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Minutes of Senate meeting held on 1 February 2017

Executive Summary

The paper provides the minutes of the Senate meeting held on 1 February 2017.

How does this align with the University/College School/Committee’s strategic plans and priorities?

Not Applicable

Action requested

The Senatus is invited to approve the minutes.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Decisions were communicated via the Senate Committees’ Newsletter to stakeholders on the distribution list: http://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/jan-feb_2017.pdf

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   This paper does not have resource implications.

2. Risk assessment
   This paper does not include a risk assessment.

3. Equality and Diversity
   Not relevant.

4. Freedom of Information
   Open paper

Any other relevant information, including keywords

A comment need only be submitted to raise an objection/suggest corrections. If no comments are received the minutes will be deemed approved. In this context any comments on this paper should be e-mailed to Senate.Support@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on e-S 16/17 3 A.” These comments will be added verbatim at https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees/senate/senate-restricted

Originator of the paper
Senate Secretariat
May 2017
UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS held in the Debating Hall, Teviot Row House, 1 February 2017


Associate Members: Mr A Edgecliffe-Johnson, Mr P Garratt, Ms J Husbands, Mr J Vercruysse, Mr M Wildasin

In Attendance: Mr S Bottomley, Ms F Boyd, Dr M Brennan, Mr A Bunni, Mrs C Campbell, Ms L Chalmers, Ms R Claase, Mr B Connolly, Ms A Conroy, Mr A Crossland, Dr P Docherty, Dr M Donaldson, Mr G Douglas, Dr P Erskine, Miss V Farrar, M Forde, Ms M Gibson, Ms K Gilliland, Ms J Grier, Ms S Harvey, Ms L Henderson, Mr D Hills, Dr K Hughes, Ms A Jones, Mr G Jubb, Ms J Kelly, Mrs J Kemp, Dr L Kendall, Ms L Ketchion, Ms C Lennie, Ms M MacKenzie, Miss S McAllister, Miss S McBain, Mrs C McGrath, Mr R Miller, Mr D Mole, Professor Emeritus R Morris, Ms J Murray, Mrs J Nicholson, Ms R O’Neill, Ms S Padaruth, Ms J Paterson, Professor Emeritus D Porteous, Ms S Renton, Dr S Rolle, Mr R Sargeant, Ms R Shade, Miss T Sheppard, Professor P Smith, Ms S Smith, Dr N Speirs, Ms S Spielman, D Stevenson, Mr N Summers, Dr J Thompson, Dr N Tuzi, Ms C Wallace, Ms P Ward, Mr S Warrington, Ms S Williams,

The moment of reflection was delivered by Ms Jenna Kelly, Students’ Association Vice-President, Services who used the words of Michelle Obama to express the importance of striving for excellence.

PRINCIPAL’S COMMUNICATIONS

The Principal reported that Tam Dalyell, alumnus, rector and parliamentarian, had died. The Principal had written on behalf of the University to his widow and would speak at his memorial service about the important contributions he had made to the University.

The Principal emphasised the extremely good relationship that the University had with the Scottish Government.

The Principal noted that this was his last meeting of Senate and that the announcement of the new Principal would be made the following day.

FORMAL BUSINESS

1. Report of E-Business (S 16/17 2 A)

The report of the e-business conducted between 10 and 18 January 2017 was noted.
2. Development of a Policy on Learning Analytics (S 16/17 2 B)

Professor Dragan Gasevic addressed the Senatus on the institutional policy on Learning Analytics which was being developed by a Task Group appointed for the purpose by the Knowledge Strategy Group and the Learning and Teaching Committee.

The policy would support the collection and analysis of data relating to learning with a view to improving the learning environment and the student experience. The data analysis would also support the planning of resources.

Professor Gasevic emphasised that, as part of the development of the policy, measures would be put in place to ensure that the data was used ethically and transparently to support and optimise learning, that its use had full consent, and that a consultation exercise of Colleges, Schools and students was underway and a student survey was also planned. Stakeholders would also be given the opportunity to provide written submissions on the draft policy.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- Use of the data was potentially controversial, and a consensus would need to be reached across the stakeholder groups as to when, and in what situations, the data could be acceptably used.
- The policy should explain how the University would identify and address any potential bias (e.g., gender bias) in the data.
- Information about the learning process might be obtained from a variety of data environments, such as the enrolment process, and unstructured data, such as click streams, tags, and data on library usage.

3. Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act – Options for the Senatus Academicus (S 16/17 2 C)

The University Secretary noted that the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Bill had been amended following feedback from the sector, and that the Act had been passed in 2016. A Task Group appointed in May 2016 had reviewed the implications of the Act for the composition of Senatus and had devised five possible models of membership on which Senatus was invited to comment.

The Director of Academic Services provided an outline of each of the models set out in the paper. It was noted that under the Act, more than 50 per cent of the Senate’s members must be elected.

In discussion, preference was expressed for both Model 1 (large Senate reaching a membership of around 1,400) and Model 2 (Medium-sized Senate of around 250, with the University specifying separate pools for election for Professors and for other academic staff categories).

It was noted that the large membership of Model 1 would reflect the diversity of the institution which in turn would offer security in uncertain times and would better enable the University to confront big challenges in the coming years. A large membership, however, would not necessarily guarantee representation, for example across staff grades, gender and ethnicity, and consideration should be given as to whether the current composition should reflect the composition of the University as a whole.
It was felt by those who supported Model 2 that the composition of Senate under this model would reflect current levels of attendance, and would be sufficiently large to be reasonably representative of the University’s community.

It was felt that the revision of Senate membership would provide the opportunity for democratic renewal, possibly leading to increased engagement with the wider community and ultimately a more active Senate.

There was no support for a smaller Senate (Model 3) or the Council of Senate and Congregation of Chairs models (Models 4 and 5) which would not reflect the diversity of the institution.

