University also held an internal review of the structure of Senate Committees to ensure these remained fit for purpose following the inception of Senate Committees in 2009/10. Progress has since been made in implementing the recommendations from both of these reviews.
5. Composition of Senate was revised in 2020, in line with the requirements of the [Higher Education Governance \(Scotland\) Act](#), passed in 2016. The revised composition of Senate, which saw Senate move to a largely elected body, was introduced in October 2019 in line with Ordinance 212.
6. Feedback from Senate members following the previous external review indicated a hope that an increase in the proportion of elected members would mean that members were motivated to ensure that Senate was an effective and influential body ([Minute of meeting of Senatus Academicus held on 29 May 2019, Paper C](#)).

Discussion

7. The change in the composition of Senate to a largely elected body has led to increased engagement of members with Senate processes. This is a positive shift and reflects the hope of Senate that an increase in the proportion of elected members to Senate would result in greater engagement to ensure Senate was an effective and influential body.

8. Whilst changes have been positively received, some Senate members have expressed discontent with Senate processes and functions, including the composition of Senate Standing Committees. Given concerns, and to avoid a piecemeal approach to addressing any potential reforms, the proposal in this paper is to bring the planned external review in 2023-24 forward by one year to 2022-23, which will support reflection and provide opportunities for Members to shape Senate business and operation thus addressing impairments.
9. The process for appointing the external reviewer and the Terms of Reference are attached in Appendix 1. The development of the review will be a matter for the University Secretary.

Resource implications

10. There are resource implications for Academic Services and specifically the Senate Clerk in relation to staff time in preparing for and supporting an external review.
11. The external review process is expected to have a budgetary implication, which will be covered by the University Secretary's Group.

Risk Management

12. There are minimal risks anticipated to be associated with an externally-facilitated review.

Responding to the Climate Emergency and Sustainable Development Goals

13. Not applicable

Equality and Diversity

14. The externally-facilitated review will be designed to ensure a breadth of inputs from a wide range of stakeholders, and will provide an opportunity to identify any barriers to equality, diversity and inclusion in the conduct of Senate business.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

15. The report of the externally-facilitated review will be shared with Senate members once available. Any agreed changes to Senate processes to be taken forward by Academic Services.

Consultation

16. Senate is being consulted on the proposal to bring the external review forward and the Terms of Reference for the review.

Further information

Author(s)

Olivia Hayes
Senate Clerk & Academic Policy Officer
On behalf of the Director
Academic Services
May 2022

Presenter(s) (if required)

Ms Sarah Smith
Vice-Principal and University Secretary

Freedom of information

Open

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference

Draft Terms of Reference for the externally facilitated review of Senate Effectiveness:

- To offer advice on how the University's Senate can best operate as a forum which both encourages discussion and debate and provides high standards of academic governance appropriate to this institution, through:
 - Reviewing effectiveness of existing approach of Senate and its Committees in fulfilling their roles; and
 - Reviewing the membership of Senate Standing Committees and their Terms of Reference

It is proposed that the review address the following specific issues:

Current arrangements

- The operation and effectiveness of Senate and its committees including how they manage their business and reflect on performance
- The effectiveness of the governing documents in place, including the Standing Orders and Terms of Reference
- The effectiveness of the relationship between Senate, its committees, and the wider University governance structure
- The effectiveness of the communication between Senate, its committees and their stakeholders across the University
- The effectiveness and suitability of the current membership of the Senate committees

Planning for the future

- How Senate can operate as a forum which encourages discussion and debate, and provides effective governance
- The future role and authority of the Senate committees

Process

It is proposed that the review be conducted by one external individual according to the process outlined below. It is estimated that this will amount to around 8-10 days' work.

- Approximately 10-15 interviews with the Principal; Senate Committee Conveners; the Provost and University Secretary; Senate members, and student representatives, as well as key institutional staff involved with Senate and its Committees
- Emphasis will be given in any review to the views of the elected members of Senate.
- The review will in addition provide for electronic submission of comments and views from the wider Senate membership to be incorporated.

- Review of governance documents which set out the operation and function of Senate, including relevant legislation, Senate Handbook, Standing Orders, Senate Committee Terms of Reference and sample Senate and committee papers
- Review of recent Senate Standing Committees reports
- Two-day, predominantly desktop based review in Semester 1, 2022
- Outputs include a report and summary of findings and recommendations for presentation at the Senate meeting on 24 May 2023.

Appointment of external reviewer

- It is recommended that the University approach external consultant, Dr Jennifer Barnes of Saxton Bampfylde to undertake the externally-facilitated review of Senate.
- Dr. Barnes undertook the last external review of Senate in 2018-19 and it is expected that her familiarity with Senate will be invaluable as she is equipped with existing knowledge of Senate operation.

SENATE

11 Aug 2022

Guidelines for Senate Committee Papers

Description of paper

1. Members of Senate need to be able to access proposals, analyses, and policies considered by Senate committees in order to be engaged with university governance and fulfil our statutory role of superintending teaching and discipline and promoting research at this university. This paper articulates guidelines for access to papers that may contain sensitive or privileged information, building on current practices.

