



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Senatus Academicus

Wednesday 1 October 2025, 1:10-4pm

Lecture Theatre G.03, 50 George Square, Central Area / Microsoft Teams

Confirmed Minutes

Attendees: Catherine Abbott, Samer Abdelnour, Thomas Ahnert, Andrew Alexander, Omar Alfituri, Jana Alramahi, Katya Amott, Jonathan Ansell, Naomi Appleton, Kate Ash-Irisarri, Andy Aydin-Aitchison, Liz Baggs, Richard Ball, Kasia Banas, Dario Banegas, Michael Barany, Jacob Bard-Rosenberg, Frances Barnett, Louisa Bates, Richard Baxstrom, Sian Bayne, Matthew Bell, Christine Bell, Philip Best, Richard Blythe, Tamanna Bostani, Nicola Boydell, Julian Bradfield, Barry Bradford, Aidan Brown, Emily Brownell, Tom Bruce, Karl Burgess, Mette Cameron, Christopher Campbell, Mirko Canevaro, Jeremy Carrette, Leigh Chalmers, Sue Chapman, Jianyi Cheng, Seongsook Choi, Neil Chue Hong, Martin Corley, Elliot Crowley, Juan Cruz, Caspar Cubitt, Jo Danbolt, Kirsty Day, Giulia De Togni, Luigi Del Debbio, Jean-Christophe Denis, Chris Dent, Charlotte Desvages, John Devaney, Kevin Donovan, Julia Dorin, Leonidas Dumas, Donald Dunbar, Claire Duncanson, Susan Dunnett, Olivia Eadie, Georgie Elson, Mark Evans, Omolabake Fakunle, David Farrier, Tonks Fawcett, Valentina Ferlito, Sue Fletcher-Watson, Emily Ford-Halliday, Ross Galloway, Vashti Galpin, Einan Gardi, James Garforth, Akrit Ghimire, Antonis Giannopoulos, Stuart Gilfillan, Benjamin Goddard, Iain Gordon, Kim Graham, Lucy Grig, Marc Hadlow, Lauren Hall-Lew, Jeni Harden, Tina Harrison, Gareth Harrison, Helen Hastie, Olivia Hayes, Ailsa Henderson, Chris Heunen, Athena Hezi, Jane Hislop, James Hopgood, Jenny Hoy, Emma Hunter, David Ingram, Jakov Jandric, Amanda Jarvis, An Jiang, Hamish Kallin, Itamar Kastner, Meryl Kenny, George Kinneer, Dave Laurenson, Andy Law, Tom Leinster, Nazarii Lialiuik, Dawn Livingstone, Ewa Luger, Karen Luo, Sophia Lycouris, Antony Maciocia, Malcolm MacLeod, Cait MacPhee, Peter Mathieson, Sarah McAllister, Fiona McClement, Velda McCune, Gavin McLachlan, Encarni Medina-Lopez, Marc Metzger, Mihaela Mihai, Tijana Mitic, James Mittra, James Mooney, Steven Morley, Ben Morse, Simon Mudd, Rachel Muers, Harish Nair, Rupert Nash, Pau Navarro, Bryne Ngwenya, Killian O' Dochartaigh, Olga Oikonomidou, Richard Oosterhoff, Ugur Ozdemir, Diana Paton, Cheryl Patrick, Josephine Pemberton, Sari Pennings, Nick Polydorides, Sarah Prescott, Colin Pulham, Andrew Rambaut, Syjil Ramjuthan, Emma Ramsay, Ken Rice, Carol Richardson, Simon Riley, Aryelly Rodriguez Carbonell, Liam Ross, Brodie Runciman, Enrique Sanchez Molano, Eberhard Sauer, Ash Scholz, Bernd Schroers, Kirsteen Shields, Stewart Smith, David Smith, Antonella Sorace, Courtney Stafford-Walter, Euan Stamper, Perdita Stevens, Wilfried Swenden, Emily Taylor, Alex Thomson, Sally Till, Suzanne Trill, Tamara Trodd, Ian Underwood, Shannon Vallor, Joris Veltman, Patrick Walsh, Lena Wanggren, Michele Weiland, Iain Wright, Ben Wynne, Chunyou Yao, Ingrid Young

In attendance: Meg Batty, Adam Bunni, Lisa Dawson, Arlene Duffin, Lucy Evans, Olivia Hayes (Clerk), Richard Kenway, Nichola Kett, Jan McClean

Apologies: Marialuisa Aliotta, David Argyle, Kelly Blacklock, Lisa Boden, Christina Boswell, Laura Bradley, Mary Brennan, Carol Campbell, Celine Caquineau, Jeremy Crang, Afshan Dean, Kevin Dhaliwal, Stuart Forbes, Laura Glendinning, Richard Gratwick, Karen Gregory, Rachel Happer, Thorunn Helgason, Gavin Jack, Linda Kirstein, David Kluth, Paul Le Tissier, Jason Love,

1 Welcome and Apologies

The Convener, Principal Professor Sir Peter Mathieson, welcomed members to the first Senate meeting of the 2025-26 academic session with special welcome extended to new members. It was confirmed that Senate had reached quorum. The Convener reminded members that the Senate meeting would be recorded to aid in the production of the minutes as per the Senate Recordings Privacy Statement.

Amendments to Senate business

The Academic Registrar, Lisa Dawson, updated Senate on how amendments would be handled for this meeting. She advised that an amendment form has been introduced for use from the October meeting onwards. The form is being introduced in response to member feedback and is intended to provide members with clarity on decisions and the purpose and implications of proposed amendments.

She advised that one amendment was received in time to be circulated in advance via the Senate Members Portal. The amendment would be considered under Paper H.

She informed Senate that members were able to propose further amendments without having previously notified Senate Support and that this is permissible under Standing Order 10. Where amendments are proposed without being previously notified, a short adjournment of up to 10 minutes may be required to confirm understanding and to set up voting. She also confirmed that where there are believed to be wider checking or advice required on amendments submitted, amendments may need to be returned to a future meeting.

Report of the Senate Business Committee

The Academic Registrar provided Senate with a verbal report of the Senate Business Committee. She reported that the Committee had met on 28 August to consider the agenda for today's meeting and that the Committee must meet five weeks prior to Senate to allow papers to be circulated two weeks in advance. At its meeting, the Committee recommended that seven of the eight papers submitted should be included on the agenda (billet) and agreed the order and time allocated to papers. The Convener of Senate accepted all the recommendations from the Business Committee.