The following wider points were made with regard to the membership of Senate:

- The members of Senate would have equal status and voting rights.
- Clarity was sought as to whether ‘membership’ implied representation of constituencies or delegation of responsibility.
- Election to Senate should be public and membership should be time-limited and rotational.
- Under a reduced membership, a random (‘sortition’) method of selection for Senate might be a desirable means of appointing a representative sample of non-elected members.
- The Act would require no more than 30 student members but, given the size of the student body, the reconstituted Senate should not necessarily be limited by such a number. It would be important for students to have a direct voice rather than being represented by the University staff.
- Membership of Senate was a big responsibility and the University should feel challenged to make it more engaging and more important.

The Principal thanked Senatus for a helpful discussion and it was noted that further comments by email would be welcomed.

The discussion would be relayed to the Task Group which would take it into account when developing more detailed proposals.

4. Communications from the University Court (S 16/17 2 D)

The Senatus noted the content of the report.

5. Resolutions (S 16/17 2 E)

Court presented to Senatus draft Resolutions in accordance with procedures for the creation of new chairs, renaming of existing chairs and the process for personal chairs. The Senatus, having considered the draft Resolutions below, offered no observations.

Draft Resolution No. 9/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Environmental Law
Draft Resolution No. 10/2017: Foundation of Additional Chairs of Finance (2 chairs)
Draft Resolution No. 11/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Infection Medicine
Draft Resolution No. 12/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Interdisciplinary Science
Draft Resolution No. 13/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Software Engineering
Draft Resolution No. 14/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Quantum Technology Innovation
Draft Resolution No. 15/2017: Alteration of the title of the Chair of Classroom Learning
6. Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)

The Director of Academic Services informed the Senatus that the decision had been taken by Court that the University would not enter the Teaching Excellence Framework on the basis that Scottish Higher Education already had a strong quality enhancement framework which currently suited the Scottish context better than the TEF. The majority of Scottish Higher Education Institutions had also decided not to enter the TEF, although five had taken the decision to enter.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: Student Disability Services Review and Mental Health Services Review

Non-Senate members who were in attendance for the presentation and discussion section of the meeting were welcomed.

The focus of the presentation and discussion section was the Student Disability Services and the Mental Health Services Reviews.

Seven members of staff and one student addressed Senatus on the reviews, which focused on how reasonable adjustments for students were made and implemented, the accessibility of the University estate and the promotion of wellbeing in the student population generally.

Student Disability Services Review

Introduction: overview, summary of action plan and timescale
Professor Jane Norman, Vice-Principal, People and Culture

Professor Norman introduced the work of the disability review panel which had been appointed following concerns raised by students about the University’s current arrangements for supporting students with disabilities. The review had focused on the accessibility of the estate, and implementation of reasonable adjustments and the policy and practice around interruptions of studies. The Student Disability Service and the Estates and Buildings Department had been invited to produce a commentary, the panel had met individual disabled students, and the panel had discussed the implementation of adjustments with School staff. Recommendations focused on implementation and communication of adjustments and an action plan to address areas of inaccessibility in the estate.

Student perspective

Ms Jess Husbands, Students’ Association Vice-President, Societies & Activities

Ms Husbands reported that students had made a valuable contribution to the panel. From the student perspective, the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy was regarded as a positive development, promoting and inclusive environment while making students feel less conspicuous. Non-implementation of some adjustments remained an issue, however, and was a cause of stress for students. The lack of systematic engagement with disabled students had also led to issues across the estate, which met statutory requirements but remained inaccessible in some areas.

Ms Husbands indicated that it was unclear where the responsibility lay for accessibility in the estate and it was recommended that accessibility champions be appointed to drive access issues in a coordinated and strategic way. The University should also consider whether its approach was to be one of minimum compliance or whether it would set the sector-wide standard for disability issues.
Mainstreaming of adjustments
Professor Tina Harrison, Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance
Professor Iain Gordon, Head of School of Mathematics

Professor Harrison introduced the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy which sought to improve learning by mainstreaming a small number of adjustments to support those with disabilities. The University had an anticipatory duty towards its students and part of the University’s strategy was to create an inclusive environment which would support all students achieve their full potential. The aim of the Policy was to reduce the number of individual adjustments to implement by mainstreaming a range of adjustments, which account for around 25 per cent of all adjustments recommended by the Student Disability Service.

The propensity to declare a disability was not distributed equally across all student cohorts, however, and the policy would need to support the increasing diversity of the student body.

Professor Gordon outlined the ways in which the policy had been implemented by the School of Mathematics. Efforts had been made by the School to embed its own pedagogy into the process of mainstreaming adjustments and significant value was placed on liaison between staff and students in order to help the School identify where the Policy was not being implemented effectively. The School had used Learn to communicate with whole classes regarding reading lists/lecture outlines, while Path had been used to enable students to identify reading lists for the following year. This had the added benefit of allowing the School to provide details on courses well in advance of the academic year. Microphones in lectures were found to be useful and the School had held ongoing discussions on the efficacy of providing lecture notes.

Implementing adjustments
Professor Sandy Tudhope, Head of School of Geosciences

Professor Tudhope reported that a key concern for the panel was the lack of communication between the Student Disability Service and Schools and a lack of clarity over where the authority lay to determine and implement ‘reasonable’ adjustments. While Schools and the Student Disability Service both had specific roles in supporting students with disabilities, there was no one individual with overall authority to ensure that adjustments were implemented. The IT systems were also inadequate to support the necessary communication of learning profiles setting out students’ recommended reasonable adjustments.

The panel had made a number of recommendations to address these issues:

- That the University change the status of agreed adjustments from a recommendation to a necessary requirement to implement, with the Student Disability Service, as the professional service with specific expertise in relation to disability, having the ultimate authority with regard to identifying what is a ‘reasonable’ adjustment.
- That the Student Disability Service must forge closer relationships with Schools and engage in a programme of communication, so that Disability Advisors understand the context of adjustments in order to make them feasible and optimal.
- Schools should appoint a single point of contact for students with disabilities.
- Schools should undertake an annual review of adjustments and report to the Disability Committee.
IT systems, which will be updated in 2016/17, should include a single portal listing all the adjustments for any individual student and assemble information throughout the entire student journey.

Improving accessibility of the estate
Mr Gary Jebb, Director of Estates

Mr Jebb focused on the accessibility of the estate and improvements which were planned and underway. While most of the new estate was reasonably accessible, a quarter was currently not accessible.

