



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Senatus Academicus

Wednesday 8 February 2023 at 2-5 pm

Hybrid meeting

Gordon Aikman Lecture Theatre and Microsoft Teams

Confirmed Minute

Attendees: Ruth Andrew, Mohammad Amir Anwar, Matthew Bailey, Kasia Banas, Michael Barany, Sian Bayne, Shereen Benjamin, Daniel Bilc, Richard Blythe, Helen Bond, Tom Booth, Lauren Byrne, Conchur O Bradaigh, Laura Bradley, Holly Branigan, Mary Brennan, Jane Calvert, Celine Caquineau, Anthony Carbery, Leigh Chalmers, Hope Conway-Gebbie, Sam Coombes, Chris Cox, Jeremy Crang, Hilary Critchley, Sarah Cunningham-Burley, Jo Danbolt, Jamie Davies, Matuikuani Dax, Anne Desler, James Dunlop, Agata Dunsmore, Murray Earle, Jite Eferakorho, Constantinos Eleftheriou, Natalie Ellingham, Andrea English, Suzanne Ewing, Susan Farrington, Bob Fisher, Chris French, Stuart Gilfillan, Benjamin Goddard, Manuel Fernandez-Gotz, Liz Grant, Richard Gratwick, Yong Guo, Patrick Hadoke, Karen Halliday, Lorna Hamilton, Uzma Tufail-Hanif, Colm Harmon, Tina Harrison, David Hay, Margarete Heck, Pia Helbing, Thorunn Helgason, Melissa Highton, Jane Hillston, James Hopgood, Jenny Hoy, David Ingram, Kirsten Jenkins, Crispin Jordan, Tobias Kelly, Meryl Kenny, George Kinnear, Linda Kirstein, Philip Larkman, Dave Laursen, Ashley Lloyd, Antony Maciocia, Rebecca Marsland, Peter Mathieson (Convener), Alistair McCormick, Gavin McLachlan, Heather McQueen, Steven Morley, Richard Morris, Susan Morrow, Lyndsay Murray, Jade Naulty, Pau Navarro, Robbie Nicol, Paul Norris, Diana Paton, Sarah Prescott, Ken Rice, Sabine Rolle, Mariana Costa Cruz Santos, Bernd Schroers, Matthias Schwanneuer, Robert Semple, Jo Shaw, Mike Shipston, Geoff Simm, Izabela Skowronska, David Smith, Tim Stratford, Elaine Haycock-Stuart, Gavin Sullivan, Amer Syed, Melissa Terras, Robert Thomas, Alex Thomson, Tamara Trodd, Jon Turner, Nadia Tuzi, Jeremy Upton, Stephen Warrington, Christopher Weir, Robyn Woof, Ben Wynne, Ingrid Young

In attendance: Sinead Docherty, Arlene Duffin, Olivia Hayes, David Matheson, Amanda Percy, Ella Ritchie, Tom Ward, Aleksandra Wiaderna

Apologies: Peter Adkins, Arianna Andreangeli, Elizabeth Bomberg, Chandan Bose, Aidan Brown, Tom Bruce, Adam Budd, John Cairns, Andrew Connor, Karen Dawson, Stuart Forbes, Kim Graham, Gillian Gray, Aisha Holloway, Emma Hunter, Laura Jeffery, Catherine Martin, John Menzies, Andrew Morris, Silmee Nowar, Marion Schmid, Tobias Schwarz, David Smith, Sarah Stock, Jonathan Terry, Eleanor Tuladhar-Douglas, Isi Williams, Mark Williams

The Convener, Principal Professor Peter Mathieson, opened the meeting and confirmed that Senate had reached quorum. This was Senate's first hybrid meeting of Senate and he advised members of the etiquette to follow – including discouraging members from using the meeting chat to make substantial points, reminding them that the chat is subject to freedom of information requests, and noting that Senate Support would manage any votes use the Teams voting function, and that non-members attending the meeting should not vote.

