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Dr M Grant, Mr B Green, Professor S Hart, Dr M Heimann, Dr M Heslop, Professor I
Hunter, Professor K Ibeh, Professor B Kalin, Professor A Kendrick, Professor W Kerr,
Professor R Land, Professor D Littlejohn, Professor S MacGregor, Professor A
McGrew, Dr J A McInnes, Dr A McLaren, Professor A Marshall, Professor S Marshall,
Professor R Martin, Professor K Miller, Dr N NicDaied, Professor D Nickson, Dr K
O’Gorman, Professor M Pacione, Professor S Padgett, Dr H Pinto, Professor S Porta,
Dr S Rasmussen, Dr P Riches, Dr R Rogerson, Dr C Schaschke, Professor P
Skabara, Dr S Tagg, Dr D Willison, Professor S Wilson, Dr L Woolfson, Professor P
Winn, Mrs L Young

Attending: Mr H Hall, Professor C Grant, Mr G Mann, Dr D McGhee, Dr P Sayer, Mr P Whyte,
Mr G Allan, Dr V O’Halloran, Mr Tom Collins, Ms S Hansen, Ms J Meredith

Apologies: Dr A Agapiou, Dr P Davies, Mrs S Ellis, Professor A Ferguson, Dr V Ferro, Professor
D Gani, Dr D Harle, Dr N Hunt, Dr P McKenna, Dr D MacKenzie, Professor K Swales,
Dr R Tate, Dr K Thompson, Professor L Walls, Mr D Coyle

11418 Minutes of the meeting of 15th September 2010

Senate approved the Minutes of the meeting of 15th September 2010.

11419 Convenor's Action

Senate noted and endorsed the actions taken by the Principal on its behalf as detailed in
Paper 3.1.

11420 Principal’s Report and Correspondence

The Principal reminded members that the Scottish Government was announcing its budget
plans for the coming year that afternoon which, it was anticipated, would result in a reduction
in funding available to the Higher Education sector. He emphasized the role the University
had played in the discussions that Universities’ Scotland had had with the Scottish
Government in the run up to this announcement.

Towards the end of the meeting, the Principal informed Senate of the key content of the
Budget that had just been announced. It was noted that this was a draft budget which had
still to go through the full Parliamentary process. The Funding Council intended to provide
institutions with an indication of their allocation for the next financial year by the end of
December.

The Principal also updated Senate on the following:

- HASS and Business School infrastructure developments were going ahead
• Scottish Enterprise had confirmed its commitment to the Technology Innovation Centre
• A research centre, the Power Network Demonstration Centre, was being developed in Cumbernauld.
• EXPO 2010 had gone very well and had been well attended and received. The Principal thanked all those involved in its organisation.
• The University Charter and Statutes had been approved by the Privy Council and the University would now be able to implement the planned changes such as the extension of Senate membership and appointment of a Vice Principal. Discussions would also take place with the University and Colleges Union on revising Statute 23 which was now an ordinance. The Principal thanked all those involved, in securing this approval, for their hard work.
• The University Chancellor, The Rt Hon the Lord Hope of Craighead, had intimated his intention to stand down in 2012. Court Membership Group would now take forward the process of finding a successor and Senate would be consulted as appropriate.

11421 Draft University Strategic Plan 2011-2015

The Deputy Principal (Strategy) reminded members of the extensive consultation that had taken place in developing the Strategic Plan. It was hoped that it would guide the University in consolidating the changes that had already taken place and making the further changes that were necessary. He noted the key ambitions of becoming a Leading International Technological University, remaining a Place of Useful Learning, building One Strathclyde and promoting the distinctiveness of the University, all of which were articulated in the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan as such would not be produced in full in hard copy. Rather it would be available on the University web site and only Section 1 would be produced in a printed format.

Senate recommended to Court that the Strategic Plan 2011-2015 be approved.

11422 Strathclyde Business School: Agreement with SKIL

The Dean of the Business School described to members the proposed collaboration with SKIL to deliver courses in India. SKIL was one of the leading infrastructure developers in India and was expanding its activities to include social infrastructure, primarily education and health. Extensive due diligence checks had been undertaken involving significant external input including professional advice and comment from Ernst and Young.

SKIL would provide the physical infrastructure, HR, IT and library services. The Business School would be responsible for the courses and awards, the reputation and some teaching. Strathclyde approved staff would also be employed to teach in India. Three programmes were initially planned: Master in Management, Bachelor of Business Studies and MBA with the first starting in 2011 and the last 2013. It was also hoped that some research and knowledge exchange activities could be developed, linked with the Faculty of Engineering.

Senate endorsed this initiative and the Principal congratulated the Business School on its entrepreneurship.

1 Master in Management (India)

As part of the above collaboration, the Business School wished to bring forward the Master in Management award for approval, with delivery commencing in 2011. Most of the modules were drawn from existing classes within the Business School.
Senate **recommended** to Court that Ordinance 3.1 be amended to include the Degree Title "Master in Management".

Senate **approved** the course of Master in Management, for delivery from session 2011/12, subject to Court approval of the change in Ordinance and scrutiny of the regulations by Ordinances and Regulations Committee.