Action requested / Recommendation

2. Senate is asked to approve the following guidelines for committee papers:
 - 2.1. Papers should be open by default, meaning they can be accessed at will by members of Senate whether or not they are on the committee and they have open freedom of information (FOI) status.
 - 2.2. Papers should be available in advance of the meeting at which they are considered, if possible, to facilitate comments and participation. If information is presented as an oral report, a detailed summary shall be included either in the minutes or as a supplementary paper that includes sufficient detail to engage the content of the report.
 - 2.3. Exceptionally, papers may be considered closed or reserved by the committee convenor in situations where closed or reserved FOI status is appropriate. In such cases, the reason for not considering the paper open shall be made available. Such papers will be distributed to members of the committee and shall be available on request to other members of Senate. The default position would not be to redact papers before doing this, unless there are very compelling reasons associated with their Closed Freedom of Information status for doing so.
 - 2.4. In situations involving personal information of individual students, closed or reserved papers may be redacted to remove sensitive personal information (consistent with applicable data protection legislation and policies) before being made available to members of Senate. Such papers shall be accompanied by an explanation of the reason for redaction and a sufficient summary of any redacted information to allow consideration of any matters relevant to Senate's oversight role.

Background and context

3. The Universities Scotland Act gives Senate the power and responsibility of superintending teaching and discipline and promoting research. Our Standing Orders allow us to delegate certain of these powers to committees, which need not consist of just members of Senate. However, the statutory responsibilities continue to apply to Senate as a whole.
4. The recommendation that papers be open by default and made available in advance of meetings is current practice for committees. Academic Services currently routinely makes open papers available online.
5. Following discussions on Senate effectiveness and transparency, committees have taken steps to share committee papers proactively with Senate as a whole, including an announcement to all members when papers are posted. Senate members are

encouraged to offer comments to their respective College representatives on committees.

6. Senate business occasionally includes matters to which Freedom of Information (FOI) exemptions apply. These papers, whether considered by committees or Senate as a whole, are considered privileged and are to be handled in a way that prevents their deliberate or accidental release to those who should not see them.
7. In 2021-2022, the Education Committee had 4 closed papers, relating to NSS results, curriculum demands, and student experience. The Quality Assurance Committee had 4 closed papers: three annual reports (Academic Appeals, MOOCS, and Student Discipline) and sector summary outcomes from institution-led review. Academic Policy and Regulations had one closed paper, concerning a partnership agreement with Huazhong University of Science and Technology. Academic Services estimate that 95% of committee papers are open.
8. The SQAC Appeals and Discipline reports contain anonymised aggregated student information that may need further data protection review before being made available to Senate at large. Otherwise the last year's closed papers are (as far as I have been able to determine) of the sort proposed to be available as written to members of Senate on request.
9. Absent explicit guidelines on the distribution of closed committee papers, committee convenors have exercised discretion to withhold closed papers from interested members at large of Senate. Convenors have asked for this paper to clarify Senate's view on the matter.
10. The Senate Handbook explains that "It is good practice to minimise closed business, in order to ensure as much transparency as possible regarding the operation of Senate." This principle is widely shared in governing institutions, especially where there are matters of public accountability.
11. In some cases, particularly in APRC, the committee convener or committee members deal with personal student information as part of their work related to their committee. To the extent this information is not normally part of committee papers and formal committee business, it would not be subject to the availability and preparation expectations set out here.

Discussion

12. Recent developments to support greater engagement from Senate at large with Senate committees have been welcome. These promote transparency and good governance and, just as importantly, help build capacity by giving Senate members opportunities to learn about aspects of the university under Senate's purview.
13. The fact of delegating certain Senate powers to committees does not remove the statutory authority and responsibility of members of Senate. Access to papers, including ones on sensitive matters subject to FOI exemptions, is essential to fulfilling this responsibility individually and collectively. Members of Senate are elected into positions of trust in university governance and are quite capable of respecting rules and norms of document security associated with those positions of trust.
14. The recent change in Senate composition, dramatically reducing the number of members and requiring explicit nomination and election for a majority of positions, may affect some assumptions about transparency, access, and responsibility. Papers that might have been imprudent to distribute to all members of the vastly larger Senate as previously composed would not be subject to such concerns with a Senate made up of a smaller number of members who have affirmatively taken on the responsibilities of membership, including appropriate handling of confidential documents.
15. It has been past practice in some instances to restrict access to certain non-personal information, such as confidential business agreements or non-finalised information about university priorities for investment. These proposed guidelines take the perspective that such papers may be appropriately closed for FOI purposes but

should be accessible to all members of Senate as they are relevant to Senate's effective conduct of its statutory role, subject to the usual protections of closed papers considered in Senate.

16. Where sensitive personal information is involved, it should be possible for Senate to carry out its role with redacted and summarised documents that preserve confidentiality, in accordance with data protection legislation and policies. These guidelines balance the needs of oversight and data protection.

Resource implications

17. Preparing and circulating papers is already provisioned in the ordinary conduct and support of Senate and its committees. However, some of the proposals may hypothetically increase the support workload potentially required, depending on what papers come before committees in the future.
18. While it is likely that there would have been limited if any requirement to redact any papers in 2021-22 in order to follow these guidelines, redacting and summarising a future hypothetical such paper should it arise would add to workload both for staff supporting the committees, the authors of papers, and, potentially Records Management. The proposal to include in the minutes or as a supplementary paper a detailed summary of information provided in oral reports would also increase workload for staff supporting the committees relative to the level of information they currently prepare.
19. Academic Services were unable to provide an estimate of the potential time requirements, and the author could not independently produce one without access to past closed papers or content/extent of past oral reports.