The Convener welcomed Professor Ella Ritchie (lead consultant undertaking the external review of Senate and its Committees on behalf of Advance HE) to the meeting. He also welcomed five new Postgraduate Taught student representatives (Daniel Bilc, Mariana Costa Cruz Santos, Matuikuani Dax, Shatabdi Mukhopadhyay and Jade Naulty), and one Postgraduate Research student representative (Patrick Lennard).

1.	<p>Convener's Communications</p> <p>The Convener noted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and Money continues to generate a high level of concern among colleagues, and Senate will receive an update on this under Item 7. • A period of industrial action is underway with further strike action scheduled for the coming weeks. Senate will receive an update on this under Item 8. • The University has negotiated a renewal to the MasterCard Foundation scholars programme, which was due to conclude in 2023. The renewal sees a further £40 million of investment to 2030, focussed primarily on Postgraduate Taught opportunities. • The Chancellor, Her Royal Highness, The Princess Royal, recently visited the University. She hosted the annual Chancellor's dinner where she presented the Chancellor's awards; met colleagues involved in an industry collaboration between the University, Babcock International and Fife College; and met colleagues and students from the School of Health in Social Sciences. • Universities Scotland held its annual Parliamentary reception at the Scottish Parliament Building, the first since 2020. Around 30 Members of the Scottish Parliament attended the event, including Cabinet Secretary for Education, Shirley-Anne Somerville. The event showcased innovation from across Scotland's universities, with the University's presentation focussing on a data driven start-up.
2.	<p>2.1 Senate Minutes S 22/23 3 A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Senate meeting held on 12 October 2022 <p>Senate approved the minutes, subject to the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Item 7: Code of Student Conduct: The statement was read out by the EUSA Women's Liberation Officer, not EUSA VP Welfare. • Under Item 2.2: The query regarding the resourcing of Timetabling should be recorded under Item 1.1 not 2.2. The comment should be amended to reflect Ms Evan's response to the query, which was to confirm that Timetabling was adequately resourced. <p>In relation to Timetabling, a Senate member indicated that the issues that Senate members had raised in October 2022 in relation to Semester 1 continue to be experienced in Semester 2. The Convener noted that some Senate members had asked that Ms Evans provide an update on Timetabling at this meeting. However, given the substantial agenda for the 8 February meeting, this update would be received at the next Ordinary meeting of Senate. Ms Evans invited members to raise any concerns with her in the interim.</p> <p>A member raised a discrepancy in the 12 October minute. The member requested that section 2.1 (Minutes of Senate meeting held on 12 October 2022) be amended by including the following text: A number of amendments were submitted and incorporated in advance of the meeting. There was a discrepant recollection about paper 2I (point 10 of the minutes), namely whether Senate had agreed to "approve" the paper formally. This was clearly and distinctly recalled by the member raising the point, but not reflected in the informal meeting notes or draft minute. In the interest of time, the convener was asked to allow this to be noted without a formal motion to that effect, but declined to do so.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of E-Senate held from 11 – 25 January 2023 <p>Senate approved the report.</p>
	<p>2.2 Matters arising Verbal update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of Curriculum Transformation Programme costs [Minutes of 9 February 2022 meeting of Senate, Item 4] <p>This was covered in the paper under item 6.2: <i>Curriculum Transformation Project - Planning</i>.</p>

- **Senate Standing Committees membership – outstanding issues [Minutes of 12 October 2022 meeting of Senate, Item 5]**

This was due to be covered in the paper under item 11: *Senate Standing Committee Membership – outstanding membership items*.

- **Update on discussions on the Sustainable Travel Policy [Minutes of 12 October 2022 meeting of Senate, Item 8]**

The Convener confirmed that, following Senate’s discussion on 12 October 2022, he had conveyed Senate’s views on the Sustainable Travel Policy to the University Executive. The University Court also received a report which included the minute on this item from the 12 October 2022 Senate meeting. In response to a query that Senate had raised in October 2022, the University Secretary confirmed that the contract with the supplier, Diversity Travel, runs until 2025. The contract does not contain specific review dates but can be terminated or suspended as provided for in the contract. She also confirmed that the contract does not stipulate that the University must use a single supplier for bookings.

- **Senate Exception Committee membership – expansion of membership [Minutes of 12 October 2022 meeting of Senate, Item 11]**

The Convener confirmed that Academic Services had completed this action, adding four new elected academic Senate members to the Committee. The updated membership of the Committee is available on the Academic Services website.