While it would not be possible to have a fully accessible estate in the near future, progress over the last few months had included the drafting of an accessibility policy which was out for consultation and an access review of the site had also started, with access guides available during Welcome Week from September 2017.

It was planned that £15m would be spent on the estate over five years, with £2m being spent in 2016/17. Access proposals for major developments were currently under review; proposals for six schemes had already been reviewed and a number of enhancements had already been implemented. A programme of Disability Awareness training was underway for key staff in the Estates Department and a helpdesk had been introduced to tag maintenance issues.

Student mental health strategy

Overview, summary of action plan and timescale
Mr Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary, Student Experience
Professor Helen Cameron, Director of the Centre for Medical Education

Professor Cameron introduced the work of the Student Mental Health Strategy Group which had noted the growing demand for mental health services among young people. At the outset, a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats analysis had been undertaken: the University’s strengths lay in the scale, scope and quality of its services to support students’ mental health, such as counselling, disability and residential services and the Chaplaincy. The University’s focus of attention, however, had been on reacting to demand rather than adopting proactive well-being strategies and communication on provision of services had been fragmented. Threats lay in changing factors such as under-capacity in the NHS and the risk of universities attempting to backfill NHS services. Following the SWOT analysis, the Group had conducted desk-based research, including an examination of strategies at comparable universities and had consulted a wide range of stakeholders.

Professor Cameron noted that the Group’s vision was to create an environment which enabled and supported students to flourish. The two-fold aims of the strategy were to treat all students with respect and empathy while promoting good health, and to help students overcome mental health problems by supporting them through services.

Mr Douglas emphasised the importance of communicating the support that was available to students throughout the student journey and of promoting well-being at an early stage by developing specific material and guidance. There were various initiatives around the University which were already having a positive impact and pilots would be assessed and scaled up if necessary. A strong focus was on building a sense of community and supporting students who experienced mental health illness.

In terms of supporting the mental health of students, the University would need to consider where its resources should be invested.
Discussion

In discussion, the following points were raised:

- Recommendations should take into account the current capacity of the Student Disability Services; the Service was currently operating at full capacity and had extended to evening appointments, but there was a limit to its capabilities.
- Recommendations should be mindful of transient, as well as permanent disabilities.
- The recommendations around communications of reasonable adjustments for disabled students were potentially challenging to implement and sufficient time should be allowed for this, especially since not all adjustments were currently being implemented, such as use of microphones in lectures.
- Design of assessment was an important issue for both disability and mental health: thought should be given to assessments which were more inclusive; moreover, examination stress was a common cause of mental health issues and consideration should be given to the effect of certain modes of assessment on mental health.
- When consulting key stakeholders regarding the mental health strategy, it would be important to distinguish between undergraduate and postgraduate students since there was a difference between the integration and campus support available to these two cohorts.
- Waiting times for accessing NHS provision were an issue for mental health patients and should be addressed either through more in-house support or greater connections with the NHS.
- The social environment was important for students’ well-being since issues around mental health were frequently associated with the pressures of being far from home. A strong community structure was essential and initiatives such as the buddy scheme run by the Students’ Association were effective in this regard.
- In addition to providing support to students with short-term mental health issues, the University should develop ways of supporting students in the longer-term, including supporting students to become more resilient.

The Principal expressed his appreciation for the serious and considered presentations given and noted that the commitment of the University was very strong in the face of a demanding set of issues.

Senate Clerk
10 February 2017
Executive Summary

The paper provides the Special Minutes for those Professors who have retired recently.

How does this align with the University/College School/Committee’s strategic plans and priorities?

Not applicable.

Action requested

The Senate is invited to adopt the Special Minute of Professor A Cumming, Emeritus Professor of Medical Education.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Emeritus Professor procedures for communication will be followed.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource Implications
   None

2. Risk Assessment
   This paper does not include a risk assessment.

3. Equality and Diversity
   Not applicable.

4. Freedom of Information
   Open paper.

Any Other Relevant Information

A comment need only be submitted to raise an objection/suggest corrections. If no comments are received the minutes will be deemed approved. In this context any comments on this paper should be e-mailed to Senate.Support@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on e-S 16/17 3 B.” These comments will be added verbatim at http://edin.ac/18tbekG.

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat
May 2017
Special Minute

Professor Allan Cumming MBChB, BSc, MD
Emeritus Professor of Medical Education

Allan Cumming was brought up in Nairn, but studied Medicine in Edinburgh, awarded BSc (Hons) in Pathology, and since then has spent almost his entire professional life in the city.

He chose to go into the specialty of renal (kidney) medicine in 1980, at a time when dialysis provision was straining to meet burgeoning demand. One of his tasks was to establish the new technique of chronic ambulatory peritoneal dialysis (CAPD) to increase the number of patients who could be treated. He went on to gain an MD from a period of experimental research into acute renal failure that included a year in London Ontario 1984-5. In 1989 he became a Clinical Senior Lecturer in Renal Medicine under Professor James Robson.

However it was his increasing involvement in teaching which brought his greatest local and international recognition. In the mid 1990s he developed Edinburgh’s first clinical skills unit, teaching practical procedures on manikins and volunteers before students undertook them on patients. Allan was then appointed to the central role in realising an ambitious project to revise the undergraduate teaching of medicine, moving from a subject-based to system-based programme, with integration between the clinical departments. This was a politically sensitive and culturally very different way of organising medical education. To do this he led a new Medical Teaching Organisation which began as just three people, whose task was to work out how this could be done, and to persuade both non-clinical and clinical specialist departments to contribute to a larger whole. Implementation included a revolutionary Virtual Learning Environment EEMeC, which won a Queen’s Award in 2005.

In 2002 Allan became the first person to be appointed to the University’s new category of Personal Chair of Student Learning. In the same year he had become Director of Undergraduate Learning and Teaching for the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine. In 2004 he received the Chancellor’s Award for Teaching, and in 2012 became Dean for Students. Internationally he was the chair and coordinator for the European Commission’s MEDINE 2 project 2009-13, with 93 partner institutions developing staff and student mobility, use of competences and learning outcomes to raise standards, and further harmonisation by the Bologna process.
Communications from the University Court

Executive Summary

This report deals with certain matters considered by the University Court at its meeting on 6 February 2017.

