



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Senatus Academicus

Wednesday 24 May 2:00-5:00pm

Online meeting

Microsoft Teams

Confirmed Minute

ATTENDEES: Marialuisa Aliotta, Arianna Andreangeli, Ruth Andrew, Mohammad Amir Anwar, David Argyle, Michael Barany, Daniel Bilc, Richard Blythe, Tom Booth, Conchur O Bradaigh, Julian Bradfield, Holly Branigan, Aidan Brown, Adam Budd, Jane Calvert, Tony Carbery, Alan Convery, Hope Conway-Gebbie, Sam Coombes, Miguel Costa-Gomes, Jeremy Crang, Hilary Critchley, Juan Cruz, Sarah Cunningham-Burley, Jo Danbolt, Jamie Davies, Matuikuani Dax, Anne Desler, John Devaney, Paul du Plessis, Murray Earle, Jite Eferakorho, Constantinos Eleftheriou, Natasha Ellingham, Mark Evans, Bob Fisher, Chris French, Daniel Friedrich, Stuart Gilfillan, Benjamin Goddard, Iain Gordon, Kim Graham, Liz Grant, Richard Gratwick, Lorna Hamilton, Uzma Tufail-Hanif, Colm Harmon, Tina Harrison, David Hay, Elaine Haycock-Stuart, Margarete Heck, Thorunn Helgason, Sarah Henderson, Caroline Heycock, James Hopgood, Jenny Hoy, Andrew Hudson, Emma Hunter, Gbenga Ibikunle, David Ingram, Aditi Jain, Laura Jeffery, Kirsten Jenkins, Tobias Kelly, Meryl Kenny, George Kinnear, Linda Kirstein, Dave Laurenson, Patrick Lennard, Steff Lewis, Ashley Lloyd, Wendy Loretto, Ewa Luger, Sam Maccallum, Antony Maciocia, Rebecca Marsland, Peter Mathieson, Keith Matthews, Gavin McLachlan, Heather McQueen, Avery Meiksin, Steven Morley, Jade Naulty, Pau Navarro, Paul Norris, Diana Paton, Rebecca Reynolds, Ken Rice, Simon Riley, Sabine Rolle, Marion Schmid, Bernd Schroers, Matthias Schwannauer, Hamish Simpson, David Smith, Antonella Sorace, Tim Stratford, Gavin Sullivan, Jonathan Terry, Alex Thomson, Tamara Trodd, Jon Turner, Nadia Tuzi, Jeremy Upton, Jose Vazquez-Boland, Patrick Walsh, Stephen Warrington, Christopher Weir, Mark Williams, Ben Wynne, Alper Yildirim

IN ATTENDANCE: Kim Ansell, Lisa Dawson, Sinead Docherty, Arlene Duffin, Lucy Evans, Patrick Hadoke, Olivia Hayes, David Langley, Kathryn Nicol, Dean Pateman, Ella Ritchie, Jo Roger

APOLOGIES: Peter Adkins, Shereen Benjamin, Chandan Bose, Mary Brennan, Celine Caquineau, Leigh Chalmers, Siddharthan Chandran, Dylan Clements, Andrew Connor, Charlotte Desvages, Simone Dimartino, Lawrence Dritsas, Agata Dunsmore, Andrea English, Jay Evans, Suzanne Ewing, Manuel Fernández-Götz, Aisha Holloway, Simone Lamont-Black, Catherine Martin, Damian Mole, Andrew Morris, Susan Morrow, Robbie Nicol, Wayne Powell, Sarah Prescott, Niamh Roberts, Jo Shaw, Tobias Schwarz, Geoff Simm, Melissa Terras, Mike Shipston, Ryan Wereski, Isi Williams, Ingrid Young

The Convener, Principal Professor Sir Peter Mathieson, opened the meeting and confirmed that Senate had reached quorum. The Convener reminded members of the etiquette for online meetings – including requesting that members do not use the meeting chat to make substantial points, reminding members that the chat is subject to freedom of information requests, and noting that Senate Support would manage any votes using the Teams voting function, and that non-members in attendance should not participate in voting.

Senate received a presentation with the emerging findings of the Senate External Effectiveness Review ahead of the formal meeting with a detailed discussion on the review and recommendations to take place following the final report being received in July.