- **Research Strategy Group update – report to UE on REF performance and funding [Minutes of 12 October 2022 meeting of Senate, Item 16]**

The Annex to Item 13: *Research Strategy Group update* included the information that Senate had asked for.

3. Update on Externally Facilitated Review

Verbal update

Professor Ella Ritchie introduced herself, indicating that she is former Deputy Vice-Chancellor of Newcastle University and has undertaken reviews of four Scottish Universities. She is supported on the review by Professor David Langley, and Hillary Gyebi-Ababio. Ms Gyebi-Ababio is the former Vice-President (Higher Education) at the National Union of Students (NUS) and will primarily support the student side of the review.

Prof Ritchie indicated that the review will focus on Senate and its Standing Committees. As part of the process, the consultants will review background documentation (for example, Senate minutes), undertake surveys of Senate members and Standing Committee members, hold a series of individual interviews and focus groups, and observe meetings of Senate and its Committees. She planned to present the findings of the review to Senate in May 2023. She would frame her findings and recommendations within the institutional and legislative context. She encouraged members to engage with the review by way of completing the survey and volunteering for focus groups. The review would primarily be conducted online.

4. Senate Standing Committees – upcoming business

S 22/23 3B

This paper was introduced by Dr Paul Norris (Convener of the Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee, APRC) and Professor Tina Harrison (Convener of the Senate Quality Assurance Committee, SQAC, and Vice-Convener of the Senate Education Committee, SEC).

Dr Norris highlighted some of the business from the January 2023 meeting of APRC:

- The Coursework Extensions and Special Circumstances task group intends to bring proposals forward to APRC's next meeting, with a view to putting in place some potential policy changes for 2023-24.
- The Committee agreed the process for considering on a case by case basis any proposals for variations to academic regulations and policies for particular courses / programmes / Boards of Examiners – by Convener's action in consultation with Committee members. To date, two cases relating to External Examiners had been handled in this manner.
- Thirty-six individual student concessions have been handled by Convener's action between the September and January meetings, with the majority relating to authorised interruption of study and extensions.

Professor Harrison provided an update on the business conducted at SEC's January meeting, which she convened in Professor Harmon's absence. This included an update on the Curriculum Transformation Programme, an issue which Senate will consider under Item 6 of the agenda.

Professor Harrison also noted that SQAC's upcoming work will focus on annual reporting (for example, for Academic Appeals, Complaints, and Student Support Services) along with considering changes to the annual quality monitoring templates for Schools.

A member raised concern regarding allegedly transphobic Personal Tutors being assigned to students who identify as transgender.

Lucy Evans (Deputy Secretary, Students) confirmed that under the new Student Support Model, the pastoral support for students will be undertaken by professional services staff including Student Advisers. Training will be developed to raise awareness, knowledge and understanding of gender identity, transgender people and their experiences.

Senate noted the paper.

In response a question, Tom Ward (Director of Academic Services) outlined the Senate Standing Committees are establishing two new task groups to coordinate assessment and feedback activities. One group will focus on strategy and policy, the other on guidance, procedures, data, systems and evaluation. To date, two of the Committees have discussed the memberships and remits for the task groups, and have made suggestions for some refinements including regarding representation from elected members of Senate. Members were invited to contact Tom Ward if they have further comments on the proposed task groups.

5. Senate Elections 2023/24 & Senate Standing Committees 2023/24

S 22/23 3C

Ms Olivia Hayes, Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services, introduced the paper, inviting Senate to consider a series of options outlined in the paper and its appendices.

Senate approved the appointment of Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officer for the Senate elections. Senate considered two alternate processes for allocating terms of office to successful candidates for election to Senate, with Ms Hayes noting that Court Services had confirmed that either process is compatible with the Senate Election Regulations. Senate agreed by majority vote a process whereby voter preferences are utilised to allocate terms of office to successful candidates (see Option B, paragraph 26 of the paper). Senate approved the later of the two potential timelines for receiving nominations and conducting voting for the elections, starting with a call for nominations opening on 1 March 2023, as set out in Appendix 1, on the grounds that this would allow Court to consider its recommendations for Senate Assessors (which would have implications for the conduct of the elections) at its meeting on 27 February 2023.