Risk Management

20. This paper balances the risks of disclosure of sensitive information and the risks of ineffective oversight and governance.
21. The relevant data protection considerations require balancing need to know and legitimate interest against risks of accidental or unauthorised disclosures. This proposal mitigates risk within that standard by having closed papers available only on request, so that the identities of members actually accessing each paper are known and they are only made available when Senate members feel they are needed. In this way, access is automatically proportionate to Senate members' estimation of need to know and legitimate interest.
22. The University's Risk Policy and Risk Appetite statement refers to the University holding 'no appetite for any breaches in statute, regulation.' This paper improves capacity for effective compliance with the Universities Scotland Act by enabling Senate to fulfil its statutory role with all appropriate information.

Responding to the Climate Emergency and Sustainable Development Goals

23. n/a

Equality and Diversity

24. Senate at large, by virtue of its numbers and constitution, reflects more dimensions of the university's diversity than Senate's individual committees. These guidelines establish as default this diversity of capable stewards of Senate's governance responsibilities, increasing effectiveness in considering equality and diversity across Senate's functions.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

25. To be implemented by Senate Support and committee convenors.

Consultation

26. This paper was prepared at the invitation of the Senate Education Committee convenor after a question arose during 2021-22 over access to a closed committee paper. Current committee convenors have discussed the matter with the author and with their committees, and factual background and logistical considerations have been discussed with the Director of Academic Services. Modifications or alternative proposals were invited from consulted stakeholders and none received.

Further information

Author(s) Dr Michael Barany

Presenter(s) (if required)

Freedom of information Open

SENATE

11 August 2022

Regulations Experts and Senate Capacity Building

Description of paper

1. Senate meetings could have gone more smoothly this year than they did. Academic Services proposes that it offers Senate members briefings on Senate regulations and procedures with a view to building capacity for future Senate effectiveness.

Action requested / Recommendation

2. Senate is asked to discuss the issues from this paper, leading to possible actions that do not require a formal action of Senate to take forward.
3. The Principal has the formally designated responsibility of understanding and communicating both the formal rules and informal norms of Senate business, and of supporting good practice in Senate. Academic Services will continue to act as the first point of consultation on regulations, providing advice to the convener on regulatory issues associated with the operation of Senate.
4. It is suggested that Senate will be more effective if more members are confident in their understanding of how Senate ought to work. This paper recommends that Academic Services will offer Senate members a briefing on Senate regulations and procedures, to supplement existing arrangements for guidance and induction for Senate members.
5. It is further suggested that members of Senate be encouraged to support fellow members in preparing papers and otherwise engaging with Senate's operations. Articulating this informal expectation in this paper is meant to encourage members of Senate to cultivate the expertise and interest already present among members.

Background and context

6. Senate business is conducted according to our Standing Orders, which implement relevant legislation and ordinances. These give the Principal responsibility for presiding over meetings.
7. Senate is very capably supported by a team from Academic Services whose role includes advising members of Senate on the lawful and effective conduct of Senate business.
8. At several points this academic year, Senate has encountered confusion over proposals and votes, leading to delays, ambiguity, and the need for additional meeting time and repeated votes. Some of these situations involved risks that our proceedings were not complying with standing orders.

Discussion

9. The new composition of Senate adopted in 2019 has represented an opportunity to revitalise Senate as a cornerstone of university governance. A smaller and deliberately selected membership makes it possible and desirable to consider Senate as a whole as a group capable of engaging in serious discussion and decision-making, rather than just as a sounding board and certifying authority for detailed work by committees.
10. The Principal has adopted a norm of open discussion and consensus-based action that is appropriate and effective for most of Senate's business. However, there are times when Senate must decide between alternatives or take action on proposals on

which not all members are agreed. In these circumstances, Senate must proceed according to its established decision-making rules to reach decisions efficiently in a way that is legally valid.

11. Comporting to regulations and norms of good governance is a legal requirement, and need not be an onerous one. In practice the standing orders and other relevant procedural guideposts give considerable adaptability and discretion to support effective consideration appropriate to the needs of Senate and the demands of the question under discussion. Familiarity with applicable regulations and norms empowers us to use them flexibly and appropriately, so that they facilitate effective conduct rather than feel like a procedural burden.
12. We are used to situations where a firm command of regulations and their applicable flexibilities is important. On exam boards, we appoint regulations experts so that someone is designated with the responsibility of being familiar with the regulations and interpreting them on the spot. This helps exam boards operate efficiently without requiring every participant to worry about regulatory details.
13. This year we have relied heavily on Senate Support to advise both during and between meetings on matters of procedure and best practice. This has at times been burdensome to Senate Support, especially on top of challenges of minuting and other activities that become harder precisely when questions of procedure arise. However, Academic Services have reviewed their capacity to support Senate, and they are satisfied that they can provide the relevant support going forward. If there are capacity issues in future they will address them via normal planning processes.
14. To supplement Academic Services' role in advising on matters of regulations and procedures regarding Senate, Academic Services have agreed to offer a briefing to Senate members on this issue. This would supplement the Senate Handbook and normal induction for new Senate members.
15. Deliberately developing regulations expertise among members of Senate will help us to operate more effectively in a way that is less burdensome to Senate Support.