The Convener welcomed Advance HE consultants, Professor Ella Ritchie and Dr David Langley and Kim Ansell, to the meeting and extended his thanks to them and Hillary Gyebi-Ababio on behalf of the University for their work in undertaking the External Review of Senate.

1. Presentation: Emerging findings of the Senate External Effectiveness Review

To note and comment

Senate received a presentation from Professor Ritchie, lead consultant for Advance HE, which provided an overview of the approach and emerging themes from the externally facilitated review. Professor Ritchie extended her thanks to Senate and Standing Committee members on behalf of Advance HE for taking time to contribute to the review. Professor Ritchie also thanked Academic Services staff for their support throughout the review.

The following key points were made:

- The support provided to Senate by Academic Services staff including Olivia Hayes and formerly by Tom Ward was noted as being an asset to Senate.
- The methodology used by the review included two surveys: one of Senate members and a second of Standing Committee members, a review of documentation, observation of Senate and Standing Committee meetings and individual interviews. The strong engagement with the survey along with overall review methodology provided a rich picture of Senate.
- Academic Governance is working well in some areas, with the majority view reflecting that Senate operates in the interests of the wider University rather than the interests of individual members'. The overall view is that Standing Committees add value to decision making processes.
- Some areas are not working well and there may be benefits seen by making changes to the operation and scope of Senate, the focus and outcomes coming from Senate, culture and links to Colleges, Schools and Court.
- An emerging theme is on the culture of Senate and it was observed that it is challenging to conduct constructive debate around core issues. Discussion was observed as being confrontational with the use of the chat function during meetings detracting from valuable strategic discussions. Respecting agenda and meeting timings would aid in creating trust, where there is currently a culture of openly questioning of the value of Senate among members.
- An emerging theme is on the reputation of Senate and there is a risk of Senate becoming unrepresentative of the academy. This is reflected in the lack of attendance at meetings and frequent quoracy issues. There was some evidence of Senate views being side-lined, even when the opinion was strong and broad. There would be benefit in building the reputation and culture of Senate across the University.
- An emerging theme is on student voice at Senate. There is a lack of profile and visibility of student matters, which affects engagement and trust. This was particularly seen among student members who are not representatives of the Student Association and who struggled to keep track of the progress of issues.
- An emerging theme is on enablers at Senate. At present, operational matters dominate strategic discussion and detract from focus on strategic issues. A focus on detailed procedural matters alienates staff and is usually unproductive. Greater visibility of professional services leadership on Senate and clarifying the scope and boundaries of Senate and its relationship with Schools and Colleges would be useful.
- An emerging theme is on the Senate Standing Committees. Overall the Committees generally work well, however there would be value in strengthening connectivity between Senate and its Committees.
- Emerging themes including the University's focus on EDI matters was not visible as part of academic governance during the review. There is a limited research agenda at Senate, despite the promotion of research being one of Senate's statutory functions.
- A range of emerging recommendations were outlined, as presented in the slides, these cover the following broad areas: a change to allow Senate to focus on the academic mission; an enhanced role of the senior leadership team on Senate to create more collegiality and cohesion across Schools, Colleges and departments; increased visibility of the agenda setting process; an increased profile of student matters at Senate; discussion of research strategy; composition of Senate; logistical enablers to support operational effectiveness of Senate; a review of Senate induction; and an expansion of support provided to Senate by Academic Services.
- A range of emerging suggestions were outlined, as presented in the slides, these covered the following broad areas: the balance of activity between Standing Committees; strengthening links between Court and Senate; empowering subject and School leaders to help formulate

feedback or steer policy; Senate membership as part of the WAM; and increased promotion of the work and benefits of Senate.

Professor Ritchie invited initial comments from the floor. The following points were made:

- The purpose of Senate was raised as a key area of concern with recent focus on legalistic and non-academic issues. It was noted that increasing the time spent on core issues relating to Senate's remit would be useful.
- A more constructive approach to the debate in Senate would be valuable. An approach which sees speakers taking a collegial approach to solving issues was suggested.