There was one paper submitted for the agenda which the Business Committee agreed would be held. This paper was titled *Senate's Role in the Recruitment and Appointment of Vice-Principals*. The Business Committee Convener offered to meet with the paper author to discuss the paper contents and provide them with an opportunity to outline what information they were seeking, and whether it is possible to provide that through other means.

A late paper was submitted for inclusion on the agenda (billet) on 16 September, the day prior to Senate papers being circulated. The paper was titled *Senate Role in Board of Examiner Policy and Regulations*. This item was considered in line with the terms of reference of the Senate Business Committee by the Business Committee Convener, Vice-Convener and the Senate Convener, and they agreed that the paper would not be included on the agenda. It was agreed that the paper was not considered to be urgent noting the full agenda and time available for additional papers. The Academic Registrar noted that she offered to meet with paper authors and that there is upcoming engagement on the topic at two Senate Standing Committees (Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) and Academic Policy and Regulation Committee (APRC)) and that a paper on this topic would be presented to the December meeting of Senate. The wider Business Committee were informed of the decision.

The Academic Registrar also outlined a query raised by a Senate member in relation to papers not included on the agenda. The member asked whether papers not taken forward would be

handled in line with the process approved by Senate in February 2024, in Paper S 23/24 2J: Suppressed Items from Senate Business. That process has now been superseded by the formation of the Senate Business Committee which was approved at the December 2024 meeting. The enquiring member was informed of this.

A Senate member thanked the Academic Registrar for the information and stated they had enquired in response to the Senate Clerk where, in approval of the Business Committee, it had been agreed that Senate's previously adopted process for handling suppressed motions was to be superseded. The member stated that their recollection, as supported by the minutes, was that the handling of suppressed items would remain explicitly with the Convener and there would be no change to the suppression handling procedures.

In response, the Convener of the Business Committee reiterated the establishment of the Committee and that the role of the Committee is to decide what items of business are brought to Senate. The member objected that this was inaccurate. The Business Committee Convener then clarified that the Committee provides recommendations to the Senate Convener on what papers are brought to Senate, and the priority and timings associated with these. To date, the Senate Convener has accepted all recommendations made by the Business Committee. The member reminded the Business Committee Convener of the obligation to disclose on the billet when papers are not included on the agenda in line with the process agreed via Paper S 23/24 2J in February 2024.

2 Minutes and e-Senate Reports

Senate approved the minutes of the meetings of 24 April 2025 (S 25/26 1A) and 20 May 2025 (S 25/26 1B) without requiring a vote.

Senate approved the e-Senate report of 27 August - 10 September 2025 (S 24/25 1C) without requiring a vote. On behalf of Senate, the Convener congratulated the large number of new Professors Emeritus and Emerita.

2.1 Matters arising

A member, who co-authored the paper referred to in the Report of the Senate Business Committee titled *Senate Role in Board of Examiners Policy and Regulations*, explained that the paper authors had been informed that the paper was rejected due to non-urgency, which the authors dispute. The member explained that the changes to Board of Examiners are expected to come into force in January and several members of Senate and the wider academic community believe that Senate should have greater input into the changes, and as the paper was not included on the billet the following motion is proposed:

1. Any regulation change relating to the operation of Boards of Examiners in the academic year 2025/26 must come to full Senate for approval.
2. Any change to the operation of Boards of Examiners in academic year 2025/26 that does not require changes to the regulations also requires approval by full Senate. Proposals for potential mechanisms for delegation of approval of minor changes are welcomed; such mechanisms would also require explicit approval by full Senate.

Proposer: Aidan Brown

Secunder: Ross Galloway

The Academic Registrar, Lisa Dawson, provided an update on the Board of Examiners project. She explained that the second iteration of designs is being worked through and shared with the critical friends group and, at this point in time, no policy changes are proposed. Once the second iteration of designs is complete, this should identify whether policy changes may be required. Papers providing an update on the project have gone to both the Academic Policy and Regulation Committee (APRC) and Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC) in September. The project is working closely with Deans of Education and the elected Senate members on APRC have been invited to join the critical friends group to ensure wider input and bringing Senate views into the project.

The Senate Convener explained that a substantial change to the delegated authority to Senate Standing Committees required detailed consideration and requires further thought and understanding of the considerable implications if that change was to be made.

The Convener of the Senate Business Committee also spoke to the rationale for not including the paper in the October meeting of Senate, noting that it was a late paper and the project is not currently proposing any policy changes with discussions ongoing via the Senate Standing Committees. She explained that this is why the paper authors received the feedback that the paper was not considered to be immediately urgent, highlighting the ongoing work, space on the biller and that a paper will be forthcoming to the December meeting of Senate.

The member responded that whilst there may not be proposed changes in policy, a communication was circulated to colleagues in CSE which stated that 'we expect all Schools to adopt all recommendations for 2026/27 academic year' and listing various recommendations. He shared that the effect of recommendations that are to be adopted is indistinguishable from policy changes. He stated that, irrespective of any procedural issues with the motion, this is an extremely significant change to the running of Boards of Examiners and it would be shameful if the University's supreme academic body was not permitted to discuss and input into this.

The Convener of the Business Committee confirmed that Senate will have an opportunity to input into this project at the next Senate meeting.

Another member asked whether there would be no changes to the January Boards of Examiners and for confirmation that any changes would come to Senate.

Another member sought to clarify that if the paper was rejected at the December meeting of Senate that no changes would come into effect for January. She observed that this appeared to be a compressed timescale and asked if there was room for the changes not to come into effect as quickly as planned.

The Academic Registrar confirmed that a paper would come to the December Senate meeting, with further papers to go to the next round of Senate Standing Committees. The project is working with Deans of Education on a phased approach and to understand what is possible for the January Boards. She confirmed that any policy changes would be presented to APRC in the first instance in line with the delegated authority model and that APRC has delegated authority from Senate to carry out business relating to policy. She confirmed that the second iteration of designs is complete, and this will be shared with critical friends group which includes Senate elected academic member representation. Any changes would go through the relevant governance models, which would be APRC for any policy changes, and a paper expected for the December meeting of Senate.

Lucy Evans, Associate Principal and Deputy Secretary, Students, explained that the project is exploring what changes are possible and what changes will take longer. She confirmed that this

will be communicated to staff in a transparent way, however decisions will not be implemented that will break anything, and the Deans of Education are critical in supporting this working.