Resource implications

16. Over the long term, offering a briefing to Senate members on regulations will improve Senate effectiveness and reduce support resource needs. Offering a briefing to Senate members would have relatively modest workload implications for Academic Services.

Risk Management

17. The University's Risk Policy and Risk Appetite statement refers to the University holding 'no appetite for any breaches in statute, regulation.' This paper proposes approaches to reduce the risk of regulatory noncompliance or breach of statute due to ineffective knowledge or application of relevant regulation regarding the conduct of Senate business.

Responding to the Climate Emergency and Sustainable Development Goals

18. n/a

Equality and Diversity

19. Well-understood and implemented norms and procedures preserve access and voice in deliberative settings, reducing the risk of arbitrary or biased effects of *ad hoc* proceedings.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

20. To be implemented by Academic Services in communication with members of Senate. Peer-led member support to be implemented informally by members with a view to minimising any burdens on Academic Services.

Consultation

21. Consulted with members of Senate and Court, Senate Support, Director of Academic Services, and the interim Deputy Secretary (Student Experience).

Further information

Author(s) Dr Michael Barany

Presenter(s) (if required)

Senate

11 August 2022

Senate Exception Committee Terms of Reference and Membership

Description of paper

1. Minor update to the Senate Exception Committee Membership

Action requested / recommendation

2. Senate is asked to approve the updated Membership. The Terms of Reference are unchanged and are attached for information.

Background and context

3. The Senate Exception Committee operates under delegated authority, to make urgent formal business decisions which would otherwise require Senatus approval between meetings.

Discussion

4. The Committee Membership appended below has been updated to note one change in the membership. Niamh Roberts, the new President of the Students' Association will take up position and will become a member of the Exception Committee with immediate effect.

Resource implications

5. None

Risk management

6. Effective academic governance assists the University in managing risk associated with its academic activities.

Equality & diversity

7. The membership of the Committee is largely a consequence of decisions taken elsewhere to appoint individuals to particular roles. Ensuring that appointment processes support a diverse staff body is part of the broader responsibility of the University.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

8. The Terms of Reference and updated Membership will be published on the Senate website.

Author

Olivia Hayes

Academic Policy Officer

02 August 2022

Freedom of Information

Open

APPENDIX 1

Senatus Exception Committee

1 Purpose

1.1 Under delegated authority, to make urgent formal business decisions which would otherwise require Senatus approval between meetings of Senatus subject to defined principles and on the understanding that any matter so referred can be referred to the full Senatus should this be the wish of the Exception Committee.

2 Composition

2.1 The Committee shall consist of at least six members.

2.2 The Principal, the Vice-Principal Students, the Convener of the Research Strategy Group, and the Convener of each of the Standing Committees of Senate shall be ex officio members of the Committee.

2.3 Unless otherwise represented, the membership of the Committee must also include two Senate members and a representative of the Edinburgh University Students' Association (normally the President).

2.4 The term of office for Senate members, where they are not ex officio members of the Committee, will be no longer than their membership of the Senatus and will be for a maximum of three years.

2.5 Edinburgh University Student Association annually nominate one fully matriculated student to be a member of the Exception Committee; this is normally one of the elected Students' Association sabbatical officers.

2.6 Previous members are eligible for re-appointment up to a normal maximum of two consecutive terms of office.

2.7 The Principal shall be appointed Convener of the Committee.

2.8 The Vice-Principal Students will be appointed Vice-Convener of the Committee.

3 Meetings

3.1 The Committee will be convened only if required and much of its business is expected to be conducted through correspondence.

3.2 The aim will be to circulate minutes, agendas and papers to members of the Committee at least five working days in advance of the meeting or prior to the conclusion of the consultation period. In cases of extreme urgency, which is likely to be the case given the nature of this Committee, and with the agreement of the Convener, papers may be tabled at meetings of the Committee. If being conducted by correspondence the consultation period may be no shorter than a 24 hour period.

3.3 Papers will indicate the originator/s and purpose of the paper, the matter/s which the Committee is being asked to consider and any action/s required and confirm the status of the paper in respect of freedom of information legislation.

3.4 Four members of the Committee shall be a quorum. This number must include the Principal or Vice-Principal Students and a Senate member.

3.5 A formal minute will be kept of proceedings and submitted for approval as soon as practicable to members of the Committee. The draft minute will be agreed with the Convener of the Committee prior to circulation.

4 Remit

4.1 To consider any matter between meetings of the Senatus and with the full delegated authority of Senatus to make a decision on the matter on behalf of the Senatus.

4.2 The Committee in reaching a decision must be satisfied regarding the following:

- there is evidence of the consideration given to the equality impact of the matter under consideration; and
- there is a robust rationale for the proposals or options being presented by the identified lead senior officer or officers including information on the outcome of any consultation undertaken.

5 Other

5.1 A report on issues discussed at each meeting or concluded via correspondence will be provided to the next available Ordinary Meeting of the Senatus.