Professor Ritchie invited further comments via email to ella.ritchie@ncl.ac.uk by 7 June. The full report would be provided by early July with the report and recommendations to be considered at the next meeting of Senate.

FORMAL MEETING OF SENATE

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

The Convener opened the formal meeting and reminded members of the etiquette for online meetings. He discouraged members from using the meeting chat to make substantial points and reminded them that the chat is subject to freedom of information requests. The Convener noted that Senate Support would manage any votes required using the Teams voting function, and that non-members in attendance should not take part in any voting that may take place.

Members were asked to be mindful of time when making comments.

2. Convener's Communications - Verbal update

The Convener made the following points:

- People and Money continues to be a focus for the Senior Leadership Team. The external advisor engaged to provide confidential support to the Principal on People and Money has shared recommendations for improvement which are in the process of being shared with and implemented by the relevant leads for People and Money. It was acknowledged that issues relating to People and Money are not resolved, however progress towards addressing issues with means of measuring the progress of mitigations are in place.
- Industrial Action and the Marking and Assessment Boycott (MAB) are a focus for the Senior Leadership Team. The University put forward a proposal to the Edinburgh branch of UCU that the proposed 50% deduction of pay would not be implemented for any staff member if the work of graduating students and students with critical assessments were marked. Though initial discussions with the local branch were positive, the national UCU body did not permit a ballot on this to be undertaken. The Senior Leadership Team are engaged with UCU Scotland with the same resolution put forward where it can be guaranteed that work for the identified cohorts is completed after 4 July. The University is awaiting a response to this offer from the unions.
The Senior Leadership Team are very distressed by the messages from students and their families on the prospect of not graduating and are seeking any avenue to compromise on this. The University has agency over the extent of pay to withhold and is seeking a local compromise if the conditions of the offer are met.
- The rapid growth of Artificial Intelligence and tools such as Chat GPT is a focus with the implications for Universities of these still being considered and explored. It is anticipated that this may return to Senate in the future.

The Convener invited comments and the following points were made:

- The guidance produced by the University on the use of AI tools is very useful. Thanks and congratulations were extended to the colleagues involved in drafting this.
- A query was raised on how and when Senate can expect to receive the People and Money update referred to by the Convener and to be involved in the P and M response as approved at our previous meeting. The Convener said he did not know, and agreed to discuss with necessary colleagues, with any updates likely to be circulated electronically.

- Media reports suggest that the University has committed to all work being marked. The Convener noted that the 4 July is the date by which the full impact of the MAB would be felt, as this is the date publicised when all awards and course results should have been communicated to students, and that the University would be willing to waive pay deductions for all staff if the work of graduating students is marked. He noted that the local solution proposed is intended to protect these students from the impact of the MAB.
- A student member reflected on their experience and noted that since commencing their programme in 2019 every semester has been impacted by industrial action or Covid. The student raised a concern over allegations regarding the sexual behaviour of some staff hired in teaching positions and noted concern regarding a funding cut for the Edinburgh Rape Crisis Centre in the context of an alleged pay rise for the Principal. The Convener expressed his regret and apologies that Industrial Action and Covid has impacted on their entire studies. The Convener said that the news story reporting on his salary is factually incorrect. The Deputy Secretary, Students noted that a meeting is being held imminently with the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee to discuss the funding cuts. The Deputy Secretary, Students agreed to report back to Senate on this in due course.

3. **Senate Minutes - S 22/23 5A**

- Minutes of Senate meeting held on 8 February 2023
- Minutes of Senate meeting held on 29 March 2023
- Report of E-Senate held from 26 April – 10 May 2023

To approve

Senate approved the minutes of the meeting held 8 February 2023 as presented.