Tina Harrison, Convener of SQAC, provided an update to Senate on the discussion that took place at the 29 September meeting of SQAC. The discussion was detailed and wide-ranging with several comments received on the Board of Examiners review. There is considerable expertise in SQAC and the Conveners of the Board of Examiners were invited to have further discussion on this. There is a clear avenue for elected academic Senate members to feed their views into the discussions taking place at SQAC.

A Senate member observed that colleagues agree that Senate will be able to discuss the Board of Examiners proposals at Senate and therefore the motion proposed should not be controversial and the member asked that Senate be asked to reach a decision on this motion.

The Convener explained in response that there has not been time to consider the implications of the motion and this will return to the December meeting for discussion. He acknowledged that members are entitled to bring motions without prior notification in line with the Standing Orders

Nichola Kett, Head of Academic Quality and Standards, observed that several members have previously provided feedback both in-meeting and via post-meeting surveys on motions and amendments and expressing a lack of understanding on what decision members are being asked to reach. She acknowledged that the Standing Orders allow for amendments to be proposed without prior notification, however consideration of such amendments does not align with the wishes or feedback from members which requests clear information and understanding ahead of Senate being asked to reach a decision.

The proposer of the motion, Dr Aidan Brown, stated Senate can make its own decision on whether it has sufficient information and proposed that the chair's ruling be overturned and the motion put to a vote.

Another member observed that members are being reassured that due process is being followed and information will become available, however remain deeply confused by precisely what the situation is. Staff have received explicit emails from College level outlining changes which are to be in place by the January Boards of Examiners, with these communications indicting that these changes are mandatory. The member explained that staff are very upset about this project as there is a lack of clarity and Senate is entitled to vote on the requirement for clarity.

Another member expressed concern that changes for the January Boards of Examiners are not being ruled out. He spoke to Schools which have professional accreditation requirements and the obligation to consult with professional bodies before changes of this nature are rolled out. There is insufficient time to do this between the December meeting of Senate and the January Boards of Examiners. This poses a risk to the continued professional accreditation of programmes. The member sought to have changes to the January Boards of Examiners explicitly ruled out as a reassurance on this point. In response to explanation from the Academic Registrar, the member welcomed the reassurance that the project is not mandatory for January, however observed that this was not the tenor of communications.

The Academic Registrar explained that the project is working with Deans of Education to identify a small set of pilot Schools, taking account of the feedback received via College roadshows, and confirmed it is not mandated for the January Boards of Examiners.

Professor Iain Gordon, Head of the College of Science and Engineering, spoke to the email communication which provided an update on the Board of Examiner review and outlined the changes that were anticipated for the January 2026 Boards of Examiners. This included decision trees and timelines for Exceptional Circumstances processes, as well as role descriptors and workflows for Course and Progression Boards. He reflected that Exceptional Circumstances and decision trees have been under discussion with Schools for quite some time and this element is try to address issues that Schools have experienced with regard to late Exceptional Circumstances. Concerns with regard to accreditation have also been raised in discussions with Heads of Schools and the review is seeking to identify some pilot schools to have an opportunity to understand any potential issues

Another member sought clarity on what Senate's role is in relation to the review, there have been references to discussion being held at Senate Committees and Senate input being sought. Senate is the senior academic body of the University and the motion is seeking for Senate to approve these changes. Senate's approval should be uncontroversial if the plans are reasoned and sensible.

In response, the Convener reflected that the concern related to the implications for Senate's delegated authority.

A student member explained that new student members did not have context for the discussion that was being held and, in the absence of a paper, that there was a lack of understanding of the discussion which was underway. The member reflected that decision-making on this topic was challenging in the absence of the required information and asked why this could not be returned to the December meeting of Senate for a decision, along with a paper provided for context.

The Convener observed that there are strongly held views that Senate is entitled to a vote. After a short adjournment, Senate approved the motion by a majority vote of 102. 16 members did not approve, 8 members abstained and 27 members stated there was not enough information.

Clerk's note: an additional voting option was available to allow members to indicate where they believed they did not have sufficient information to make an informed decision on the item.

2.2 Senate Action Log

Senate noted the status of actions as detailed within the Action Log (S 25/26 1D).

3 Convener's Communications

Financial Context of the University sector and the University of Edinburgh

The Convener outlined a recent announcement by the UK Government that there will be a levy on international student tuition fees in England. He stated that the details on this are limited at present. He noted that the Scottish Government has previously said that no such levy would be introduced in Scotland, and this may provide a competitive edge for Scottish institutions.

The Convener outlined that the levy would be linked to maintenance grants, which would be reintroduced in England and funded via the international student levy. He stated that the Scottish government may seek to match maintenance grants offered in England, however it is unclear where funding would be sourced to provide such grants and the Scottish government may look to introduce a similar levy on international students to pay for this. He stated there are potential implications for Scottish universities in any future decisions made by the Scottish government on this topic, Universities Scotland are currently taking this up with the Scottish government and there may be further information to follow in due course.

4 EUSA Sabbatical Officer Priorities 2025/26

Katya Amott, Students' Association Vice-President Education, introduced the paper (S 25/26 1E). She outlined the priorities and drew particular attention to two priorities of importance to the Vice-President Education and the wider Sabbatical Officer team. Those are: addressing the awarding gap which affects widening participation students through strategic and evidence-based initiatives; and empowering student voice. She also highlighted the small bloc of student members and their wish to ensure that the student voice continues to be uplifted, protected and valued.

5 Amendments to the Laigh Year Regulations

Lucy Evans, Associate Principal and Deputy Secretary, Students introduced the paper (S 25/26 1F). Ms Evans outlined the changes to the Regulations, which allow student sabbatical officers from the Edinburgh University Students' Association (EUSA) and Edinburgh University Sports Union (EUSU) to matriculate as students without having to fulfil the normal academic requirements of their programme of study. A series of changes to the Regulations are proposed, these changes have come from and been discussed and agreed between the Associate Principal and Deputy Secretary Students, EUSA, EUSU and Colleges.

Senate recommended that Court approve the amendments to the Laigh Year Regulations without requiring a vote. The Regulations would be referred to Court for final approval.