How does this align with the University / Committee’s strategic plans and priorities?

Not applicable.

Action requested

Senate is invited to note the report.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Not applicable.

Resource / Risk / Compliance

1. Resource implications (including staffing)
   Where applicable, as covered in the report.

2. Risk assessment
   Where applicable, as covered in the report.

3. Equality and Diversity
   Where applicable, as covered in the report.

4. Freedom of information
   This paper can be included in open business.

Any Other Relevant Information including key words

A comment need only be submitted to raise an objection/suggest corrections. If no comments are received the paper will be deemed approved. In this context any comments on this paper should be e-mailed to Senate.Support@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on e-S 16/17 3 C.” These comments will be added verbatim at http://edin.ac/18tbekG

Originator of the paper

Dr Lewis Allan
Head of Court Services
5 May 2017
COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE UNIVERSITY COURT

6 February 2017

1 Minute

On behalf of Court, the Rector thanked the Vice-Convener, University Secretary, Director of Human Resources and all those involved in the recruitment process leading to the appointment of Professor Peter Mathieson, President and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Hong Kong as the next Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Edinburgh.

2 Principal’s Communications

Court observed a one minute silence in memory of Tam Dalyell, former Rector (2003-06), Member of Parliament for West Lothian (1962-83) and Linlithgow (1983-2005) and great supporter of the University, who died on 26 January 2017.

Court noted the content of the Principal’s report and the additional information on: recent engagement with the Scottish Government; 2017/18 application statistics; and the University’s position of 13th in the Times Higher Education World’s Most International Universities 2017 ranking.

3 Assistant Principal Extension

Court approved the extension of Professor Arthur Trew’s term of office as Assistant Principal Computational Science with immediate effect until 31 July 2018.

4 Student Experience Update

The Senior Vice-Principal reported on ongoing work to enhance the student experience following the December Court seminar. The intention to develop a holistic plan for learning and teaching to support the ambition to achieve a top ten placing in UK league tables was discussed. It was noted that a pilot project to subsidise a public bus link between King’s Buildings and the Central Area will begin shortly and the Main Library will open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week from 20 March, with a successful communications campaign having been launched.

5 Strategic Plan Performance Measurement Framework

The Deputy Secretary, Strategic Planning, presented a performance measurement dashboard illustrating the health and impacts of the University for use in assessing performance against the Strategic Plan 2016. Members welcomed the intention to develop an online version with further detail below each measure and discussed measuring social and economic impacts on a regional, Scottish, UK and international basis and measuring the return on investment of estates projects.

Noting that the ‘work in progress’ measures will continue to be developed, Court endorsed the performance measurement dashboard and agreed the proposed targets and next steps set out in the paper.

6 Edinburgh Global Update

The Vice-Principal International presented the new University Global Engagement Plan and provided an update on the MasterCard Scholars Program, Zhejiang
University Joint Institute and planned Hua Xia Healthcare collaborative initiatives. Opportunities arising from the Cross-Government Prosperity Fund, further improving Chevening and Commonwealth Scholarship student numbers, the ability to offer an international experience at Edinburgh with 20,000 international staff and students; and, peer support schemes that match domestic and international students were discussed.

7 Core Systems Strategy

The Chief Information Officer presented an initial information brief to raise awareness of the evolving University Core Systems Strategy – to operate the underpinning business and administration software systems in an integrated fashion. The risks of not replacing existing systems, the opportunity to improve the student and staff experience, ensuring realistic measurement of expected savings and the Strategy’s close alignment with the Service Excellence Programme were discussed. Court noted the requirement for a University Core Systems Strategy and the proposed governance process and timeline.

8 EUSA President’s Report

The EUSA President reported on activities since the last meeting and forthcoming events, including the annual Gather Festival (20-28 February) to celebrate the diverse University community, the Sustain.Ed Festival (16-18 February) to celebrate sustainability at the University and in the city and the opening of nominations for the annual Impact Awards, Teaching Awards and the EUSA elections.

9. Resolutions

The following resolutions were approved:

Resolution No. 1/2017: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Common Law
Resolution No. 2/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Economics
Resolution No. 3/2017: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Global Agriculture and Food Security
Resolution No. 4/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Economics
Resolution No. 5/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Business
Resolution No. 6/2017: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Paediatric Infectious Diseases and Global Health
Resolution No. 7/2017: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Corporate Finance
Resolution No. 8/2017: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Computational Biology
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Report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee

Executive Summary

This paper is to report the Out of Cycle Personal Chair recommendations of the Central Academic Promotions Committee.

It is important to be able to review periodically Out of Cycle Personal Chairs to fulfil the University Strategic Plan People Objectives to recruit, reward, develop and retain high-performing staff.

How does this align with the University/College School/Committee’s strategic plans and priorities? N/A

Action Requested

For Information.

How will any action be implemented and communicated? N/A

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   Does the paper have resource implications? Yes. Increased salaries will impact on the individual College’s staff budget.

2. Risk Assessment
   Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

3. Equality and Diversity
   Has due consideration been given to the equality impact assessment? Not directly applicable to each individual case. Equality and diversity impact is monitored centrally in relation to the Grade 10 population, new appointments and promotions. Remuneration Committee also considers data relating to the Grade 10 population with specific focus on equality and diversity indicators.

4. Freedom of Information
   Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Any Other Relevant Information

Members of Senatus wishing to comment on this paper should e-mail senatesupport@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on paper e-S 16/17 3 D”. These comments will be added verbatim to the intranet located at http://edin.ac/18tbekG
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REPORT FROM THE CENTRAL ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE

Since the last report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee one Personal Chair has been awarded out of cycle.

Personal Chairs

Professor Luis Duarte d’Almeida, Personal Chair of Jurisprudence with effect from 1 August 2017.

Louise Kidd
University HR Services
3 May 2017
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Resolutions

Executive Summary

This report is presented to Senate in accordance with the procedures for the creation of new chairs, renaming of existing chairs and alteration of Resolutions.