5.2 Membership of the Committee will be published on the University's website.

Senate Exception Committee Membership 2022-23

Name	Position/School	Term of office	Composition Section
Professor Peter Mathieson (Convener)	Principal	Ex Officio	2.2
Professor Colm Harmon (Vice Convener)	Convener of the Education Committee, Vice Principal Students	Ex Officio	2.2
Dr Paul Norris	Convener of Academic Policy and Regulations Committee	Ex Officio	2.2
Professor Tina Harrison	Convener of Senatus Quality Assurance Committee, Assistant Principal (Academic Standards and Quality Assurance)	Ex Officio	2.2
Professor Jonathan Seckl	Convener of the Research Strategy Group	Ex Officio	2.2
Dr Ashley Lloyd	Business School	1 August 2021 – 31 July 2024	2.3
Professor David Hay	Edinburgh Medical School	29 September 2020 – 31 July 2023	2.3
Niamh Roberts	Students' Association President	Nominated	2.3

SENATE

11 August 2022

Report from Central Academic Promotions Committee

Description of paper

1. Report of the recommendations of the Central Academic Promotions Committee.

Action requested / Recommendation

2. For information.

Resource implications

3. Increased salaries will impact on each individual College's staff budget.

Risk Management

4. N/A

Responding to the Climate Emergency and Sustainable Development Goals

5. N/A

Equality and Diversity

6. Equality and Diversity is central to the considerations of the Central Academic Promotions Committee.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

7. N/A

Further information

Author(s)

Louise Kidd
HR Partner Reward
University HR
11 May 2022

Presenter(s) (if required)

Freedom of information: Open

REPORT FROM THE CENTRAL ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE

The Committee met on 11 May 2022 to consider academic promotions to Grade 10 plus award of title of Personal Chair and award of title of Personal Chair to clinical academic staff.

The Committee approved 99 nominations for award of the academic title of Personal Chair. All Personal Chairs are effective 1 August 2022 as follows:

Title	Initial	Surname	College	School/Deanery	Personal Chair Title
Dr	G	Andreeva	CAHSS	Business School	Personal Chair of Societal Aspects of Credit
Dr	A	Bancroft	CAHSS	School of Social and Political Science	Personal Chair of Sociology
Dr	C	Beattie	CAHSS	School of History, Classics and Archaeology	Personal Chair of Women's and Gender History
Dr	C	Bovill	CAHSS	Institute for Academic Development	Personal Chair of Student Engagement in Higher Education
Mr	J	Brennan	CAHSS	Edinburgh College of Art	Personal Chair of Sustainable Architecture
Dr	J	Brownlie	CAHSS	School of Social and Political Science	Personal Chair of Sociology of Emotions and Relationships
Dr	R	Bunduchi	CAHSS	Business School	Personal Chair of Innovation
Dr	R	Calabrese	CAHSS	Business School	Personal Chair of Data Science
Dr	A	Cohen	CAHSS	School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences	Personal Chair of Kantian Philosophy
Dr	P	Crosthwaite	CAHSS	School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures	Personal Chair of Modern and Contemporary Literature
Dr	J	Culbertson	CAHSS	School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences	Personal Chair of Experimental Linguistics
Dr	C	Damro	CAHSS	School of Social and Political Science	Personal Chair of European Politics
Dr	G	Davis	CAHSS	School of History, Classics and Archaeology	Personal Chair of the History of Medicine
Dr	D	Fry	CAHSS	Moray House School of Education and Sport	Personal Chair of International Child Protection Research

Title	Initial	Surname	College	School/Deanery	Personal Chair Title
Ms	T	Giblin	CAHSS	Edinburgh College of Art	Personal Chair of Contemporary Curating
Dr	A	Gillis	CAHSS	School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures	Personal Chair of Modern Poetry
Dr	G	Haddow	CAHSS	School of Social and Political Science	Personal Chair of Sociology of Medicine and Technology
Dr	L	Hall-Lew	CAHSS	School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences	Personal Chair of Sociolinguistics
Dr	P	Honeybone	CAHSS	School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences	Personal Chair of Historical Phonology
Dr	A	Jack	CAHSS	School of Divinity	Personal Chair in Bible and Literature
Dr	E	Kelly	CAHSS	Edinburgh College of Art	Personal Chair of Music and Politics
Dr	W	Lamb	CAHSS	School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures	Personal Chair in Gaelic Ethnology and Linguistics
Dr	P	Lamont	CAHSS	School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences	Personal Chair in History and Theory of Psychology
Dr	E	Luger	CAHSS	Edinburgh College of Art	Personal Chair of Human-Data Interaction
Dr	A	Manches	CAHSS	Moray House School of Education and Sport	Personal Chair of Children and Technology
Dr	T	Milnes	CAHSS	School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures	Personal Chair in Romantic Literature and Philosophy
Dr	I	Naumann	CAHSS	School of Social and Political Science	Personal Chair of Comparative Social Policy
Dr	A	Niven	CAHSS	Moray House School of Education and Sport	Personal Chair of Psychology of Physical Activity