6 Award of Degrees - (CLOSED)

Adam Bunni, Academic Policy Manager, Academic Quality and Standards, introduced the paper (S 25/26 1G). Dr Bunni explained in October 2024 Senate approved a trial to delegate authority to Boards of Examiners to formally award or confer degrees for the period 1 January to 31 December 2025. The paper seeks approval to move this delegation of authority from a trial to open-ended operation with the request being made in October 2025 to allow time to revert processes to previous ways of operating by 1 January in the event that Senate does not approve the open-ended delegation. Dr Bunni explained that traditionally degrees are awarded just prior to the relevant graduation ceremony, however during the trial period, degrees were awarded at the point of recording by the relevant Board of Examiners. The change to the delegation of authority is primarily proposed to support the student and graduate experience by reducing situations where graduates cannot take up further study or employment due to their award status. In approval of the trial and to aid in evaluation of the trial, Senate asked for information on errors in published awards during the trial period. A total of 23 errors were recorded, and these were the result of incorrect data entry. In all cases, the resolution of these errors resulted in an increase to a graduate's award. Some members contacted Dr Bunni to feedback on this point and suggested that there may be further errors where graduates received inflated classifications and where the University has not noticed and the student has not queried this. Dr Bunni acknowledged this was a possibility, however the current proposal has no impact on the likelihood that these errors would be picked up as the previous approach did not contribute any additional quality control assurances with regard to awards.

From a student experience perspective, graduates could access their Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR) which includes written confirmation of their award status in advance of their graduation ceremony. The delegation of authority to confer awards will remain

with Senate and therefore Senate retain the right to reverse the delegation of authority at a future point should it wish to do so.

A member stated that the ceremony of Senate approving awards prior to graduation does not add value to the award process as there is no discussion of awards and members of Senate are not usually present.

They raised that the trial period is not yet complete and it is premature to seek approval for full delegation prior to the completion of the full cycle, noting that MSc Boards are still to take place. They expressed a view that MSc processes differ to Undergraduate processes and therefore a full cycle's experience is required before Senate is asked to consider making the trial permanent. In response, Dr Bunni stated that the differing processes between undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes do not have bearing on this particular element.

The same member also expressed concern that the conferral of degrees upon publication of results may make it harder to revise awards downwards if there is an error picked up after the conferral of an award. In response, Dr Bunni disagreed that there was an issue and explained that the process for making changes to awards is the same regardless of whether the award is technically conferred or not. From a student experience perspective, students consider their award as final from the point at which it is published and therefore there is impact to the student experience regardless of whether an award has been technically conferred or not.

Another member queried the rationale for the paper being marked as closed and the purpose of closed papers.

Dr Bunni explained that a closed paper is not publicly available and is available only to members of Senate. This paper is closed partly because the previous related paper was also closed, and partly because it contains sensitive information around the University's degree awarding processes and the risks to those processes.

Another member expressed the view that the issues which the paper seeks to resolve are centred on processes and systems which are largely the work of professional services colleagues within the exam board processes, working in tandem with academic colleagues. The member stated that in their experience the differences in the Assessment and Progression Tool (APT) within Euclid for postgraduate taught and undergraduate students increase the likelihood of problems arising at postgraduate taught level. The member supported the request for the trial to be complete before Senate is asked to decide on making the delegation permanent.

A student member raised the tight turnaround between postgraduate taught students receiving their award and further study commencing. This creates stress among applicants and therefore receiving awards earlier will allow graduates to make contingency plans where necessary. The receipt of awards earlier also gives graduates a competitive edge in the job market. Some international students, particularly those from North America, seek early graduation as internships commence earlier than those in the UK.

Another student member reflected on the student experience element and that the proposal intends to improve the student experience. The early award of degrees is of particular importance to international students. The member consulted with The Advice Place who have experienced fewer issues from international students seeking conferral of their award for employment and internships abroad during this award cycle when compared with previous award cycles.

A Senate member clarified that there is no impact on the date by which results are released, the decision is only relating to the official award of degrees.

Senate considered the amendment proposed by Chris Dent and seconded by Michael Barany. By a majority vote, Senate approved the amendment that a decision on making the trial permanent be delayed until the next meeting of Senate, and that the temporary delegation (but not the trial) be extended to cover the June 2026 exam boards. 95 members approved, 42 members did not approve and 20 members abstained.

Action: A paper be brought to the December 2025 meeting of Senate seeking a decision on the delegation of authority to exam boards for conferral of awards.

7 Senate Assessor Election Arrangements for 2025/26

Leigh Chalmers, University Secretary and Vice Principal introduced the paper (S 25/26 1H). The paper proposes some changes to the Senate Assessor Election Regulations. There is a complex legislative and governance framework underpinning the elections which is set out in the paper. Senate is invited to consider bringing the timing of the election forward to fill a vacancy in the non-Professorial Senate Assessor role and to consider proposed changes to the Election Regulations. The changes to the Election Regulations are primarily to extend the eligibility to stand for election to include all elected and ex officio members of Senate, except for those who hold an executive role, such as Provost and Vice Principals. This would revert the Election Regulations to the position to that was in place prior to 2022 and is intended to align with good practice in governance and to ensure the ethos and intention behind the legislation is honoured.

By a majority vote, Senate approved Option 2: to bring forward the Senate Assessor election, with the successful candidate for the non-professorial position filling the current vacancy until 31 July 2026 and then serving a new four-year term from 1 August 2026 (a 'double' election for that position). The successful candidate for the professorial position would take office on 1 August 2026 as originally envisaged. 107 members approved Option 2, 5 members approved Option 1, 2 members approved Option 3 and 24 members abstained.

Senate considered an amendment to the Senate Election Regulations proposed by Vashti Galpin and seconded by Kate Ash-Irisarri

Amend paragraph 10 of the Senate Assessor Election Regulations by re-adding: 'elected' and removing 'and are not Vice-Principals or the Provost', to give the following sentence:

"Only those members of the electorate, as defined in paragraph 6, who are elected academic staff, shall be eligible for nominations and nominations may be made only by members of the electorate."

Ahead of consideration of the amendment, the proposer explained that the amendment is seeking to resolve a divergence with a particular element of the legislation to ensure that a Senate Assessor who is an ex officio member of Senate is able to stand for re-election and that this can be achieved without expanding the candidacy to include all non-Executive ex officio members and that the pool of candidates should be retained as elected academic Senate members only.

