



Senatus Academicus

Thursday 11 August at 2-5pm

Online meeting

Microsoft Teams

CONFIRMED MINUTES

Attendees: ADKINS Peter, ANDREANGELI Arianna, BARANY Michael, BLYTHE Richard, BOSE Chandan, BRADFIELD Julian, BRADLEY Laura, BRANIGAN Holly, BROWN Aidan, BURLEY Sarah, CAIRNS John, CALVERT Jane, CONVERY Alan, CRUZ Juan, DESLER Anne, DESVAGES Charlotte, DEVANEY John, DUNSMORE Agata, EARLE Murray, EFERAKORHO Jite, ELLINGHAM Natalia, EWING Suzanne, FRENCH Chris, CONWAY-GEbbie Hope, GILFILLAN Stuart, GODDARD Benjamin, GOTZ Manuel, GRAHAM Kim, GRATWICK Richard, HAMILTON Lorna, HARMON Colm (Acting Convener), HARRISON Tina, HAY David, HELBING Pia, HELGASON Thorunn, HUNTER Emma, IBIKUNLE Gbenga, INGRAM David, JEFFERY Laura, JENKINS Kirsten, JIWAJI Zueb, JORDAN Crispin, KENNY Meryl, KHATTAR Medhat, KINNEAR George, LAURENSEN Dave, LEWIS Steff, MACCALLUM Sam, MATTHEWS Keith, MEIKSIN Avery, MORAN Carmel, MORLEY Steven, MURRAY Lyndsay, NAVARRO Pau, NORRIS Paul, PRESCOTT Sarah, RICE Ken, ROBERTS Niamh, RYDZEWSKA Ewelina, SCHMID Marion, SCHROERS Bernd, SCHYFTER CAMACHO Pablo, SHAW Jo, SIMPSON Hamish, SMITH Sarah, STRATFORD Tim, SYED Amer, TERRAS Melissa, TOWNSEND Rosemary, TRODD Tamara, TUFAIL-HANIF Uzma, WALSH Patrick, WARRINGTON Stephen, WEIR Christopher, WERESKI Ryan, WILLIAMS Isi, WILLIAMS Mark, WYNNE Ben, YILDIRIM Alper

In attendance: CHALMERS Leigh, DOCHERTY Sinead, EVANS Lucy, HAYES Olivia (Clerk to Senate), WARD Tom

Apologies: ANDREWS Richard, ANWAR Mohammad, BANAS Kasia, BOOTH Tom, BYRNE Lauren, CAQUINEAU Celine, CONNOR Andrew, DANBOLT Jo, DAWSON, Lisa, DIMARTINO Simone, EVENSEN Darrick, FARRINGTON Susan, GRAY Gillian, HOPGOOD James, HOY Jenny, LAMONT-BLACK Simone, LORETTO Wendy, LUGER Ewa, MENZIES John, MORROW Susan, PATON Diana, REYNOLDS Rebecca, RILEY Simon, ROLLE Sabine, SIMM Geoff, STOCK Sarah, THOMSON Alex, TURNER Jon,

Acting Convener, Vice-Principal Professor Colm Harmon opened the meeting and confirmed that Senate had reached quorum. Principal and Chair, Professor Peter Mathieson was unwell and Vice-Principal Harmon convened the special meeting of Senate in his absence. Senate extended its best wishes to Professor Mathieson for a speedy recovery. Members were reminded of the etiquette for Senate meetings conducted online.

1. Senate Minutes

S 22/23 1 A

1.1 To approve:

- 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

Senate approved the amended minutes of the 9 February and 25 May meetings, and the report of e-Senate held 27 April – 11 May subject to agreeing one amendment to the minutes of the February meeting and two amendments to the minutes of the May meeting.

An amendment to item 6 of the 9 February meeting was moved, seconded, and passed by a majority vote.

As a result of this amendment, Item 6 in the minutes of the 9 February meeting would be amended by replacing:

“There was some objection to the Chair’s decision to take a vote on a contentious issue.”

With

“The Chair acknowledged concerns about his improvisatory approach to chairing, in this instance taking a vote on whether to consider a duly proposed and seconded amendment.”