A significant number of detailed amendments to the minutes of the meeting held 29 March 2023 were raised as follows:

Matters Arising: Senate Elections and Amendment to Senate Election Regulations

A concern was raised regarding Court's decision to overturn a proposed amendment to the Senate Election Regulations approved by more than 80% of Senate at its 8 February meeting on the basis of advice provided by Academic Services and legal advisors that contained at least two significant factual errors. In the open Court paper relating to the relevant Court meeting, Court was given factually incorrect information about what Ordinance 212 states regarding elected members and about the relationship between at-large elected Senate terms and the terms of Senate Assessors

Matters Arising: Legal Context of Senate Motions/ Context of Some Recent Member Contributed Papers

It was noted that there was a paper titled Legal Context of Senate Motions/ Context of Some Recent Member Contributed Papers submitted for inclusion in the 8 February meeting and included on the 8 February agenda marked as 'to follow'. A revised version of this paper was submitted on 8 March but was not included on the 29 March agenda (which was a continuation of the February meeting) on the grounds that it was not part of Senate's business in February. The authors objected to the assertion that the paper was not part of Senate's February business, noting that it was listed on the 8 February agenda and not withdrawn by the authors. The paper recorded obstacles experienced in proposing a Senate response to the University travel policy and a pattern of questionable actions by the Senate convener, and challenged representations of law and procedure offered to Senate in paper S 22/23 2B.

The following concerns were noted on behalf of the paper authors:

- The authors raised concern that the University Secretary and Academic Services demanded changes to -the paper submitted for 8 February as a condition of circulating it.
- The authors confirmed with Legal Services that there is no document formally approved in law, by Senate or by Court that provides a basis for not permitting the paper to be included.

- The authors raised objection to the decision to withdraw the paper from the 29 March meeting and requested that the paper be included in the 29 March meeting. The authors noted that the decision to withdraw the paper raises serious concerns with the actions of the Convener which suggest a desire to suppress criticism.

The following points were made:

- Legal advice had been obtained which stated that the Standing Orders can be relied on and are instructive and of assistance in determining which person or body is responsible for determining what matters are put before Senate at a meeting of Senate. This position is supported by advice from the University's Legal Services team and external legal advice. The Principal, as President of the Senate, had received professional legal advice on this issue and was entitled to rely on that advice.
- The Sustainable Travel Policy is a critical issue and the policy impacts on the ability of staff to undertake their job within a reasonable framework. There is a cumulative effect of policies, including the Sustainable Travel Policy, which Senate members would like an opportunity to discuss at Senate. It was noted by Legal Services that the legal advice provided did not state that any particular matters were unable to be discussed at Senate.

The Convener noted that an earlier version of this paper focussed on the author's opinions about legal matters which were contrary to the legal advice received, and that the decision not to circulate the paper was based on legal advice alleging that the paper fundamentally misrepresented the law and may materially misdirect Senate as to legal matters, rather than a desire to suppress criticism nor prevent discussion on particular topics as suggested.

The University Secretary claimed that the language within the paper could be damaging if received out of context and without accompanying advice from the University's Legal Services team.

The Convener would consider receiving the paper at a future meeting of Senate. Any future inclusion of the paper on a future Senate agenda would be accompanied by a paper prepared by Legal Services given ongoing concerns about the accuracy of the author's statements on legal issues.

Item 6: Supporting a Negotiated Resolution to Industrial Action as an Academic Priority - S 22/23 4D

The paper asks Senate to consider the current industrial action, a continuation of sector-wide industrial disputes of many years running, as bearing fundamentally on the academic mission of the university.

The following comments were made on this motion:

- The use of the word 'disservice' is not reflective of the efforts by staff in engaging with and attempting to resolve the dispute.
- From a student perspective, continuing to rely on mitigations rather than directly resolving the dispute was indeed a disservice.

Item 8: Senate Standing Committee Membership – outstanding membership items - S 22/23 4F

Senate first expressed its support for the motion at the 11 August meeting, and affirmed it again by majority vote at the 12 October meeting, during which Senate already heard many of the objections repeated here. There has been adequate time and latitude for Conveners to consider and make progress on the actions approved by Senate and as outlined in the motion, and failure to do so raises concerns about the legitimacy of committees' delegated decision-making.

"As Senate was no longer quorate, the Convener invited Senate to reach a decision on the paper. The item was deemed contentious and no action agreed."

Senate agreed to consider the amendments received electronically subsequent to the meeting. The formal approval of the 29 March minute would be deferred until the next Ordinary meeting.