How does this align with the University/College School/Committee’s strategic plans and priorities?

Not applicable

Action requested

Senate is invited to make observations on the attached draft Resolutions.

How will any action agreed be implemented and communicated?

Via Senate’s report to University Court.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications

   There are no resource implications. Part of the approval process involved confirmation of the funding in place to support new Chairs.

2. Risk Assessment

   The paper does not include a risk analysis. There are reputational considerations in establishing and renaming Chairs and updating regulations, which are considered as part of the University’s approval processes.

3. Equality and Diversity

   There are no specific equality and diversity issues associated with this paper. However equality and diversity best practice and agreed procedures are adopted in appointing individuals to chairs.

4. Freedom of Information

   Open paper.

Any Other Relevant Information, including keywords

Keywords - Court, Resolutions, Chairs

A comment need only be submitted to raise an objection/suggest corrections. If no comments are received the minutes will be deemed approved. In this context any comments on this paper should be e-mailed to Senate.Support@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on e-S 16/17 3 E.” These comments will be added verbatim at http://edin.ac/18tbekG.

Originator of the paper

Ms K Graham
Deputy Head of Court Services
April 2017
Senate
Resolutions

Personal Chair (Appendix 1)
These Personal Chairs require to be created:

Draft Resolution No. 16/2017: Foundation of a Personal Chair of Jurisprudence

Establishment of Chair (Appendix 2)
The Central Management Group approved the creation of the following new Chairs:

Draft Resolution No. 17/2017: Foundation of a Sir Timothy O'Shea Chair of Veterinary Informatics and Data Science
Draft Resolution No. 19/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Material Design and Innovation
Draft Resolution No. 20/2017: Foundation of a Chair of Isotope Geochemistry
Draft Resolution No. 21/2017 Foundation of a Chair of Food and Environmental Security

Alteration of the title of Chairs (Appendix 3)
The alteration of the title of the following Chairs:

Draft Resolution No. 18/2017: Alteration of the title of the Chair of Learning Analytics and Informatics
Appendix 1

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 16/2017

Foundation of a Personal Chair of Jurisprudence

At Edinburgh, the Nineteenth day of June, Two thousand and seventeen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Personal Chair of Jurisprudence:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Personal Chair of Jurisprudence in the University of Edinburgh.

1. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. Notwithstanding the personal nature of this Chair, the terms and conditions of appointment and tenure which by Statute, Ordinance and otherwise apply to other Chairs in the University shall be deemed to apply in like manner to the Personal Chair of Jurisprudence together with all other rights, privileges and duties attaching to the office of Professor.

4. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 August Two thousand and seventeen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 17/2017

Foundation of the Sir Timothy O'Shea Chair of Veterinary Informatics and Data Science

At Edinburgh, the Nineteenth day of June, Two thousand and seventeen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Sir Timothy O'Shea Chair of Veterinary Informatics and Data Science:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Sir Timothy O’Shea Chair of Veterinary Informatics and Data Science in the University of Edinburgh.

2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 August Two thousand and seventeen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 19/2017

Foundation of Chair of Material Design and Innovation

At Edinburgh, the Nineteenth day of June, Two thousand and seventeen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Chair of Material Design and Innovation:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Chair of Material Design and Innovation in the University of Edinburgh.

2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 August Two thousand and seventeen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary
Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 20/2017

Foundation of Chair of Isotope Geochemistry

At Edinburgh, the Nineteenth day of June, Two thousand and seventeen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Chair of Isotope Geochemistry:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Chair of Isotope Geochemistry in the University of Edinburgh.

2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 August Two thousand and seventeen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 21/2017

Foundation of Chair of Food and Environmental Security

At Edinburgh, the Nineteenth day of June, Two thousand and seventeen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to found a Chair of Food and Environmental Security:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. There shall be a Chair of Food and Environmental Security in the University of Edinburgh.

2. The patronage of the Chair shall be vested in and exercised by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh.

3. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 February Two thousand and seventeen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH

University Secretary
Draft Resolution of the University Court No. 18/2017

Alteration of the title of the Chair of Learning Analytics and Informatics

At Edinburgh, the Nineteenth day of June, Two thousand and seventeen.

WHEREAS the University Court deems it expedient to alter the title of the Chair of Learning Analytics and Informatics founded by Resolution 17/2014;

AND WHEREAS paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, provides that the University Court may, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and with the consent of the incumbent and patrons, if any, alter the title of existing professorships;

AND WHEREAS the Chair dealt with in this Resolution is in the patronage of the University Court itself:

THEREFORE the University Court, after consultation with the Senatus Academicus and in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, with special reference to paragraph 5 of Part II of Schedule 2 to that Act, hereby resolves:

1. The Chair of Learning Analytics and Informatics shall hereafter be designated the Sir Timothy O'Shea Chair of Learning Analytics and Informatics.

2. This Resolution shall come into force with effect from 1 August Two thousand and seventeen.

For and on behalf of the University Court

SARAH SMITH
University Secretary
The University of Edinburgh
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Senate Standing Committees: Amended Terms of Reference

Brief description of the paper, including a statement of relevance to the University's strategic plans and priorities

This paper sets out proposed changes to the Terms of Reference for Senate Learning and Teaching Committee and Curriculum and Student Progression Committee. The proposed changes are highlighted within the document.

Action requested

For approval

Communication and Implementation

The Terms of Reference will be updated on the Academic Services website.

Resource implications

Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper?

There are no equality implications for the proposed changes. Senate Committee Terms of Reference are covered by an Equality Impact Assessment: www.docs.csg.ed.ac.uk/EqualityDiversity/EIA/Senate_Committees_ToR(Academic_Services).pdf

Freedom of information

Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Any other relevant information, including keywords

A comment need only be submitted to raise an objection/suggest corrections. If no comments are received the minutes will be deemed approved. In this context any comments on this paper should be e-mailed to Senate.Support@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on e-S 16/17 3 F.” These comments will be added verbatim at https://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/committees/senate/senate-restricted

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat, Academic Services
May 2017
1. Purpose and Role
1.1 The Learning and Teaching Committee is responsible, on behalf of Senatus, for undergraduate, taught postgraduate and other forms of academic provision, apart from postgraduate research and higher degrees.