An amendment to the minutes of the 25 May meeting was moved and seconded and passed by majority vote. The minutes of the 25 May meeting would be amended by inserting the bold text as follows:

*“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 noted that multiple colleagues with disabilities, medical vulnerabilities, and other barriers to attendance requested and were denied the reasonable accommodation of a hybrid or remote meeting.** 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.”*

Two amendments to the minutes of the 25 May meeting were moved and accepted by the Convener as uncontroversial. Item 17 of the minutes of the 25 May meeting would be amended to remove the struck out text as follows:

“~~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.~~”

Item 28 of the minutes of the 25 May meeting would be amended to remove the struck out text as follows: *no objections to this were raised at the time.*

In relation to item 14.2.3 of the 25 May meeting, the VP Students, Professor Harmon agreed to update Senate on the costs of the Curriculum Transformation Programme at the next Ordinary meeting. In relation to item 16, the Convener of APRC, Dr Norris agreed to update Senate on external examiner concessions associated with the industrial action at the next Ordinary meeting of Senate.

Senate also agreed that an amendment be incorporated in the 25 May minutes to acknowledge the impact of the Student Support model on pre-Honours students. The Acting Convener would liaise with the Senate Clerk to incorporate this point.

2. Revocation of Honorary Degree

For formal noting and approval

S 22/23 1 B
CLOSED

Deputy Secretary Lucy Evans introduced the paper which invited Senate to approve the recommendation from the Honorary Degrees Committee to withdraw an Honorary Degree. The recommendation follows the Honorary Degree Withdrawal Procedure.

While members were generally supportive of the recommendations, the following points were made:

- A concern was raised regarding the revocation of an Honorary Degree in relation to actions undertaken after the award.
- There is limited precedent for the withdrawal of an Honorary Degree and the Honorary Degree Withdrawal Procedure is the only procedure available to inform the Honorary Degrees Committee and Senate.

Senate approved the recommendation to withdraw the Honorary Degree. The Deputy Secretary (Student Experience) indicated that she will arrange for a review of the Honorary Degree Withdrawal Procedure, to present to a future Senate meeting. Senate also suggested that the University should update its processes for awarding Honorary Degrees, in order to indicate that any recipient of an Honorary Degree

should uphold the principles and values of the University and that the University has the power to withdraw Honorary Degrees should a recipient not adhere to this.

3. Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees

S 22/23 1 C

For formal noting and approval

Senate noted the major items of committee business from 2021-22. At the request of Senate, each of the Standing Committee Conveners' expanded on the priorities for the next academic year identified in section 6 of the paper, and said that they were happy to answer Senate members' questions about the business of the committees at future Senate meetings and between meetings. Senate members said that the detailed verbal explanation of the work of the Standing Committees and priorities for the year ahead was valuable, and asked that a greater level of detail be included in the reports in future years. Senate approved the plans of Senate Standing Committees for the next academic year, subject to one amendment.

An amendment was moved and seconded. The amendment proposed that a priority be added to Section 6 of the paper, under each committee's list of activities:

“Examine and report to Senate on the implications of staff workload, casualisation, pay disparity, and past and possible future industrial action for the matters under its remit.”

Discussion on the proposed amendment took place. The following points were made:

- While the consideration of staffing, workload and resource issues are not the formal responsibility of Senate, they may be relevant to work being undertaken or considered by the Senate Standing Committees.
- While the Standing Committees currently give consideration to staffing and resource implications, they cannot consider items which fall outside their remit.
- Any amendment should duly reflect on what is deliverable and within the remit of the relevant Standing Committee - providing an explanation of the consideration of these matters will be challenging where related issues fall outside of the Committees' powers.
- There were opposing views on the requirement to explicitly state each of the items for consideration as presented in the proposed amendment.
- Matters relating to staff workload lack a single 'home' in the University – but Senate cannot provide this 'home'

The spirit of the amendment was supported. However, rather than approving the specific wording of the amendment, Senate considered alternate wording proposed by the Convener, and agreed that the Convener would refine this formulation and add a revised version with the Standing Committee Conveners, taking account of the discussion the minutes, giving consideration to what is deliverable by the Committees and in consultation with Standing Committee Conveners.

Post-meeting update on the wording for the amendment: Senate Standing Committees agreed to ensure due consideration of key issues of staff concern are factored into discussions and recommendations of Committees, inter alia, staff workload and resourcing, when considering business that falls within their remit.