In response, Ms Chalmers explained that expanding the candidate pool was proposed to ensure that the academic members of Senate are adequately supported and represented on Court. Prior to 2022 this was the position and there does not seem to be justification for Heads of School, Deans of Research and so on being unable to stand for election as a Senate Assessor due to holding an ex officio position. Expanding the candidacy to include these members would

be in line with good governance and in line with the spirit and intent behind the original ordinance for all academic colleagues who are members of Senate to be able to stand for election in these roles.

The proposer expressed that this position was not made clear in the paper.

By a majority vote Senate approved the amendment to amend the Senate Election Regulations. 105 members approved, 41 members did not approve and 10 members abstained.

Without requiring a vote, Senate approved the amended Senate Election Regulations and the Senate Assessor Nomination Form.

8 Amendments to the Senate Election Regulations

Olivia Hayes, Senate Clerk introduced the paper (S 25/26 1I). Senate is invited to recommend that Court approve changes to the Senate Election Regulations. The changes to the regulations include removing reference to specific dates within the Regulations, which will allow Senate to approve arrangements for the election at its December meeting, and for the elections to take place on a timescale approved by Senate. There is also a proposal to add a paragraph which states how the membership of non-Professorial members on Senate are handled when they are promoted to Professor during their term of office, Senate is invited to choose one of three options for handling this. Finally, Senate is notified of an update to the ex officio membership which are detailed in Table 1 and Appendix 1.

By a majority vote, Senate approved Option 3: that there be no change to existing practice for handling members who are promoted to Professor during their term on Senate. Members will continue as a 'non-professorial' member until the end of their current term of office. 62 members approved Option 3, 40 members approved Option 1, 21 members approved Option 2 and 20 members abstained.

Without requiring a vote, Senate recommended that Court approve the changes to the Senate Election Regulations.

9 Senate External Review

9.1 Senate External Review Task and Finish Group – Final Report

This item was provided for noting and therefore no time was allocated to this item on the agenda (S 25/26 1J), however one member raised a comment regarding an omission from the paper. There is an item missing from the summary table: that payment for students and some staff will be considered. This has not been finalised, however the member indicated that this should happen and it is crucial that the information is not lost.

Senate noted the paper subject to this correction.

9.2 Senate External Review Task and Finish Group – Recommendations

Professor Richard Kenway, Convener of the Senate External Review Task and Finish Group introduced the paper (S 25/26 1K). He highlighted that the group formally concluded in July 2025 however one important piece of business remains, which is the terms of reference and delegated authority for Senate Standing Committees. The group has had several discussions and consulted with Senate and the deliberations on this are presented in the appendix, however the group felt they could not present full proposals for approval without firstly clarifying Senate's

terms of reference and remit. The establishment of a terms of reference for Senate is Court business, therefore it is proposed that a holistic review be undertaken over the coming academic year with the support and involvement of the University Court, Academic Quality and Standards and Legal Services.

Lisa Dawson, Academic Registrar, outlined an amendment received in relation to the item. The amendment was received the day prior to Senate and proposes changes which are beyond the work plan outlined in the paper, and beyond the proposed plan from the Group outlined in Appendix 1. The requests of the amendment require advice from Court Services and further consideration of governance matters, as some of the requests related to non-Senate Committees. There has not been sufficient time to circulate the amendment to Senate, nor seek the advice required to support members to make an informed decision. Ms Dawson has discussed with one of the proposers of the amendment and agreed to discuss the paper, however not take a vote on this at the meeting. Colleagues would work together to bring a revised paper to the December meeting.

A member, who was one of the proposers of the amendment, reflected on their understanding of the paper and expressed difficulty in navigating and understanding the paper. The member highlighted commonality and that both the cover paper and the appendix agree that a new working group is required and that a review of Senate's terms of reference is required. They also highlighted the differences between the cover paper and the appendix, namely the composition of any new working group, the remit of a working group and the tasks the group should take forward. They also highlighted that the appendix indicates that a working group should look at Committees who do not currently report to Senate, but whose work is concerned with academic strategy noting Research Strategy Group and University Initiatives Portfolio Board as examples. The member expressed that the diverging approaches and vision outlined in the paper and appendix was challenging to navigate as a reader who has not been close to the work nor a member of the Task and Finish Group. They also highlighted that some members of the Task and Finish Group did not see the paper until this had been submitted to the Senate Business Committee and it was not formally signed off by members of the group. This adds to the sense that the group was unable to reach agreement on next steps, and therefore there are different approaches for taking the remaining pieces of work forward presented. The member expressed their view that it would be desirable for Senate to have greater input into the development of its terms of reference and scope to review the work of Committees undertaking academic strategy work.

Nichola Kett, Head of Quality Assurance and Standards acknowledged there are differences in the approach set out in the cover paper and the appendix and these were both presented to Senate as it is important to receive the outputs. The Senate External Review was undertaken in 2022/23 and this was flagged up as an issue affecting the University's governance. The next External Review will take place in 2026/27 and there is an opportunity to make progress toward the recommendations from the 2022/23 review and make changes ahead of the next review. The Standing Committees are part of Senate and any changes to these will come to Senate in line with the Standing Orders. Consultation with Senate is one of the key sources of information, however wider input is now required in order to make progress.

The development of a Senate Statement of Responsibilities is an action arising from the Court Services External Review and non-Senate related Committees are not covered by the 2022-23 External Review recommendations and therefore both items remain out of scope.

A member, who was on the Task and Finish Group, stated that during discussions at the group it was difficult to make progress toward resolving the Committees issue without returning to the

question of Senate's remit. The member queried how this would be resolved to allow progress to be made.

In response, Ms Kett confirmed that work towards establishing principles for Senate's Statement of Responsibilities would take place alongside consideration of wider Committee-related issues. In particular, benchmarking of other institutions and ancient Scottish institutions would take place to understand how Senate and its committees' function in comparable institutions. She confirmed that it was unlikely that a Statement of Responsibilities would be prepared in time for the December meeting of Senate.

Another member of the Task and Finish group acknowledged that this is a challenging problem which is how to enact the principles of academic self-governance in an ancient university and in the context of a modern managerialised university. This is a very challenging issue and no institution has established a good model for this. The member explained that the appendix sets out an approach which is intended to manage the issues which hinder the effectiveness of Senate and its meetings. The member stated their view that the disconnect between the cover paper and the appendix is a result of insufficient time to develop a shared understanding of academic self-governance and that more time is required to establish this understanding for the next step of the process to be effective.

A student member queried what groups and in what manner would input be sought from academics and students.