1.2 The Committee provides a forum to facilitate and encourage the development of academic strategy and also discusses and promotes academic developments, whether internally driven or externally indicated.

2. Remit
The remit of the Learning and Teaching Committee is to:

2.1 Discuss, formulate and promote strategic initiatives which enhance the student experience as it relates to teaching and learning and which contribute to, and which support attainment, of the University's objectives.

2.2 Support the creation and development of a high level framework which encourages and supports innovation, flexibility, accessibility and interdisciplinary initiatives.

2.3 Promote and promulgate specific innovations in learning, teaching and assessment, embracing new pedagogies and technologies in support of the enhancement of the student experience.

2.4 Approve any specific local developments or initiatives which could have substantial implications for University strategy or policy or for University level services and/or operations.

2.4 Proactively engage with any high level issues or themes arising from the National Student Survey, the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey, the International Student Barometer and other internal and external student satisfaction surveys.

2.6 Engage in horizon scanning to anticipate and prepare for new opportunities and likely future developments in learning and teaching.

3. Governance
3.1 The Committee will act with authority, as delegated by the Senatus, in order to take strategic and high level policy decisions in the area of teaching and learning.

3.2 In taking forward its remit, the Committee will support and encourage diversity and variation where this is beneficial, whilst seeking consistency and common approaches, where these are in the best interests of staff and students.

3.3 The Committee shall report directly to the Senatus as necessary, but at least annually.

3.4 The Committee shall liaise with relevant Court Committees and with specific managers and offices in respect of issues or instances where matters of academic policy intersect with management issues.

3.5 The Committee shall identify and agree the ways in which it will periodically interact and exchange information with relevant academic and student services in matters relating to teaching and learning.

4. Operation
4.1 The Committee will meet at least four times per annum. The Committee will also interact electronically, as is necessary for its business to be effectively progressed.
4.2 The Committee may also meet electronically to note formal items or items which are not considered to be of strategic importance.

4.3 The Committee will follow a strategic agenda which is set prior to the start of the Academic Year and which is agreed through consultation with Senatus, the Convenors of the other Senatus Committees, and other relevant members of the University community.

4.4 Limited life Task Groups will take forward as relevant the detailed examination of, and consultation on, the strategic issues which make up the majority of the Committee’s work.

4.5 Task Groups will be given a clear brief and will consult as appropriate during their work in order to ensure the confidence of the Committee, the Senatus, and the wider University Community in the resulting conclusions and recommendations.

4.6 Information on Task Group activities will be made available electronically to ensure that members of the University Community are kept informed and can contribute to specific developments.

4.7 Agenda, papers and approved minutes will be published on the University’s web pages in accordance with the University’s agreed publication scheme and the status of the above listed in respect of freedom if information legislation. This will include details of the membership of the Committee.

4.8 The University Secretary or his/her nominee will be responsible for ensuring the provision of secretariat support for the Committee.

4.9 The Convenors of the other Senatus Committees shall receive papers for the Committee and can attend any of the meetings.

5. Composition

5.1 The Committee shall be convened by the Senior Vice-Principal. The Vice-Convenor shall be the Assistant Principal Academic Standards and Quality Assurance.

5.2 The Colleges shall each nominate two senior members of staff who have responsibility for learning and teaching.

5.3 The Edinburgh University Students’ Association Vice President Education shall be an ex officio member of the Committee. A permanent member of Students’ Association staff shall also be an ex officio member.

5.4 The University Secretary or his/her nominee shall be an ex officio member of the Committee. The University Secretary shall also identify a member of staff to act as the expert academic governance member of the Committee.

5.5 The Assistant Principal Research-Led Learning shall be an ex officio member of the Committee.

5.6 The Director of the Institute for Academic Development or his/her nominee shall be an ex officio member of the Committee.

5.7 The Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions or his/her nominee shall be an ex officio member of the Committee.

5.8 The Director of the Learning, Teaching and Web Services Division of Information Services or his/her nominee shall be an ex officio member of the Committee.

5.9 The Director for Careers and Employability or his/her nominee shall be an ex officio member of the Committee.

5.10 Up to 5 additional members may be co-opted onto the Committee by the Convenor depending on the expertise required. Co-opted members will normally serve a three year term. Other co-opted members may serve for shorter periods.
5.11 The Convenor may invite individuals for specific meetings or agenda items.

5.12 Substitution of members (ie due to an inability to attend) shall be at the discretion of the Convenor of the Committee.

6. Responsibilities and Expectations of Committee Members

All members of the Committee:

6.1 Are expected to be collegial and constructive in approach.

6.2 Should attend regularly and participate fully in the work of the Committee and its Task Groups. This will involve looking ahead and consulting/gathering input in order to provide the broad spectrum of thoughts and opinions which are necessary for proper consideration of the area being discussed.

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

6.4 Are expected to be committed to communicating the work of the Committee to the wider University Community.
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1. Purpose and Role

1.1 The Curriculum and Student Progression Committee is responsible, on behalf of Senatus, for the academic regulatory framework apart from those aspects which are primarily parts of the Quality Assurance Framework.

1.2 The Committee is also the forum which oversees the process of maintaining and disseminating the regulations, and other guidance, in light of policy developments and changes in the internal and external environments.

2. Remit

The remit of the Curriculum and Student Progression Committee is to:

2.1 Offer strategic advice on the University’s portfolio of undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes.

2.2 Oversee the development, maintenance and implementation of a fit for purpose regulatory framework which effectively supports and underpins the University’s educational activities.

2.3 Examine the need for, and approve the simplification, development and review of any specific components of the regulatory framework in light of new innovations or specific trends, issues or problems.

2.4 Ensure that the academic regulatory framework continues to evolve in order to meet the organisational needs of the University, especially within the context of the designated powers and authority of the University and its Colleges and Schools.

2.5 Act with delegated authority from the Senatus on matters of student conduct and discipline¹.

3. Governance

3.1 The Committee will act with authority, as delegated by the Senatus, in order to take decisions regarding the regulatory framework for the University’s educational activities.