4. Senate Standing Committees: Membership and Terms of Reference

S 22/23 1 D

For formal noting and approval

The item was introduced by Acting Convener, Senate Education Committee Convener, and Vice Principal Harmon. It was noted that there is a meeting scheduled with the Standing Committee Convener's and a group of elected Senate members to discuss some specific issues related to the membership and terms of reference of Standing Committees.

Members made the following points in response to the paper:

- There is a desire among some Senate members for greater visibility of, access to and oversight of work being undertaken by Senate Standing Committees.
- There are two dimensions to the relationship between Senate and its Standing Committees: delegation of authority and composition of the committees.
- The Committees have already taken actions, such as circulating a notification regarding the availability of Standing Committee papers, to increase the visibility of the work of Standing Committees and provide an opportunity for Senate members to feed into the work undertaken by the Committees.

An amendment (Amendment 1) was moved and seconded. In the terms of reference for each committee, it proposed to substitute the following for item 3.1 under Operation:

3.1. The Committee reports to Senate, acting with delegated authority to advise and take decisions on operational matters within existing strategy and policy and to develop, consult, formulate, and propose to Senate changes to strategy and policy within its remit.

Discussion on Amendment 1 took place. The following points were made:

- The wording as proposed could capture nearly all work undertaken by the Standing Committees – meaning that Senate itself may need to make decisions on a far wider range of issues than at present. This would have far-reaching implications.
- These include would have substantial resource and operational implications for the work of Standing Committees and the Senate Exception Committee. For example, it would be likely to require Senate to meet more than the current pattern of three Ordinary meetings per year. In addition, unless Senate is able to meet very frequently, the University may find it difficult to respond appropriately to urgent issues (for example, short-notice changes to laws and regulations).
- The specific wording in the Amendment is not sufficiently precise to allow the Standing Committees to determine where they have delegated power to make decisions and where they would need to make recommendations to Senate – for example, what constitutes an operational matter as opposed to a policy.
- Relevant professional services areas are represented on the Standing Committees in order to ensure the committees have the appropriate range of expertise. Senate's composition has limited scope for professional services representation – meaning that, were Senate to approve the amendment, it may need to make decisions on issues on which it does not have the appropriate range of expertise.
- The desire for greater transparency and oversight may be achieved by expanding the composition of Standing Committees to include three elected members of Senate (see Amendment 3), rather than reversing the current delegation of a range of responsibilities to the Standing Committees. This would provide the scrutiny requested without raising the broader resource and operational implications for Senate associated with Amendment 1.

An amendment (Amendment 2) was moved and seconded. Under “4. Composition” for each committee, it proposed to add:

The following preliminary committee compositions are to allow the committees to begin work prior to the next Ordinary Meeting of Senate and shall expire at that time. An updated committee composition shall be proposed for approval at that meeting that reflects consideration of representation of elected Academic Staff and elected Student members, BAME members of Senate and the university community, and recognised trade unions.

An amendment (Amendment 3) was moved and seconded. Under “4. Composition” for each committee, it proposed to add:

3 x members of staff chosen by elected academic members of Senate plus Senate Assessors and the Academic Staff Member of Court from among their number.

Discussion on Amendments 2 and 3 took place. The following points were made:

- Senate would need to agree how to approach the practical arrangements for operation, were it to adopt Amendments 2 and/or 3.
- Senate Standing Committees have three co-opted spaces which Convener's may be able to use to expand the membership as a short-term solution whilst practical arrangements are finalised.
- Senate could establish an electoral process for filling the three positions on each Committee for the elected academic Senate members.
- The proposed addition of elected Senate members to Standing Committees would have a workload implication for those elected members - the Standing Committees meet around five times per year.

Senate approved the amended Membership and Terms of Reference for Senate Standing Committees, on the following basis:

- It agreed to adopt Amendment 2.
- It agreed to the principle of Amendment 3, and agreed that the practical considerations required to adopt this amendment would be considered at a meeting of the Standing Committee Conveners and elected Senate members, and presented to the October meeting of Senate.
- It gave time-limited approval to the membership of Senate Standing Committees, which would expire at the next Ordinary meeting of Senate.
- Amendment 1 requires further discussion and would be deferred for consideration at the October meeting of Senate.