Senate noted the technical amendment to Appendix 4 of the Senate Election Regulations, adding the Provost to the list of Ex Officio members (in place of the former Senior Vice-Principal role).

Senate approved the timeline, process and Returning Officer for elections to Senate Standing Committees, as set out in paragraphs 30-34.

Senate discussed the proposal to exclude Senate Assessors from the overall count of elected Senate members as outlined in Appendix 3, making the following points:

- Were Senate to recommend that Court change the Senate Election Regulations, it would need to hold off the nomination and election process for elected academic staff members until after Court had met to consider the proposed change.
- It was not clear whether the proposed amendment was compatible with Ordinance 212. From one perspective, Ordinance may imply that the Senate Assessors should be counted with elected academic staff in Senate, in which case under the proposed amendment the total elected academic staff membership could exceed the 200 to be elected under the Ordinance. It was noted in reply that the Ordinance's provision for election 200 at-large academic members does not limit the number of ex officio members who can also be elected, currently including the Academic Staff member on Court who is elected but not counted towards the 200 at-large elected staff.

Senate supported by majority vote to seek Court approval for amending the Senate Election Regulations to exclude Senate Assessors from the overall count of elected Senate members. Academic Services would seek legal advice before seeking Court approval for this amendment at the meeting on 27 February 2023.

6. Curriculum Transformation presentation and papers

6.1 Curriculum Transformation Framework

S 22/23 3D

6.2 Curriculum Transformation Resources

S 22/23 3E

These papers were introduced by Professor Colm Harmon (Vice-Principal, Students), and accompanied by presentations from Dr Jon Turner (Director of the Institute of Academic Development), Professor Iain Gordon (Head of the College of Science and Engineering, CSE), Professor Holly Branigan (Head of the School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, PPLS), Dr Philip Larkman (Director of Teaching for the Deanery of Biomedical Sciences, BMS) and Niamh Roberts, (President, Edinburgh University Students' Association). In their introductions, and in response to questions from Senate members, they made the following points:

- Curriculum Transformation is a major long-term investment project for the University. It aims to improve the University's educational experience for students and educators and provides an opportunity for cross-disciplinary study, innovation and creativity in education and positive changes to University systems and process.
- The first paper (Paper 3D) provides an overview of the proposed Undergraduate Curriculum Framework. This includes four programme archetypes, which allow for disciplinary depth and learning beyond the home discipline. The Framework also includes challenge courses, which intend to draw on institutional strengths allowing for programme-level learning, experiential learning and enrichment opportunities, drawing on expertise not only from University staff but also potential external input.
- The project is working towards September 2026 implementation to allow for a phased roll out. The second paper (Paper 3E) sets out the proposed approach to developing the case for investment for the successful implementation of the project. The project team recognises that staff workload and morale issues will create challenges for implementing the project, and the team will need to work with stakeholders to identify appropriate ways to reconcile these issues. In response to a query, the project team confirmed that the consultancy costs set out in the paper remain within the £50k limits required for procurement.
- The project team plans to bring forward separate proposals in relation to the Postgraduate Taught dimension of Curriculum Transformation in due course.
- CSE intends to pilot a challenge course on sustainability to explore the issues, including timetabling, scaling and governance, which would need to be addressed ahead of a broader roll out of challenge courses. It has established a scoping group with representatives from across Schools to develop the challenge course.
- PPLS has used Curriculum Transformation as a catalyst for discussions around pedagogy and curriculum, including discussions about ways to implement Curriculum Transformation

within each of the School's subjects. As a result of these discussions, the School has identified some challenges and tensions, for example that introducing new mandatory elements to programmes could reduce flexibility for students to transfer between programmes.

- BMS have used Curriculum Transformation as an opportunity to consider how to offer cross-disciplinary collaborative courses in the early years of its programmes. The Deanery is committed to offering challenge-based courses to its students. However, its prior experiences of developing an interdisciplinary challenge-based course (Our Changing World) highlighted some of the challenges associated with developing courses that are relevant and accessible to students across the University.
- The Students' Association believes that the project offers improved opportunities for students including the development of real world skills, increased competitiveness in the job market, improved employability with graduates equipped with skills across disciplines, and improvements in assessment and feedback.