In response, Ms Kett confirmed that wider views were required and that the legislation which underpins the University's governance would define the boundaries for any substantial changes to academic governance. Ms Kett confirmed that students would be consulted and there would be a variety of mechanisms for seeking input, including via networks, Committee meetings, email, forms and so on. Ms Kett welcomed suggestions from wider Senate on this.

A member echoed the points on academic self-governance and agreed that greater input from students and elected members in the discussion was valuable. The member referenced the amendment and the intention that this would insist that any proposals would come to full Senate for approval. The member also highlighted that the workplan lists academics as a key stakeholder group, however this does not align with academic-led governance.

A member reflected on their understanding of the discussion, which was that agreement was reached by some members of the group and this is presented in the appendix, however other members wrote the cover paper. The member expressed their desire to vote on the visions presented, given that both groups of authors agree that further specific work is required. Ms Kett confirmed that any revisions to Senate Standing Committees would be brought to Senate as per the Standing Orders. She confirmed that the paper was shared with all members of Task and Finish Group.

The Convener confirmed that a vote on the paper and proposed amendments would not be taken as advice is required from other areas. The discussion has been useful in informing any revisions to the paper ahead of this returning in December.

Kim Graham, Provost, reflected on the helpful discussion and that it mirrored several discussions held within the Task and Finish Group. She confirmed that the paper was shared with members of the Group and the paper was informed by discussions held by the group. The Group was unable to reach agreement and this is why the proposal outlined in the cover paper sought additional information to inform the next steps. There is common desire for an effective

Senate with a clear remit and clear understanding of the Standing Committees who have delegated authority from Senate on specific elements of the academic mission. She highlighted that it takes a whole university to deliver an academic mission, including academic staff, professional services staff and students. With regard to academic strategy and items not being received at Senate, she stated that where work takes place that is relevant to Senate's remit it comes to Senate, or to the relevant Standing Committee, and that governance approaches are in place to ensure this happens. She expressed the view that greater clarity on the role and remit of Senate, and its Committees as well as clarity on what items of business are brought to full Senate is very important, though there will be different views on this and this is where the Group was unable to reach a conclusion.

A member of the Task and Finish Group sought to clarify that, while a draft paper was shared with the elected academic members of the group, a detailed workplan was not. The member stated that they had written to the Convener of the Task and Finish Group and the Academic Registrar to state that they could not make a decision on supporting the workplan without seeing the detail, and understood that others had written to the same effect.

Two further members of the Task and Finish Group supported this, with one member stating that the plan was not approved by elected members and was submitted without their agreement. Another member explained that the development of the holistic plan presented in Appendix 1 was running for considerable time, and stated that the draft paper presented was circulated to the group at a very late stage with a very limited consultation phase.

The Provost stated that members did have sight of the paper and that her understanding was that two emails had been sent to Task and Finish Group members during the development of the paper. She highlighted differing viewpoints on next steps during the Task and Finish Group discussions on the matter and that some members did not give their support for the workplan presented in the cover paper.

Ms Kett added that the workplan was circulated to the group. She indicated that feedback was received from Task and Finish Group members and a final version was circulated to the group, however the group did not give their support for this. Therefore, a workplan was developed which was informed by discussions and feedback from Task and Finish Group members and this is the workplan presented in the cover paper. She acknowledged that the workplan differs from the holistic plan prepared by some Task and Finish Group members as presented in Appendix 1.

The Convener concluded that it was clear from the discussion that further work is required before the item returns with a clear proposal. The Convener suggested that ensuring clarity and separating of actions arising from the Task and Finish Group and what is emerging as follow-on work. The Convener confirmed with the proposer of the amendment that they were content to hold a decision on this item until the paper returns in December.

Thanks were extended to Professor Richard Kenway for chairing the Task and Finish Group.

Clerk's note: *The Task and Finish Group received an email on 14 August which provided a brief outline for a workplan for which support was requested. Members were asked to provide comments or queries on the workplan. Some elected members requested additional information and did not receive a response. One sought an in-person discussion in which no specific action points were agreed. None expressed support, because those that responded did not feel they could make a decision based on the information provided.*

A further email which included the paper provided to Senate was received on 25 August – five days after the Senate paper deadline. Members were not invited to approve or provide feedback on the paper.

10 Portfolio Review and the Size and Shape of the University's Curriculum

Tamara Trodd, elected member of Senate introduced the item (S 25/26 1L). She explained that Portfolio Review, which is the process by which Colleges review and close programmes which fall below a specified enrolment threshold, is a tool of enormous power. She outlined examples of the volume of students and programmes which would be closed if a minimum enrolment threshold of 30 students was used, as has been suggested in paperwork on Portfolio Review. She outlined an example prepared by a colleague which suggested that, should the threshold of 30 be applied, in CAHSS this would result in 90% of programmes closing and 50% of students being lost. In CSE this would result in two-thirds of programmes closing and one-third of students being lost. A threshold of 30 would also result in some subject areas closing entirely and all programmes being closed in those areas. Dr Trodd explained that the closure of programmes is unlikely to contribute to savings targets, and referenced previous discussions on part-time programmes at previous meetings of Senate. She acknowledged that courses cost money and resource, including teaching space and staff time, but stated that available data suggests that courses make an efficient return, providing the example of a cost to income ratio of 10:1 generated by courses run by Edinburgh Futures Institute (EFI), even though these have relatively low enrolments. She explained that this example was used because EFI publishes clear income and cost data, however this is not currently available across the University, though there is work to develop this and such metrics are required to make informed decisions on course and programme closures.

She stated that where closures allow for savings on staff costs, these costs are not likely to be significant when considering the loss of income and that there is a risk that an effort to cut costs, has the result of also cutting income, requiring more cuts, and so on, until the organisation has no more costs, but no more income either. She further explained that some of the costs and workload for teaching, such as marking, attach to the student, rather than the course, so closing courses and potentially firing staff would not remove those costs, which would instead be shifted onto the remaining courses and staff. Dr Trodd suggested that Portfolio Review might be used as a way to identify candidates for redundancy in those associated with low-recruiting courses and programmes, and asked for discussion of why this is considered to be the best or most strategic way to achieve redundancies, and what the risks might be of such an approach.