Senate also recognised that the planned External Effectiveness Review would provide an opportunity to consider the range of issues associated with the relationship between Senate and its Standing Committees

5. Proposal to bring forward External Effectiveness Review

S 22/23 1 E

For formal noting and approval

This item was introduced by Tom Ward, Director of Academic Services. He noted that Senate had considered the paper at its 25 May meeting and had confirmed its unanimous support to bring forward the External Effectiveness Review to 2022-23. However, while it had provided comments on the approach to the review, it had not approved the terms of reference due to lacking quorum. Mr Ward indicated that, taking account of that earlier discussion, the University Secretary had confirmed that there will be a standard tendering process to appoint an external reviewer, which will explicitly state that expertise in academic governance is required. While there is no formal requirement for Senate to approve the process or Terms of Reference for the external review, Senate confirmed its support for the Terms of Reference and way forward.

6. Guidelines for Senate Committee Papers

S 22/23 1 F

For formal noting and approval

This item was introduced by Dr Michael Barany. The paper was prepared following a discussion with Senate Standing Committee Conveners in relation to closed papers presented to Senate Standing Committees. The guidelines give consideration to data security and the handling of sensitive personal information.

Members were invited to comment on the paper as presented and the following points were made:

- At present, the vast majority of Senate Standing Committee papers are open by default.
- The proposed guidelines raise a question regarding circumstances where there is highly sensitive information and the University is not the sole

stakeholder or owner of that information – for example proposals for partnerships with other organisations. In those cases, the views and interests of external stakeholders will need to be considered on a proposal to share a paper, either in full or redacted form.

Senate approved the Guidelines for Senate Committee Papers as presented in the paper with the addition of an acknowledgement that there may be exceptional circumstances where the Convener is required to make a judgement regarding the sensitive nature of a closed paper which cannot be shared in redacted form. In these instances it will be stated why the paper cannot be shared, and this will be deemed sufficient and give Senate members confidence that there is good reason for this. In addition, Senate noted that the guidelines are applicable to whole-committee papers, rather than items normally considered by Convener's Action, such as individual student concession requests.

7. Regulations Experts and Senate Capacity Building

S 22/23 1 G

To comment

This item was introduced by Dr. Michael Barany. The paper reflects a commitment from Academic Services to hold a briefing on regulations and procedures to supplement existing arrangements for guidance and induction for Senate members.

Senate lost quorum at the conclusion of this item.

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTING

8. Senate Exception Committee Terms of Reference and Membership 2022-23

S 22/23 1 H

For approval

This item was not considered as the meeting was no longer quorate. This item would be presented at the next quorate meeting of Senate.

9. Report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee

S 22/23 1 I

For comment (previously received for information)

This paper was received at the 25 May meeting, however there was insufficient time to receive comments. Other than extending congratulations to the new Chairs, members had no comments on the paper.

10. Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate

S 22/23 1 J

For comment

This paper was received at the 25 May meeting, however there was insufficient time to receive comments. Members were invited to comment on the paper. No comments were received.

11. Report from the Senate Exception Committee

**S 22/23 1 K
CLOSED**

For comment (previously received for noting)

This paper was received at the 25 May meeting, however there was insufficient time to receive comments. Members were invited to comment on the paper and the following point was made:

- The detail in the paper was insufficient and it would be helpful to provide additional detail in future.

12. Update to Senate ex-officio membership

S 22/23 1 L

For noting

The paper was noted.

At the end of the meeting, Senate members discussed the format, duration, frequency and mode of Senate meetings. The following points were made:

- Having additional time to consider matters made today's meeting more constructive, and it would be helpful to have more time (than the established one hour) for the formal business section of Senate meetings in future.
- The presentation and discussion sessions which precede formal Senate meetings are useful and these facilitate inclusion of non-Senate members from whom attendance is generally high. However, the presentation and discussion sessions take the bulk of time available to Senate and impact on the consideration of formal business. It may be possible to hold the presentation and discussion sessions as free-standing events, freeing up Senate time for formal business.
- There was support for holding the formal business section of Senate meetings at an earlier timeslot of 2-4pm.
- There is a strong desire expressed for meetings to be held in hybrid or online format. It was noted that holding meetings on campus may impact on quorum and attendance as some members have to take account of travel time to the venue. Where a hybrid meeting is held, there is a desire for the on campus component to rotate around the University campuses.

The Convener agreed to pass these comments to the Principal, who would consider the format, location, duration, timing and frequency of future Senate meetings.