	<p>The Report of E-Senate held from 26 April – 10 May 2023 was not considered and would be carried forward to the next Ordinary meeting.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Matters Arising - Verbal update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Elections and Amendment to Senate Election Regulations [Minutes of 29 March 2023 meeting of Senate, Matters Arising] <p>The Convener noted that consideration of this item would be covered under Item 19: Senate and Senate Standing Committee Election Results 2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Standing Committees membership – outstanding issues [Minutes of 29 March 2023 meeting of Senate, Item 8] <p>The Convener noted that consideration of this item would be covered under Item 15: Senate Standing Committee Membership – recommendations</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Supporting a Negotiated Resolution to Industrial Action as an Academic Priority - S 22/23 5B To approve</p> <p>This item was received at the reconvened meeting held on 29 March. However as Senate was not quorate and some items were deemed contentious, the paper is returned to Senate for consideration.</p> <p>Professor Diana Paton introduced the paper which was presented to Senate for approval. The paper outlines a number of steps to support a negotiated resolution in the best interest of the academic mission. This is the result of the long term degradation of pay and conditions within the higher education sector and that the current industrial action, including the marking and assessment boycott, can only be resolved with a long term pay and conditions solution.</p> <p>Professor Paton outlined that Senate approved motions 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6.2 and 2.6.3 at the 29 March meeting. The previous approval of motion 2.3 asks that the University Executive concentrate efforts on promoting a negotiated national resolution. An update on this progress of this action was requested.</p> <p>Professor Paton outlined that decisions on variations to regulations resulting from Industrial Action are too important to be considered solely by APRC, and these should be considered by full Senate. Should Motion 2.4 be carried, this could require additional emergency meetings of Senate.</p> <p>The Convener of Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC), Dr Paul Norris, provided an overview of the temporary variations approved by APRC. The decisions taken by APRC are in line with the authority as given in Regulations 70 and 71 of the Taught Assessment Regulations. The timing of APRC's decision was the point at which decisions were required due to disruption to assessments that were taking place, including oral assessments, and in time for Boards of Examiners to have adequate time to prepare ahead of Boards being held in June. It is likely that further meetings to consider temporary variations will be necessary over the coming months. Following feedback from APRC members, the Convener agreed that the Committee would discuss the handling of decisions relating to industrial action at the next meeting of APRC.</p> <p>Senate members raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EUSA VP Education strongly conveyed their concern regarding the impact of Motion 2.4 on students. The variations approved by APRC were noted as being insufficient to fully mitigate against the impact of industrial action, which has had a significant impact in 2022/23 and throughout their studies. They reflected on the solidarity of students with the UCU fight, however noted the approval of Motion 2.4 would have a significant and detrimental impact on students and erode staff/student relations. • A query was made on the ability of Senate to resolve an industrial action dispute and to whether Senate was an appropriate forum to discuss this. The Convener stated that though some motions are outside the remit of Senate and some actions are not deliverable, Senate can express its view on the actions requested. It was stated in response that Senate approved uncontentious motions contained within the paper at its 29 March meeting,

establishing that industrial action and the university's response are matters of Senate interest.

- A concern was raised regarding the maintenance of academic standards in approving temporary variations. Members noted concern among non-Senatorial colleagues that the temporary variations do not uphold academic standards nor meet the requirements for external accrediting bodies. The Deputy Vice-Principal, Students (Engagement) noted that the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) has confirmed that it is satisfied with the variations approved and is content that the University is maintaining academic standards. Boards of Examiners retain responsibility for reaching decisions under the temporary variations and in line with any external accreditation requirements.
- Boards of Examiners will be under pressure to utilise the temporary variations and concern was noted regarding the impact on appeals. The guidance produced to accompany the temporary variations provides Boards with explanation on the information required where they do not apply the temporary variations.
- The impact of industrial action on lost learning was raised. There is concern among colleagues that missed education cannot be appropriately mitigated and this will have an impact on students in later years.
- The impact of industrial action has been ongoing for a number of years and the University has a duty to mitigate against impact to students on a staffing matter. The mitigations approved by APRC are taken to be robust, proportionate and appropriate to supporting students through a period of disruption. It is necessary for APRC to be able to take agile and quick decision making and the prospect of emergency meetings of Senate was flagged as a concern.
- The financial implications for specific cohorts were raised. There may be a disproportionate impact on international students who are unable to graduate and who must return to Edinburgh to undertake further study.
- The paper was originally presented to Senate on 8 February. The placement of this item on previous meeting agendas and chairing of meetings were noted as a barrier to having this item considered sooner. The Convener noted that his role is to allow Senate members to have their views heard.
- A member who serves as an elected member on APRC, reflected on their experience of decision making at APRC. The member explained that final wordings were not formally approved at the recent meeting considering exceptions, and that there were unresolved questions about the proposed mitigations. The Convener of APRC noted the feedback raised and agreed that he would discuss the handling of decisions at the next meeting of APRC. It was suggested by a non-APRC member that the APRC Convener may have erred in assuming the mitigations were completely agreed when not all members of the Committee felt that way.
- A question was raised on how the Academic Contingency Group (ACG) fits into the University governance structure, specifically querying the group's membership and lack of transparency. The Convener of APRC confirmed that this Group is comprised of individuals in key roles across the University and is a practical way of achieving discussion on key issues affecting multiple areas.
- A concern was raised regarding the tone of contributions from some members and the disparaging comments made regarding the motivations of individual colleagues, without identifying what comments were thought to be disparaging or of concerning tone.