Dr Trodd stated that closing or temporarily resting courses and programmes is a normal part of academic business and this routinely occurs across the institution for a variety of reasons, however decision making on such matters is best managed by the local areas responsible for teaching delivery. She highlighted the risks associated with such decisions being managed on a large scale via a centrally-driven process on the basis of numerical metrics. She quoted from a senior School role holder expressing concern at process being communicated out to Schools via the Student Experience Delivery and Monitoring Board (SEDaMOB) highlighting the timescales, process, compliance with the UK Quality Code and potential for providing a sub-standard offering to students as particular concerns. The colleague reflected on concerns that substantial academic changes are being implemented at a high level, against the judgement of academic colleagues and in contradiction to previous Senate motions on Portfolio Review.

Dr Trodd also reflected on the academic vision underpinning Portfolio Review and the absence of an established metric to demonstrate large scale savings and suggested that the process is potentially guided by a vision of a simplified and streamlined course and programme offering. Dr Trodd asked senior leaders why the vision or model of curriculum is better than the one which is currently in place and if the educational model is of so much greater value that it is worth the academic losses caused by course and programme closures. Dr Trodd highlighted the impact of recent closures and the loss of opportunity for students resulting from programme closures, and the absence of graduates in specific fields also having a knock-on effect to industry. She stated that closing unique and special interest programmes has a wider impact beyond the University curriculum giving industry relationships, international partnerships and furthering community

links and research as examples of areas which may be impacted by Portfolio Review. Dr Trodd asked senior leadership to explain how closing courses and programmes should be part of the financial strategy when evidence seems to suggest it will have a limited impact on saving measures and will instead impact income, student opportunity and the academic mission of the University.

Professor Kim Graham, Provost spoke to the motions as presented in the paper. She highlighted the common desire for a high-quality inspirational teaching portfolio, staff who deliver the outstanding research outcomes that the University currently produces and a holistic approach to academic delivery of teaching and research. Professor Graham disagreed with the suggestion that this is a top-down centrally driven approach, and the framework was established based on demand and agreed with the Heads of Colleges and the Vice-Principal Students. The framework enables Heads of Colleges and Schools to work with local areas to consider courses and programmes. It is at the discretion of the Heads of Colleges and Schools to decide what local areas offer, the vision and the academic offering in their areas, in turn influencing the shape of the School and College.

Professor Graham outlined a series of high-level principles for what a teaching portfolio should entail and indicated this should be inspirational; future-focussed; externally competitive; have high market demand programmes; be recruiting at the highest tariff levels; provides opportunities and increases employability; and helps to support research excellence. Additionally, the portfolio should be effectively focussed; ensure that legacy programmes and courses are not sitting on systems; be aligned to the capacity of academic staff; and balance staff workloads to enable the return of high-quality feedback in time to further improve the student experience; and considers the balance of cost between programmes with higher market demand, which in turn allows the delivery of small scale specialist provision which is important to the strategy of the University. Professor Graham agreed that the University does not want to lose income and assured Senate that the decisions taken by Schools and Colleges on course and programme closures are based on an assessment of what the scale of income may be for the particular courses and programmes which will close and that students will be provided with the opportunity to move to alternative courses and programmes. She concluded by highlighting that there should be an ongoing process that all institutions put in place on an annual basis to review course and programme offering in response to changes to the external environment, market conditions and enabling capacity to avoid overburdening staff.

Lucy Evans, Associate Principal and Deputy Secretary, Students spoke to the framework which has been set up to support this process. She reiterated that this is College-led and is undertaken with a focus on the structure and volume with the primary aim to improve student and staff experience. The framework is mindful of the wider economic context of the University, and will be shaped by the overall approach to its financial resilience, with a primary focus on the size and shape of the offering. Ms Evans explained that the framework provides a structure which ensures local agency and flexibility to facilitate pedagogical enhancement and an opportunity to provide a realistic offering to students which responds to feedback on staff workload and enables effective and efficient administration of the portfolio. Ms Evans explained that there is no institutional-level target number or proportion of programmes or courses to be closed, and the principles looked at minimum enrolment numbers as a guide to support decision making. Though work is required to develop a model on cost and revenue structures to discuss how decisions can be made in an informed way.

Ms Evans also provided an update on behalf of the Head of the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (CMVM), Professor David Argyle, who was unable to attend Senate. She explained that there are details on closures and suspensions which are available for CMVM, and the College is making progress towards a refined portfolio with a focus on postgraduate taught

provision. The ongoing College modernisation restructure has allowed an opportunity to streamline the College offering, the College has two teaching schools and is undertaking further reviews of the postgraduate taught portfolio. Decisions to close programmes has been based on several factors including the framework, student recruitment data, staff availability, expertise to deliver programmes, governance and the reorganisation of the teaching portfolio as part of the College modernisation project. CMVM have set up a Portfolio Management Board who have responsibility for overseeing the entire portfolio and consider new programmes, major programme changes and programme closures. The Board will also have oversight of the course portfolio which is managed at School level.

Professor David Smith, Deputy Head of College Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (CAHSS) provided an update on the College's perspective on Portfolio Review. He reflected on some of the terminology used to refer to the approach to Portfolio Review, noting terms such as large-scale, centrally-driven, inflexible and top-down as being an approach, he does not personally recognise, though acknowledged that this does not discount the individual experience of others. He explained that the College is taking a collaborative process as they seek to build a business-as-usual Portfolio Review process. The College has been working for over a year on this, with initial focus on postgraduate taught programmes. The College, with Schools, is seeking to actively review and refresh the portfolio of taught programmes and credit bearing courses. The work aligns with the institutional framework and seeking to alleviate workload pressures. The College established a Portfolio Review Working Group which comprised of professional services colleagues and Heads of Schools. The Group collaboratively established an approach to Portfolio Review within the College and details of the Working Group and their work is available on the CAHSS SharePoint site. Professor Smith summarised the following outputs from the Group:

- Stage 1 Postgraduate Taught Portfolio Guidance issued on 17 June 2024, the principles established as part of that were that the academic portfolio would be relevant, sustainable, fit for purpose, aligned to disciplinary and pedagogical ambition, and informed and aligned to national and international marked demands.
- Stage 2 Course Portfolio Review Guidance issued on 25 September 2024, and have been working towards having an annual timeline where all Schools work toward a business-as-usual Portfolio Review process undertaken as annual health checks.