Senate members made the following points:

- Some members, including student representatives, commended the project's focus on challenge courses, and thought that they should be available across all years of programmes, not just in years one and two, as students are more likely to have the skills to benefit from these courses in later years. However, some members felt that it would be difficult to design challenge-based courses capable of accommodating large numbers of students from a range of disciplinary backgrounds while delivering a high quality student experience, and also had concerns that large-scale courses could lead to increased utilisation of guaranteed hours teaching staff contracts. In some cases, members thought it may be more appropriate for Schools to develop new challenge courses embedded within their disciplines. Members had mixed views on the terminology of 'challenge' courses, since it could imply that other courses did not challenge students.
- Members supported the project's student-led (rather than teaching-led) approach to learning.
- In addition to developing skills in interdisciplinary learning, the project should assist students to develop general academic skills such as academic English.
- While the project needs to take account of the requirements of professional and statutory bodies, it should not treat professional programmes as separate when implementing the project. Professional programmes will be particularly good at delivering some aspects of Curriculum Transformation, and the project should enable other programmes to learn from their expertise.
- While the timelines for implementing the project are ambitious, they do allow Schools and Deaneries a reasonable length of time for piloting, testing and development of the curriculum and approaches to teaching and learning. While the University will need to determine certain elements of programmes in advance of UCAS deadlines for the admissions cycle for 2026-27 entry, there will be opportunities to work through implementation in a phased way.
- The project appeared to assume increased investment in central University structures, systems and processes. However, the University's current arrangements can create impediments to Schools and Deaneries developing interdisciplinary teaching at a local level, and some members thought that the project should focus on removing these barriers to enable organic local developments. When planning for implementation, the project should consider how to develop the University's staff and culture, and models of teaching, as well as systems and processes.
- Some members felt that the papers did not provide enough clarity regarding the proposals and direction of travel to allow them to decide whether to support them.

Following discussion, Senate supported by majority vote the proposals outlined in Paper D for:

- The continued development and design of key elements of the undergraduate curriculum framework (programme archetypes, challenge courses, experiential learning, enrichment elements and curriculum design principles); and

- The next steps for in-depth engagement with Schools and Deaneries on their response to the framework to inform its further development and the preparation of a detailed plan and timeline for implementation.

Senate also supported by majority vote the continued development of the case for investment, phased implementation and risk management needed to support the delivery of the curriculum transformation project, as set out in Paper E.

6.3 Senate Oversight of the Curriculum Transformation Programme

S 22/23 3F

Dr Tamara Trodd introduced this paper, which aimed to clarify Senate's role in regulatory and superintending the teaching and discipline of the University in relation to the Curriculum Transformation Programme.

Senate members made the following points in relation to motion 3.1 (which proposed that formal approval of the package of strategic, regulatory, and academic policy changes relating to the CTP, and all other such changes from the CTP under Senate's remit, be reserved to full Senate) and motions 3.2 and 3.3 (which proposed that the delayed implementation of the programme be used as an opportunity to review the CTP approach, and that the outcome of this review be discussed at the May 2023 meeting of Senate):

- While Senate should make the strategic academic changes regarding Curriculum Transformation, motion 3.1 would require Senate to make quite detailed decisions on a wide range of aspects of academic policy and regulations. Were Senate to pass this motion, it may need to hold additional meetings in order to get through the relevant business. Requiring formal Senate approval for arrangements for piloting aspects of the CT Framework could inhibit innovation.
- Motion 3.1 would involve a substantive change in the delegation of the powers from Senate to the Committees. The externally-facilitated review of Senate and Committees is reviewing the relationship between Senate and its Committees, and it would be more appropriate for Senate to hold off any decisions on the delegation of powers to the Committees until the conclusion of the review.
- It may prove difficult to interpret motion 3.1 in practice, since, while some decisions would relate unequivocally to changes associated with Curriculum Transformation, others may be aligned to Curriculum Transformation but not associated with the project as such (for example, where Schools or support services propose to change their own programmes in advance of the full implementation of Curriculum Transformation in order to anticipate elements of the CT vision or archetypes).
- The proposed review arrangements set out in motions 3.2 and 3.3 were not aligned with the direction of travel that Senate had just approved in relation to agenda item 6.1.
- It would be challenging to undertake the proposed review in time for the May 2023 Senate meeting.
- The proposed review would have resource implications, and the paper does not set out the practical implications of redirecting resources to the review from other activities.