Following discussion, Senate moved to vote on the remaining motions contained within the paper

Motion 2.2b was deemed uncontentious and Senate agreed to adopt the motion as presented in the paper.

An amendment to Motion 2.4 was moved and seconded. It was proposed that the motion be revised to:

2.4.1: As any academic policy changes or exceptions necessarily trade off with the primary goal of promoting a negotiated resolution, Senate expects strike-related concessions to be presented to Senate as a whole for approval, and this supersedes the delegation of authority to Senate standing committees where applicable. As with other matters approved by the whole Senate, it is

anticipated that the relevant committee (typically APRC) would develop and approve recommendations; the Exception Committee retains its powers to approve exceptional urgent cases that cannot await full Senate consideration.

2.4.2: Senate notes that APRC considered a suite of variations to the Taught Assessment Regulations at its 2 May meeting (APRC 22/23 8B). These have not been approved by Senate and are therefore not in force until approved by a vote of full Senate.

The Convener received legal advice, which he chooses to accept, on the legality of Motion 2.4.2. The advice states that motion 2.4.2 as presented is not lawful. Senate cannot retrospectively withdraw the decisions taken by APRC which are in line with the delegated authority as it currently stands. Any decision to withdraw the delegation of authority would apply prospectively. Therefore, this motion would not be presented to Senate for a decision.

A member noted in response that the assertion that 2.4.2 is not lawful reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the motion, as the motion is not intended to be a retrospective action. The practice of suppressing motions on the basis of secret legal advice was also questioned.

Senate undertook a vote on Motion 2.4 as presented in the paper. 62% of members did not support adopting the motion as presented in the paper.

Ahead of a vote on Motion 2.5, the Director HR Partnering: Professional Services provided an update on the grade scale review which will consider the pay across all grade points. The actions contained within the motion pre-empt the outcome of the review and it is not possible to commit to what specific outcomes may arise from the review at this stage.

It agreed by a majority vote of 67% to adopt Motion 2.5 as presented in the paper.

Ahead of a vote on Motion 2.6.1, the Principal claimed that the action requested in the motion is not deliverable by individual employers and he cannot publicly commit to this, however Senate can express its view. The University is part of national pay bargaining at the request of the trade unions.

It agreed by a majority vote of 64% to adopt Motion 2.6.1 as presented in the paper

Ahead of a vote on Motion 2.6.4, the Principal noted that the restoration of pension benefits is a matter for the pension trustees and he cannot publically commit to this. However, Senate can convey its opinion and it is at the discretion of the trustee to reach these decisions.

It agreed by a majority vote of 71% to adopt Motion 2.6.4 as presented in the paper

6. Conferment of degrees for undergraduate Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (MVM) students - S 22/23 5C CLOSED

For approval

This closed item was presented to Senate for approval. The paper set out the requirement for Senate to confer degrees on a group of students out with the normal Senate Graduation Meetings.

Members were invited to comment on the paper and no comments were received.

Senate approved the paper as presented.