3.2 In taking forward its remit, the Committee will support and encourage diversity and variation where this is beneficial, whilst seeking consistency and common approaches, where these are in the best interests of staff and students.

3.3 The Committee will report direct to the Senatus as necessary, but at least annually.

3.4 The Committee will liaise with relevant Court Committees and with specific managers and offices in respect of issues or instances where matters of academic policy intersect with management issues.

3.5 The Committee will identify and agree the ways in which it will periodically interact and exchange information with relevant committees and academic and student services in matters relating to the academic regulatory framework.

4. Operation

¹ This responsibility came into effect on 1 January 2014 when the Standing Commission on Discipline was dissolved.
4.1 The Committee will meet at least four times per annum. The Committee will also interact electronically, as is necessary for its business to be effectively progressed. The Convener of the Committee may approve items by Convener’s Action between meetings. The Convener is advised on such decisions by the secretariat of the Committee and/or the academic governance member. This advice draws on previous Committee decisions and on issues agreed in principle with delegated authority granted to the Committee Convener, while ensuring the maintenance of academic standards and the appropriate consistency of treatment of students.

4.2 The Committee may also meet electronically to note formal items or items which are not considered to be of strategic importance.

4.3 The Committee will follow a strategic agenda which is set prior to the start of the academic year and which is agreed through consultation with Senatus, the Conveners of the other Senatus Committees, and other relevant members of the University community.

4.4 The Convener, or Vice-Convener will have delegated authority, on behalf of the Committee, to make decisions on student concession cases, and this business may be conducted electronically where appropriate.

4.5 Limited life task groups and working groups will take forward as relevant the detailed examination of, and consultation on, the strategic issues which make up the majority of the Committee’s work.

4.6 Any task or working groups will be given a clear brief and will consult as appropriate during their work in order to ensure the confidence of the Committee, the Senatus, and the wider University Community in the resulting conclusions and recommendations.

4.7 Information on any activities will be made available electronically to ensure that members of the University community are kept informed and can contribute to specific developments.

4.8 Agenda, papers and approved minutes will be published on the University’s web pages in accordance with the University’s agreed publication scheme and the status of the above listed in respect of freedom of information legislation. This will include details of the membership of the Committee.

4.9 The University Secretary or his/her nominee will be responsible for ensuring the provision of secretariat support for the Committee.

4.10 The Conveners of the other Senatus Committees shall receive papers for the Committee and can attend any of the meetings.

5. Composition

5.1 The Committee will be convened by the Assistant Principal, Academic Support.

5.2 Before the first annual meeting the Committee shall identify a Vice-Convener for the Committee from amongst its membership. The Vice-Convener should serve for a period of at least one year.

5.3 The Colleges will each identify up to two senior members of staff within the College who have responsibility for academic governance and regulation.

5.4 The Colleges will each identify a senior member of staff within the College who has responsibility for maintaining and enhancing the quality of the student experience.

5.5 An Edinburgh University Students Association (EUSA) sabbatical officer will be an ex officio member of the Committee.
5.6 The Edinburgh University Students' Association will provide a relevant nominee for the Committee.

5.7 A member of staff of the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) will be an ex officio member of the Committee.

5.8 The University Secretary or his/her nominee will be an ex officio member of the Committee. The University Secretary or his/her nominee will also identify a member of staff from Academic Services to act as the expert academic governance member of the Committee.

5.9 Up to five additional members may be co-opted onto the Committee by the Convener depending on the expertise required. Co-opted members will normally serve a three year term.

5.10 The Assistant Principal, Assessment and Feedback and the Assistant Principal, Community Relations will be ex officio members of the Committee.

5.11 The Convener may invite individuals by invitation for specific meetings or agenda items.

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

6. Responsibilities and Expectations of Committee Members

6.1 Members are expected to be collegial and constructive in approach.

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

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

6.4 Members are expected to be committed to communicating the work of the Committee to the wider University community.
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Membership of Senate 2017/18

Executive Summary

The paper advises Senate of its new members. Student representatives will be reported at the beginning of the next academic session.

How does this align with the University/College/School/Committee’s strategic plans and priorities?
N/A.

Action requested

Senate is invited to note and welcome its new members.

How will any action be implemented and communicated?

New members will receive a welcome email and an invitation to an induction event prior to the beginning of the Senate meeting cycle 2017/18

Resources/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource Implications
   N/A

2. Risk Assessment
   N/A

3. Equality and Diversity
   Elected members were elected from specific categories, i.e. a pre-defined constituency. Within these pre-defined constituencies no barriers to election to Senatus were found.

4. Freedom of Information
   Open paper.

Any Other Relevant Information

A comment need only be submitted to raise an objection/suggest corrections. If no comments are received the membership will be deemed approved. In this context any comments on this paper should be emailed to Senate.Support@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on e-S 16/17 3 G.” These comments will be added verbatim at http://edin.ac/18tbekG

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat
April 2017
Senatus Membership

For Information

Readers, senior lecturers, and lecturers

The following have been elected or re-elected by their College for a period of three years from 1 August 2017 to 31 July 2019.

Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

Dr T Bak  School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences
Dr R Baxstrom  School of Social and Political Science
Dr A Convery  School of Social and Political Science
Dr S E MacPherson  School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences
Dr P Norris  School of Social and Political Science
Dr N Treanor  School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Science
Dr S Trill  School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures
Dr O Uduku  Edinburgh College of Art
Dr S Woodman  School of Social and Political Science

Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

Dr V MacRae  Royal Dick School of Veterinary Studies
Dr S Stock  Deanery of Clinical Sciences
G Gray  Deanery of Clinical Sciences
Z Jiwaji  Deanery of Biomedical Sciences
Dr S Riley  Deanery of Clinical Sciences
Dr C Harlow  Deanery of Clinical Sciences
Dr C Moran  Deanery of Clinical Sciences
Dr E Quaia  Deanery of Clinical Sciences
Dr G Thompson

Science and Engineering

Dr Paul Taylor  School of Biological Sciences
Dr Patrick Walsh  School of Biological Sciences