Professor Smith outlined the next steps for CAHSS and advised that the College is at the early stages of scoping the Undergraduate Portfolio and the College's approach to this. A first meeting was held in September with Heads of Schools, the Director of EFI, the Director of Academic and Student Administration, Head of Academic Education, Dean of Quality Assurance and Dean of Education to consider what questions need to be asked as part of the Undergraduate Portfolio Review process. The College recognises the need for a costing methodology and is piloting a methodology in five Schools, learnings from the pilot will be used to shape the methodology to be fit for purpose. Professor Smith concluded by noting that the College is working with a focus on critical sustainability and undertaking this in partnership and collaboration with Schools.

Professor Iain Gordon, Head of the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) provided an update on the College's work toward Portfolio Review. The College have a framework and are working closely with Schools through the Director of Education and the Head of the Student Lifecycle. There were several pieces of curriculum reform work already in progress across multiple Schools within the College with many having already undertaken a review of their curriculum and offering. There remain two Schools which the College is working closely with to consider clustering programmes and moving away from offering many versions of similar programmes. Professor Gordon confirmed that the framework is being discussed with relevant

Schools and that School leadership is being supported to move changes forward through a well-governed process allowing colleagues to feed into this.

A student member highlighted the importance of student voice in the discussion on Portfolio Review and acknowledged the validity of some points raised. They noted the importance of considering nuance in reaching decisions on small, joint and specialist programmes, and considering student recruitment impact when considering the closure of these programmes. The University's appeal to prospective students may be impacted by closing those small, joint and specialist programmes and there is value in preserving student choice in degrees where it is financially viable, noting that these programmes contribute to the academic landscape and may elevate Edinburgh as an option to prospective students when considering the comparable offering at competitor institutions.

Another student member reflected on their programme's small intake as preserving diversity of thought within specific disciplines. The University can take a leading role in promoting this diversity within education. The member spoke to discipline-specific examples to illustrate their point, and that cutting programmes based on class sizes may inadvertently deprioritise different ways of thinking which challenge the mainstream and which lead to a deeper and well-rounded understanding of different disciplines. They also stated that future facing programmes will generally start with smaller intakes as these areas build and develop into the mainstream. The member concluded by encouraging the University to look beyond class sizes and consider the viable schools of thought small and unique programmes bring to the University.

Another student member reflected on their experience as a student in a small programme, of which they are the only student in their year. They reiterated the importance of the smaller degree programmes noting that it is paramount to the competitive nature of the programmes and to the wellbeing of students. The University is the only Scottish University, which offers the study of Scandinavian language at Undergraduate level, and one of two institutions across the United Kingdom. They reiterated the strength of the small degree offerings and the importance in retaining this for the diversity of students and diversity of thought which it fosters.

Professor Sarah Prescott, Head of CAHSS, strongly reiterated that Portfolio Review is not focussed on only small courses and programmes. She reiterated that the Review takes a collaborative approach and is considering the different ways to look at courses and programmes, and considering size and shape and what the wider community wants the Portfolio to be. She stated that the University cannot deliver what it delivers now with fewer people and has to think about how to navigate challenges including workload, delivering sustainably and wider sector challenges, and this includes reviewing the portfolio.

She stated the importance of considering changes in a holistic, careful, thoughtful way and in collaboration and in consultation for the portfolio to deliver the courses and teaching that the University wants for the future. She stated her personal connection to the topic and that the Review seeks to look after the breadth of disciplines, however also consider sustainability in its broadest sense and not just in a financial manner. The Review should also consider how areas can come together and benefit in an interdisciplinary way from the breadth of discipline. She highlighted that it is a misunderstanding that Colleges are looking only at small courses and programmes, which has not been representative of her experience when working with Schools on this piece of work.

A member requested that a vote be taken on the paper. The Convener agreed that a formal vote would be held.

By a majority vote, Senate approved Motions 1, 2 and 3 as contained in paragraph 22 of the paper. 103 members approved, 15 members did not approve and 11 members abstained.

11 Transparency, Accountability and Senate Oversight in the Context of Financial Restructuring - S 25/26 1M

Senate did not reach this paper before the conclusion of the meeting.

Items for information

Clerk's note: Items for information are not allocated time on the Senate agenda. Members are invited to direct comments on these items to paper authors.

12 Court Communications

Senate received and did not have time to consider the communications from the University Court as detailed within the paper (S 25/26 1N), and which related to the University Court meeting of 23 June 2025. No time is allocated on the agenda for discussion of items provided for information.

13 Report from Central Academic Promotions Committee - S 25/26 1O

Senate received and did not have time to consider the report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee as detailed within the paper (S 25/26 1O). No time is allocated on the agenda for discussion of items provided for information.

14 Senate Effectiveness:

14.1 Internal Effectiveness Review of Senate and its Standing Committees - Report on the post-meeting surveys (2024-25) - S 25/26 1P

Senate received and did not have time to consider the report on post-meeting surveys for the 2024-25 academic year as detailed within the paper (S 25/26 1P). No time is allocated on the agenda for discussion of items provided for information.

15 Senate Standing Committee business:

15.1 Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees - S 25/26 1Q

Senate received and did not have time to consider the Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees for the 2024-25 academic year as detailed within the paper (S 25/26 1Q). No time is allocated on the agenda for discussion of items provided for information.

15.2 Senate Standing Committee Membership - S 25/26 1R

Senate received and did not have time to consider the updates to Senate Standing Committee Membership for the 2025-26 academic year as detailed within the paper (S 25/26 1R). No time is allocated on the agenda for discussion of items provided for information.

Senate was informed that an amendment was received in relation to this paper proposed by Michael Barany.

Senate is asked to approve that the Senate Clerk shall repeat the process approved last year (S 24/25 1G) with the same Returning and Deputy Returning Officers or appropriate substitute as required to fill the vacant elected member vacancy on SQAC.

The Academic Registrar confirmed that Senate Support would carry out the process described in the amendment without requiring a vote.

15.3 Senate Standing Committees Upcoming Business - S 25/26 1S

Senate received and did not have time to consider the upcoming business for Senate Standing Committees as detailed within the paper (S 25/26 1S). No time is allocated on the agenda for discussion of items provided for information.

16 Research Strategy Group Report - S 25/26 1T

Senate received and did not have time to consider the report from the Research Strategy Group as detailed within the paper (S 25/26 1T), and which related to the Group's meeting of 1 July 2025. No time is allocated on the agenda for discussion of items provided for information.

Date of next meeting: 10 December 2025

Deadline for papers: Wednesday 5 November 2025