One Senate member, Prof Tina Harrison, proposed amendments to motions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3:

Proposed amendment to 3.1: "This motion asks that major strategic elements of changes to existing academic policy and regulations relating to the implementation of the Curriculum Change Programme come to Senate for approval, as currently intended. However, ALL changes to relating to Curriculum Transformation should not be reserved to full Senate, recognising the existing governance arrangements in place which provide Senate Standing Committee with authority to make decisions on changes to academic policies and regulations. From a governance perspective the Curriculum Transformation Board has the responsibility to maintain oversight of the project and make recommendations to the University Executive and Senate Education Committee."

	<p>Proposed amendment to motions 3.2 and 3.3: “This motion proposes that the extended planned implementation date of CTP and a more explicit element of phasing provides an opportunity to undertake in-depth engagement with all Schools and complete work on the investment case and implementation plan (throughout the remainder of AY22/23), and asks that Curriculum Transformation Board reviews progress and plans once this work has been done, and reports on that review to the first meeting of Senate Education Committee and Senate at the start of academic year 2023/24.”</p> <p>Some Senate members felt that the wording of the proposed amendments (for example, where they varied from the original motions) was not sufficiently clear to allow for a vote. Given that there was insufficient time left in the meeting to redraft the amendments, and that some Senate members reported that their laptops were running out of power (which would have prevented them from voting) Senate agreed to defer decisions on Paper 3F to a subsequent meeting. In the meantime, the Vice-Principal (Students) offered to meet with the authors of the paper to discuss the issues they raised, and to explore potential ways to reframe their proposals.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Senate Role in the Response to People and Money Crisis S 22/23 3G</p> <p>In advance of Senate discussing Paper 3G, as a matter arising from the previous Senate meeting, Professor Dave Robertson provided an update on People and Money. He recognised that the implementation of PAM has placed intensive pressure on parts of the University and created significant resourcing issues. He indicated that, in order to address issues associated with PAM, the University was taking pragmatic steps focussing on six lines of work, including research finances, training, and streamlining back office processes. He also reported that Internal Audit is preparing proposals for an independent review of PAM.</p> <p>Since Senate was no longer quorate, and the meeting had already overrun the scheduled time by 30 minutes, the meeting of Senate was adjourned at 5:30pm, before discussion of this item was complete. The President of Senate indicated that he would communicate a date for a reconvened meeting as soon as possible, taking account of scheduled industrial action and diary constraints.</p> <p>At the conclusion of the meeting, Senate members made some comments on the scheduling, duration and timing of Senate meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the interests of time it would be useful to take Senate papers as read and to provide updates in written format rather than as presentations, or alternately to limit the length of any presentations. • While it is proving challenging for Senate to complete its business in the three hours, in the past Senate was able to complete its business in an hour. • Meetings of Senate should finish at their scheduled end time in order to enable the participation of all members. • While there was a case for scheduling Senate earlier in the day in order to facilitate participation from colleagues with caring responsibilities, scheduling Senate on a Wednesday afternoon allows for the participation of staff and students as the University generally avoids scheduling teaching during this time. Student representatives were particularly supportive of scheduling Senate for Wednesday afternoons.
<p>8.</p>	<p>Supporting a Negotiated Resolution to Industrial Action as an Academic Priority To approve</p> <p>Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Legal Context of Senate Motions</p> <p>The paper for this item was not coming forward to the February meeting of Senate.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Honorary Degrees Withdrawal Procedure</p>

	Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.
11.	Senate Standing Committee Membership – outstanding membership items Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTING

12.	Laigh Year Regulations Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.
13.	Research Strategy Group update Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.