Title	Initial	Surname	College	School/Deanery	Personal Chair Title
Dr	K	Potocnik	CAHSS	Business School	Personal Chair of Organisational Behaviour
Dr	H	Rabagliati	CAHSS	School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences	Personal Chair of Language and Cognition
Dr	S	Rolle	CAHSS	School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures	Personal Chair of Student Learning (Interdisciplinary Education)
Dr	V	Ruiz Abou Nigm	CAHSS	School of Law	Personal Chair of Private International Law
Dr	M	Thaler	CAHSS	School of Social and Political Science	Personal Chair of Political Theory
Dr	A	Thomson	CAHSS	School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures	Personal Chair of Modern Literature and Critical Theory
Dr	C	Weikop	CAHSS	Edinburgh College of Art	Personal Chair of Modern and Contemporary German Art
Dr	E	Wild-Wood	CAHSS	School of Divinity	Personal Chair of African Religions and World Christianity
Dr	C	Yang	CAHSS	Edinburgh College of Art	Personal Chair of Chinese Art
Mrs	G	Aitken	CMVM	Edinburgh Medical School	Personal Chair of Clinical Education
Dr	S	Cobb	CMVM	Deanery of Biomedical Sciences	Personal Chair of Translational Neuroscience
Dr	M	Denvir	CMVM	Deanery of Clinical Sciences	Personal Chair of Medical Cardiology
Dr	X	Donadeu	CMVM	Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies	Personal Chair of Translational Farm Animal Biology
Dr	S	Farrington	CMVM	Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences	Personal Chair of Colorectal Cancer Genetics
Dr	J	Figuroa	CMVM	Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences	Personal Chair of Molecular Epidemiology and Global Cancer Prevention

Title	Initial	Surname	College	School/Deanery	Personal Chair Title
Dr	J	Hillier	CMVM	Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies	Chair of Mathematical Modelling and Global Food Systems
Dr	L	Jaacks	CMVM	Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies	Personal Chair of Global Health and Nutrition
Dr	J	Keen	CMVM	Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies	Personal Chair of Equine Cardiovascular Medicine
Dr	R	Marioni	CMVM	Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences	Personal Chair of Molecular Epidemiology of Ageing
Dr	M	McGrew	CMVM	Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies	Personal Chair of Avian Reproductive Technologies
Dr	P	Mill	CMVM	Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences	Personal Chair of Cilia Biology
Dr	E	Osterweil	CMVM	Deanery of Biomedical Sciences	Personal Chair of Molecular Neuroscience
Dr	P	Pollock	CMVM	Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies	Personal Chair of Veterinary Surgery and Remote and Rural Medicine
Dr	N	Rochefort	CMVM	Deanery of Biomedical Sciences	Personal Chair of Visual Neuroscience
Dr	T	Schwarz	CMVM	Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies	Personal Chair of Veterinary Radiology
Dr	E	Sena	CMVM	Deanery of Clinical Sciences	Personal Chair of Meta Science and Translational Medicine
Dr	L	Stark	CMVM	Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences	Personal Chair of Nucleolar signalling and cancer prevention

Title	Initial	Surname	College	School/Deanery	Personal Chair Title
Dr	S	Stock	CMVM	Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences	Personal Chair of Maternal and Fetal Health
Dr	R	Weller	CMVM	Deanery of Clinical Sciences	Personal Chair of Medical Dermatology
Dr	T	Wishart	CMVM	Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies	Personal Chair of Molecular Anatomy
Dr	A	Arulanandam	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of Structural Cell Biology
Dr	A	Buck	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of RNA and Infection Biology
Dr	J	Cheney	CSE	School of Informatics	Personal Chair of Programming Languages and Systems
Mr.	N	Chue Hong	CSE	College of Science and Engineering (EPCC)	Personal Chair in Research Software Policy and Practice
Dr	A	Cook	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of Structural Biology of Gene Expression
Doctor	G	Cowie	CSE	School of GeoSciences	Personal Chair in/of Biogeochemistry
Dr	S	Djokic	CSE	School of Engineering	Personal Chair of Electrical Power Systems
Dr	J	Fleuriot	CSE	School of Informatics	Personal Chair of Artificial Intelligence
Dr	A	Giannopoulos	CSE	School of Engineering	Personal Chair of Applied Geophysics and Computational Electrodynamics
Dr	J	Hadfield	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of Quantitative Genetics
Dr	A	Hermann	CSE	School of Physics and Astronomy	Personal Chair of Computational Physics
Dr	P	Heun	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of Chromosome Organisation
Dr.	D	Jordan	CSE	School of Mathematics	Personal Chair of Categorical Symmetry
Dr	A	Kiprakis	CSE	School of Engineering	Personal Chair of Agile Energy Systems
Dr	T	Kunath	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of Regenerative Neurobiology