7. Honorary Degrees - S 22/23 5D CLOSED

For approval

The Deputy Secretary, Students introduced this closed item which was presented to Senate for approval. The paper lists the nominations for award of Honorary Degrees and Fellowships in the next academic year.

	<p>Members were invited to comment on the paper. The presenter was thanked for effectively implementing the changes to documentation of honorary degree candidates for Senate discussed in a previous meeting.</p> <p>Senate approved the paper as presented.</p>
8.	<p>Court Resolution – Personal Chairs - S 22/23 5E To comment</p> <p>This item was presented to Senate for consultation in accordance with the procedures for the creation of Resolutions as set out in the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966.</p> <p>Members were invited to comment on the paper and no comments were received.</p>
9.	<p>Proposal to extend Scotland’s Rural College’s (SRUC) Accredited Institution status to Postgraduate Research Provision - S 22/23 5F For approval</p> <p>The Deputy Vice-Principal, Students (Engagement) introduced this item which was presented to Senate for approval. The paper contains a proposal to build on the long-standing relationship with SRUC by extending the current Accredited Institution status of Scotland’s Rural College’s (SRUC) from taught degrees to include the provision of University of Edinburgh validated postgraduate research provision. There are already a number of joint PhD’s with SRUC and this proposal would delegate awarding responsibility and offer accredited status to SRUC and these programmes.</p> <p>Senate members made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A query was raised regarding the review processes and the suitability of holding an interim review at the mid-way point to ensure procedures continue to align with those of the University. In response it was noted that there is a five year review cycle and that SRUC is subject to the same QA arrangements as the University which includes an annual review. • A query was raised on whether there is desire from SRUC to extend to wider subject areas. In response it was noted that SRUC have a defined scope and remit and have not indicated a desire to extend beyond the defined subject areas. SRUC has put forward the request and the University has not sought to define or dictate what provision is considered. <p>Senate approved the paper as presented.</p>
10.	<p>Legal advice in relation to the paper: "Context of Some Recent Member Contributed Papers" - S 22/23 5G To note</p> <p>The Convener outlined that the paper is presented to Senate to note and that he accepts the paper and the legal advice provided within in.</p> <p>A concern was raised with regard to paragraph 7 and the assertion of an action that Senate would not be able to take legal advice in the future.</p> <p>Senate noted the paper. Senate did not agree to the action in paragraph 7 that Senate <i>take no further action in response to the Revised Paper as it relates to the legal advice previously provided.</i></p>
11.	<p>Context of Some Recent Member Contributed Papers - S 22/23 5H To note</p> <p>This item was introduced by Dr Michael Barany. The paper is presented to Senate to note.</p> <p>In the interest of time, one of the authors of the Context paper (5H) shared in the meeting chat a point by point list of twenty concerns about the claims and reasoning in paper 5G regarding the Context paper, and expressed the hope that management would rather spend the effort and money involved in cooperating with Senate members towards the university’s goals.</p> <p>The written concerns may be obtained upon request to the Senate Clerk.</p>

The Convener noted that in his role it is appropriate to take advice from suitably qualified experts and he is confident with the advice received.

The Provost also raised her concern regarding the tone of debate and discussion and that Senate and its members should remain mindful that it is not appropriate to call into question the competency of any University's staff and external advisors.

Senate noted the paper.

12. Senate Oversight of Estates Provision for Academic Offices - S 22/23 51

For approval

This item was introduced by Dr Tamara Trodd. The paper is presented to Senate at the request of non-Senatorial academic staff and asks Senate to recognise that space provision has significant implications for the conduct of academic work and that future estate development plans may impact on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion within the academic community.

The Provost noted that academic view and ownership of estates planning is embedded at all levels and that project boards have both academic and student representation. There is a high degree of locality in estates planning to reflect the unique needs for each discipline and compromise is required to achieve a high quality estate which delivers on the University's academic mission.

The University's estate is of a significant size and space should be used effectively and reflect the University's commitment to sustainability, evolving patterns of work, the underutilisation of space and the increased demand for particular types of spaces, for example, study space.

The University estate is overseen by Court with decisions undertaken via the appropriate governance pathways and with the academic mission at the centre of decisions taken.