University Demonstrators and Academic Research Staff

Dr C Aftab  Deanery of Clinical Sciences
Dr L Cariola  School of Health in Social Science
Mr Carlos Da Costa Filho  School of GeoSciences
Mr Emiel De Lange  School of GeoSciences
Mr Alexis Hennessy  School of Chemistry
Ms Ariana Jones  School of Chemistry
Ms Kathryn Redpath  Centre for Open Learning
Mr Brian Shaw  School of Chemistry
**Ex Officio Members**

The following College Office bearers have been nominated under Ordinance 204, section 6(i)(b)1:

**Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences**

Dr S Rolle  Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
Dr J Crang  Dean of Students  
Dr S Benjamin  Associate Dean Quality Assurance

**Medicine and Veterinary Medicine**

Mr M Akyol  Director of MBChB Admissions  
Dr M Cullen  MBChB Senior Tutor  
Dr G Pearson  BVM&S Senior Tutor  
Dr F Kristmundsdottir  MBChB Director of Pastoral Care

**Science and Engineering**

Dr G McDougall  Dean Quality Assurance  
Dr A Maciocia  Dean of Students
Executive Summary

The paper lists the College Academic Management Structures for 2017/18.

How does this align with the University/College School/Committee’s strategic plans and priorities?

N/A

Action requested

The Senatus is invited to note the paper.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource Implications

Does the paper have resource implications? These will have been considered by each College when deciding on their College Academic Management Structures for 2017/18.

2. Risk Assessment

Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

3. Equality and Diversity

Has due consideration been given to the equality impact assessment? Not relevant.

4. Freedom of Information

This is an open paper.

Any Other Relevant Information

A comment need only be submitted to raise an objection/suggest corrections. If no comments are received the paper will be deemed approved. In this context any comments on this paper should be e-mailed to Senate.Support@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on e-S 16/17 3 H.” These comments will be added verbatim at http://edin.ac/18tbekG.

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat
April 2017
For information

Humanities & Social Science

Head of College
Vice-Principal Professor D Miell
Dean of Research
Professor L Plowman (semester one)
Professor C Boswell (from Jan 2018)
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dr S Rolle
Dean of Postgraduate Studies
Professor N Mulholland
Dean of Students
Dr J Crang
Dean International
Professor C Clark
Dean of Special Projects
Professor P Quattrone
Associate Dean (Student Conduct)
Professor T Fawcett
Associate Dean (Recruitment and Admissions Strategy)
Dr J Crang
Associate Dean (Academic Progress)
Dr P Norris
Associate Dean (Quality Assurance and Enhancement)
Dr S Benjamin
Associate Dean (Quantitative Methods)
Professor J MacInnes
Associate Dean (Research, Knowledge Exchange and Impact)
Dr J Cross
Associate Dean (Research Ethics)
Dr Laura Jeffery
College Registrar
Dr C Martin

Medicine & Veterinary Medicine

Head of College
Vice-Principal Professor Sir J Savill
Deputy Head of College
Professor D Argyle
Head of the Edinburgh Medical School
Professor M Whyte
Director of Undergraduate Learning and Teaching
Professor N Turner
Director of Postgraduate Research
Professor P Saunders
Director of Postgraduate Taught
Professor A Meredith
Director of Quality Assurance
Professor J Bradshaw
Dean of Students
Dr G Pearson
Dean of Research
Professor B Walker
College Registrar
Dr C Elliott

Science & Engineering

Head of College
Vice-Principal Professor D Robertson
Deputy Head of College
Assistant Principal Professor A Trew
Dean of Learning and Teaching
Professor G Reid
Dean of Students
Dr A Maciocia
Dean of Research
Professor A Mount
Dean, International
Professor R Wallace
Dean of Quality Assurance
Dr G McDougall
Associate Dean (e-Research)
Professor M Parsons
College Registrar
Dr D B Nelson

April 2017
Executive Summary

The paper outlines business approved by the Senate Exception Committee since the last meeting of Senate.

How does this align with the University/College School/Committee's strategic plans and priorities?

Not applicable

Action requested

Senate is invited to note the business approved by the Senate Exception Committee.

Resource/Risk/Compliance

1. Resource implications
   None

2. Risk assessment
   No risk assessment is included in the paper

3. Equality and Diversity
   Due consideration has been given to the equality and diversity implications of this paper.

4. Freedom of Information
   Open paper

Any other relevant information, including keywords

A comment need only be submitted to raise an objection/suggest corrections. If no comments are received the minutes will be deemed approved. In this context any comments on this paper should be e-mailed to Senate.Support@ed.ac.uk quoting “comment on e-S 16/17 3 I.” These comments will be added verbatim at http://edin.ac/18tbekG

Originator of the paper

Senate Secretariat
May 2017
The Senate Exception Committee approved the recommendation of the Honorary Degrees Committee.
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Senate Meetings 2017/18

Senate Meetings

Members are asked to note that the Senate will meet on the following dates during the next academic session:

Wednesday 4 October 2017, St Cecilia’s Hall, Niddry Street
Wednesday 7 February 2018, Wellcome Auditorium, Queen’s Medical Research Institute
Wednesday 30 May 2018, Swann Lecture Theatre, the King’s Buildings

All meetings are scheduled to begin at 2.00 p.m.

Electronic Senate Meetings

Electronic Senate business will be conducted between the following dates during the next academic session:

Tuesday 12 September – Wednesday 20 September 2017
Tuesday 16 January – Wednesday 24 January 2018
Tuesday 8 May – Wednesday 16 May 2018

Members will be sent a link as usual to the electronic business when each E-Senate opens.

Deadline for Agenda Items

The table below sets out the deadline for agenda items and papers for submission to Senate meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Deadline for Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September E Senate</td>
<td>Friday 8 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 October Senate</td>
<td>Monday 25 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January E Senate</td>
<td>Friday 12 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 February Senate</td>
<td>Monday 29 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May E Senate</td>
<td>Friday 4 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May Senate</td>
<td>Monday 21 May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is helpful to have early notification of any likely Senate agenda items. The Senate Secretariat (senate.support@ed.ac.uk) can advise on whether proposed business should be conducted via the electronic Senate or at a Senate meeting.