Title	Initial	Surname	College	School/Deanery	Personal Chair Title
Dr	P	Lusby	CSE	School of Chemistry	Personal Chair of Supramolecular Chemistry
Dr	T	Ma	CSE	School of Informatics	Personal Chair of Financial Computing (Risk Modelling)
Dr	T	Mackay	CSE	School of Mathematics	Personal Chair of Electromagnetic Theory
Dr	O	Masek	CSE	School of GeoSciences	Personal Chair of Net Zero Emission Technologies
Dr	J	Michel	CSE	School of Chemistry	Personal Chair of Biomolecular Simulation
Dr	I	Myers-Smith	CSE	School of GeoSciences	Personal Chair of Climate Change Ecology
Dr	V	Nagarajan	CSE	School of Informatics	Personal Chair of Parallel Computer Architecture
Dr	K	Nazarpour	CSE	School of Informatics	Personal Chair of Digital Health
Dr	D	Obbard	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of Evolutionary Genetics
Dr	D	O'Connell	CSE	School of Physics and Astronomy	Personal Chair of Theoretical Particle Physics
Dr	A	Pedersen	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of Disease Ecology
Dr	A	Portelli	CSE	School of Physics and Astronomy	Personal Chair of Theoretical High Energy Physics
Dr	J	Pridham	CSE	School of Mathematics	Personal Chair of Derived Algebraic Geometry
Dr	S	Sabanis	CSE	School of Mathematics	Personal Chair of Stochastic Analysis and Algorithms
Dr	P	Series	CSE	School of Informatics	Personal Chair of Computational Psychiatry
Dr	N	Sheridan	CSE	School of Mathematics	Personal Chair of Mirror Symmetry
Dr	S	Sierra	CSE	School of Mathematics	Personal Chair of Noncommutative Algebra
Dr	C	Snodgrass	CSE	School of Physics and Astronomy	Personal Chair of Planetary Astronomy
Dr	A	Stokes	CSE	School of Engineering	Personal Chair in Bioinspired Engineering
Dr	L	Szpruch	CSE	School of Mathematics	Personal Chair of Mathematics of Machine Learning
Dr	S	Thomas	CSE	School of Chemistry	Personal Chair of Sustainable Catalysis
Dr	I	Titov	CSE	School of Informatics	Personal Chair of Natural Language Processing
Dr	I	Viola	CSE	School of Engineering	Professor of Fluid Mechanics and Bioinspired Engineering

Title	Initial	Surname	College	School/Deanery	Personal Chair Title
Dr	P	Walsh	CSE	School of Biological Sciences	Personal Chair of Biological Education
Mr.	S	Warrington	CSE	School of Engineering	Personal Chair of Engineering Education
Dr	L	Watts	CSE	School of GeoSciences	Personal Chair of Energy & Society

The following Out of Cycle award of Personal Chair has been made since the last report to Senate:

Title	Initial	Surname	College	School/Deanery	Personal Chair Title	Date of Effect
Dr	M	Fernandez-Gotz	CAHSS	School of History, Classics and Archaeology	Personal Chair of European Archaeology	1 August 2022
Dr	C	MacAmhlaigh	CAHSS	School of Law	Personal Chair of Public Law	1 August 2022
Dr	D	Friedrich	CSE	School of Engineering	Personal Chair of Energy Systems	1 February 2022

Senate**11 August 2022****Annual review of effectiveness of Senate****Description of paper**

1. This paper notifies Senate members of plans for the annual internal review of Senate's effectiveness.

Action requested / recommendation

2. Senate is asked to note the plans for the review, and to engage with opportunities to provide feedback on Senate's functioning and effectiveness.

Background and context

3. The 2017 version of the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance states that institutions are expected to review the effectiveness of their Senate and its committees annually and to hold an externally-facilitated review every five years: "49. The governing body is expected to review its own effectiveness each year and to undertake an externally facilitated evaluation of its own effectiveness and that of its committees, including size and composition of membership, at least every five years. As part of these processes or separately, the effectiveness of the academic board (also known as Senate, Senatus Academicus or academic council) is expected to be reviewed similarly. These reviews should be reported upon appropriately within the Institution and outside. Externally facilitated reviews should be held following any period of exceptional change or upheaval (allowing suitable time to see the effects of changes made), the usual timetable for externally facilitated review being brought forward if necessary in these circumstances."
4. In line with the requirements of the Code, during Summer 2022, Academic Services is conducting a light-touch review of Senate. The outcomes of this review will be reported to Senate in October 2022.
5. Academic Services are also conducting effectiveness reviews of the Senate Standing Committees, and the report of these reviews will be presented to Senate in October 2022.
6. The previous annual internal effectiveness review was reported to Senate on 12 November 2021. Actions identified in the previous annual effectiveness review, and progress against these actions, are in Appendix 1.
7. A discussion paper will be presented to Senate at the August 2022 meeting recommending that the externally-facilitated review of Senate be brought forward to 2022-23. This follows a period of exceptional change, whereby the Senate moved to be partially elected in 1 August 2020. The 2017 Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance recommends that externally facilitated reviews be held following any period of exceptional change or upheaval (allowing suitable time to see the effects of changes made).

Discussion

8. The review process will be primarily self-reflective. Senate members will be invited to respond to a brief online questionnaire during Summer 2022 (managed by Academic Services). The draft questions are contained in Appendix 2

9. Members of Senate Standing Committees will also be asked for brief feedback on working with Senate and this will be fed into the report.
10. The review process is intended to gather information on and evaluate effectiveness in terms of the:
 - a. Support and facilitation of Senate meetings;
 - b. Engagement of members and knowledge and understanding of their roles and the remit of Senate;
 - c. Impact and strategic relevance of Senate's work.
11. Senate membership and composition will be reviewed, following the move to a partially elected Senate from 1 August 2020. This review will be undertaken as part of the externally facilitated review to be brought forward to 2022-23.
12. Academic Services will collate the information gathered and produce a report on the findings, including proposed actions.

Resource implications

13. The review will be conducted by Academic Services and any resource requirements will be met from existing budgets. The resource implications of any actions identified in response to the outcomes of the review will be considered at that stage.

Risk management

14. The annual effectiveness internal review process assists the University in ensuring that its academic governance arrangements are effective and enables the University to manage a range of risks associated with its academic provision.