Senate members raised the following points:

- Members expressed support for the opportunity to discuss the provision of space, which is an important and complicated issue and reflects the desire of staff to work on campus. The management of existing spaces and new building projects is a complex and pressing issue across the University. Though it may not be possible to achieve all the aims outlined in the paper, this presents an opportunity to consider strengthening the existing practices for consultation with academic staff.
- The Head of the Edinburgh College of Art (ECA) outlined his experience of the ECA building project as an example of how building projects operate within local contexts. The ECA project is seeking to enhance access to space and provide office space, suitable music and study spaces and meet specialist space needs. It is focussed on the academic mission and the need to enhance space needs with discussions still ongoing. Colleagues have been consulted and provided a strong view of their needs. Work is ongoing to balance these needs with competing demands.
- There is a need to balance difficult and competing priorities including financial and practical constraints however the academic mission remains forefront across these tensions. The space required will be highly subjective to the discipline and nature of work being undertaken at any one time. The diversity of those requirements should be considered at the design stage.
- There is a need for private and quiet space for academic staff to hold confidential conversations with students and undertake research. Space should reflect the needs of academic staff and the views of staff and research should be taken account of in reaching decisions on what space is required for academic staff to effectively undertake their role. It may be useful to undertake benchmarking on a discipline level against other institutions, including Russell Group universities, to establish how peers and competitors manage the provision of space.
- The suitability and consideration of space for staff in lower paid roles such as postdoctoral research staff was highlighted as a concern. These staff require appropriate space to work and are often located in open plan offices and it may not be feasible for these staff to work from home.
- The University's commitment to climate and sustainability should remain a key consideration in any estates projects undertaken.

	<p>Following discussion and in the interests of time, the Convener asked the presenter if a single vote on all motions could be taken. However, the paper author requested an individual vote on each motion. Senate approved the paper on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It agreed by a majority vote of 89% to adopt the following amendment to Motion 5.1: <p>5.1 That Senate requests <i>the relevant bodies including Court and the University Estates Committee</i> to take account of its views on the provision of space where it affects academic work, for instance by altering availability and occupancy of offices for core academic tasks including research, supervision and teaching preparation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It agreed by a majority vote of 90% to adopt the following amendment to Motion 5.2: <p>5.2 That Senate requests <i>the relevant bodies including Court and the University Estates Committee</i> ensure that current and future Estates development plans make provision for appropriate spaces for academic staff to conduct research and their other contracted work (e.g. teaching, supervision, administration, collaboration with external partners), based on consultation and agreement with academic staff in the relevant areas, and that efficiency and utilisation rates should not be prioritised over the ability of staff effectively to conduct research and related academic work on campus.</p> <p>The Convener invited Senate to consider the remaining motions. These were deemed non-contentious and voting undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It agreed by a majority vote of 80% to adopt Motion 5.3 as presented in the paper It agreed by a majority vote of 83% to adopt Motion 5.4 as presented in the paper <p>Senate was then observed to be no longer quorate, and as the meeting had already overrun the scheduled time, the meeting of Senate was adjourned. The President of Senate indicated that any outstanding business would be carried forward to the next meeting of Senate.</p>
13.	<p>Annual Report of the Senate Standing Committees - S 22/23 5J For formal noting and approval</p> <p>Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.</p>
14.	<p>Senate Exception Committee Terms of Reference and Membership 2022-23 - S 22/23 5K For approval</p> <p>Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.</p>
15.	<p>Senate Standing Committee Membership – recommendations - S 22/23 5L For approval</p> <p>Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.</p>
16.	<p>Senate Standing Committees: Membership - S 22/23 5M For formal noting and approval</p> <p>Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.</p>
17.	<p>Review of Timetabling Processes – Progress Update - S 22/23 5N To note</p> <p>Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.</p>

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL OR NOTING

18.	Report from the Central Academic Promotions Committee - S 22/23 5O For information Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.
19.	Senate and Senate Standing Committee Election Results 2023 - S 22/23 5P To note Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.
20.	Annual Review of Effectiveness of Senate - S 22/23 5Q For noting Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.
21.	Report from the Senate Exception Committee - S 22/23 5R CLOSED For noting Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.
22.	Conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus - S 22/23 5S For approval Senate did not reach this item before adjourning the meeting.