Equality & diversity

15. The review provides an opportunity to identify any equality and diversity issues in the make-up of the Committee and the way it conducts its business.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

16. The report will be presented to Senate in October 2022. If the review identifies required actions or enhancement opportunities, these will be taken forward by Academic Service (if directly related to the functioning and support of Senate) or referred to the appropriate body for consideration. A note of the report will be sent to Court via the routine Senate report to Court.

Author

Olivia Hayes, Academic Policy Officer
August 2022

Freedom of Information

Open

Appendix 1

Area Under Review	Recommended Action	Responsible	Progress
Role and Remit	1. Review of Senate Standing Orders to take place in 2021/22, this is an opportunity to simply and communicate the Senate agenda-setting process	Academic Services	<p>1 – It was reported at the 9 February meeting of Senate that this action would be held back to allow time to consider whether more substantial updates would be desirable, to make the Standing Orders more accessible and support Senate business. Any revision will require consultation with and approval by Senate.</p> <p>The External Effectiveness Review will be asked to review the effectiveness of the governing documents in place, including the Standing Orders and Terms of Reference</p>
Oversight of Senate Standing Committees	2. Bring a discussion paper on the Senate Standing Committees to Senate	Academic Services and Senate Standing Committee Convenors	2 – A discussion paper was presented at the 12 November meeting recommending that Senate Standing Committee Convenors continue to improve the effectiveness of their committees and communication with Senate. A group would be formed to review what future improvements to the structure and function of Standing Committees may be required.

	<p>3. Revise the format of the annual Senate Standing Committees report to focus more on key and strategic themes rather than granular detail.</p>		<p>2 - The External Effectiveness Review will be asked to consider the operation and effectiveness of Senate and its committees including how they manage their business and reflect on performance. The External Effectiveness Review will be asked to consider the effectiveness of the communication between Senate, its committees and their stakeholders across the University.</p> <p>3 – The next annual Senate Standing Committees report will be presented to Senate at the May 2022 meeting of Senate.</p>
<p>Senate engagement with strategic priorities</p>	<p>4. Review process for identifying Senate presentation and discussion topics</p>	<p>Convener and Senate Support, in consultation with Senate</p>	<p>4 – Senate members were invited to submit suggested presentation topics and themes for 2022-23. The Convener will consider suggestions when making the final selection of presentation topics for 2022-23.</p>
<p>Committee Support</p>	<p>5. Continuously review practical arrangements for Senate meetings to prioritise accessibility and opportunities for discussion.</p>	<p>Academic Services</p>	<p>5 – Work on this is ongoing as part of a continuous review.</p>

Appendix 2

Draft questionnaire. These are the same questions as used in Summer 2021. All questions allow free text responses.

1. During your time as a member of Senate, have you had a clear understanding of your role on Senate? Do you have any suggestions for how this could be better communicated, for example via the Senate Induction sessions, the Senate Members' Handbook, or the Senate website?
2. In May each year, Senate receives an Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees. Does this provide Senate with appropriate oversight of the Committees' work?
3. During your time as a member of Senate, do you feel Senate has engaged effectively with the strategic priorities of the University? In what ways? How could Senate engagement with strategic priorities be improved?
4. Do you feel that Senate is supported effectively by the Senate Support team within Academic Services? Please comment on what works well, and what you think could be improved.

Senate

11 August 2022

Senate Ex-Officio Membership

Description of paper

1. The paper informs Senate of an amendment to the ex-officio membership from 2022/23 onwards.
2. Under Ordinance 212, the University Court are responsible for approving ex-officio Senate members. Under Regulation 4 of the Senate Election Regulations, the University Secretary can vary this list from time to time, to reflect changes in organisational structures and job titles. Any changes will be notified to Senate at the next meeting of Senate.
3. The University recently appointed its first Provost, Prof Kim Graham. The Provost will act with similar authority as that of a Senior-Vice Principal. The University Court and University Secretary are content to add the Provost to the ex-officio membership under the Vice-Principal category.
4. The total number of ex-officio members remains below the maximum of 80. There is a total of 69 ex-officio members in 2022/23.

Action requested / recommendation

5. Senate is invited to note the update to the ex-officio membership. For reference, the ex-officio membership breakdown is provided in Appendix 1.

Resource implications

6. N/A

Risk management

7. N/A

Equality & diversity

8. Annual internal reviews of Senate effectiveness provide an opportunity to identify and address any issues relating to Equality and Diversity.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

9. The 2022/23 Senate membership was published on the Senate website from 1 August 2022.

Author

Olivia Hayes
Academic Policy Officer
02 August 2022

Freedom of Information

Open

Appendix 1: *Ex-officio* membership breakdown

Position	Membership	Membership Breakdown
Principal	1	(Required under Ordinance 212)
<i>Ex officio</i> appointments	Approximately 70, with a maximum 80 <i>ex officio</i> members in total.	Heads of Schools (Required under Ordinance 212) and Heads (Deans) of the Deaneries of the Edinburgh Medical School.
		Heads of College (Required under Ordinance 212)
		Vice-Principals
		Assistant Principals
		Director of Library and University Collections
		Director of the Institute for Academic Development
		University Leads on Climate Responsibility and Sustainability; Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
		Up to 5 College-level office holders per College nominated by that College who hold academic posts (for example, Deans and Associate Deans)
		Office-holders who are specifically entitled to Senate membership under the terms of collaborative agreements.
		2 Senate Assessors on the University Court
		1 Academic Staff member on the University Court