### 11423 Report from the Executive Team

1. **Reference 180: Education Strategy Action Plan**

   Associate Deputy Principal Belton reminded members of the Education Strategy and explained that this Action Plan was intended to show how the Strategy would be implemented. It was recognised that there were many existing examples of good practice across the University and it was planned to promote these and build on them. There would also be reviews of structures and procedures to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure was in place to support delivery of the Education Strategy. Members noted that there would be various opportunities to respond to and engage with this Action Plan which would be essential to deliver the objectives.

   A Member of Senate commented that there was a need to ensure that any developments linked with technology were in line with the IT strategy.

2. **Reference 182: National Student Survey (NSS)**

   Associate Deputy Principal Grant reminded members that the University’s performance in the NSS had been mixed but overall had been static. There was a wide range of results for different Departments from excellent through to poor and that lessons needed to be learned on how to improve. To this end discussions had been held with the Heads of Department whose areas had done well to collect good practice. Meetings had also been held or were planned with the following groups: Leadership Group, Administrative and Secretarial staff, Students, Course Leaders/Directors. This final meeting would focus on assessment and feedback, an area in which the University had not scored well. The meetings so far had been positive.

   Members made the suggestion of seeking feedback from students, on a more regular basis, consistently across the University and also raised the possibility of piloting the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE was used extensively worldwide, focused on student engagement and identified high impact activities.

   Senate noted the progress being made.

### 11424 National Centre for Prosthetics and Orthotics (NCPO)

The Principal reminded Senate that restructuring and staffing issues were a Court matter and that Court had approved the changes to the structure of the NCPO which were being made in order to continue the Centre’s provision of high quality education and training. He informed Senate of his disappointment that the University and Colleges Union had circulated a briefing note on this subject earlier that day without giving any prior warning to him as Principal and Convener of Senate.

The Dean of Engineering then outlined the background to the proposed changes to the Centre. He explained that the Centre was funded by the Scottish Government Heath Department (SGHD) to provide education. This arrangement had worked well for a number of years but SGHD had recently proposed a dramatic reduction in funding, to move to a unit of teaching resource model and to channel funding through SFC. The result of these proposals would have left the Centre unviable. The Faculty and University entered into
lengthy negotiations with the SGHD which had resulted in indicative funding for the Centre over the next four years which would cover the cost of the stipulated courses, provide resources needed to restructure and offer some resource to develop research into rehabilitation and assistive technologies through links with other areas of the University.

These proposals fulfilled the SGHD’s contract as covered in the original Financial Memorandum. However, the focus was on teaching and it was therefore necessary to move staff onto teaching only contracts as time for research activity could not be built into their workloads. It was intended to ensure research informed teaching through links with other Departments in the University working in relevant areas.

A discussion followed where the following concerns were raised:

- Court approval prior to the item coming to Senate which gave Senators limited opportunity to comment on academic issues
- Would staff have a teaching commitment of 70%? Had SGHD insisted on it?
- Teaching Only sounds as if staff are not allowed to do anything but teach while an Academic contract would appear to be wider.
- How would the Funding Council view the change of contracts and loss of focus on research given that the Higher Education premium was for research informed teaching?
- Students on the undergraduate course were taught entirely in the Centre so it was not clear how they would receive research informed teaching
- There were no apparent cost savings in changing contracts
- Research effort might be lost, particularly among staff who had been working on raising their profile in this area and who might have been eligible for REF submission
- The proposal to have all staff on teaching only contracts seemed contrary to the research-teaching linkages the University was trying to build and could set a precedent.
- Would there be opportunity in the planned review to revisit the potential for disconnect between teaching and research? Would staff have any direct involvement in research? The opportunity for individuals to integrate research and teaching in their own daily work was different from research informing teaching across bigger groups within Faculties or across the institution.
- Would staff have the opportunity to transfer back to an Academic Contract?
- Would staff on Teaching Only contracts be able to supervise PhD students or be Principal Investigator in research projects?
- How would these changes fit within the wider University strategy and how would the Centre integrate?

The Principal assured Members that the Senate representatives on Court had taken the opportunity to represent Senate on these issues at Court. He agreed, with the Member who had raised this concern, to continue this discussion out of committee.

The Dean explained that the Head of Department would have to deploy staff as required so the 70% teaching figure was not set. The Teaching Only contracts were designed to meet a business need and the contractual obligations the Centre now had. They had been developed through discussions with SGHD. It was also considered unfair to ask staff who may spend 95% of their time teaching to go through an academic review. The Teaching Only contracts already existed in the University, were valued and were the most appropriate in this case.

The Vice Principal noted while staff would spend the majority of their time teaching there would also be a requirement for personal development and other activities so not all of the 30% would be available for research activity. The Dean explained that there was a
contractual obligation to provide research informed teaching, and linkages with other University Departments would be used to ensure research awareness. Evaluation of the effectiveness of this arrangement would be part of the review that was planned for the following year.

The Principal added that the Funding Council were aware of the agreement, recognised the peculiarities and there would be no extrapolation issues.

The Director of Human Resources confirmed that there was no direct cost saving in changing contracts as pay would be protected but that there was an indirect cost in time when research activity was built in to workloads. The Vice Principal reassured Senate that these changes would not set a precedent as they were a specific response to a specific set of circumstances and the University had no plans to implement similar changes elsewhere in the institution. The Principal confirmed that the concept of the Strathclyde Academic was still ongoing.

The Dean of the Business School confirmed that where staff in Hospitality and Tourism had been moved to Teaching Only contracts research links were maintained with the rest of the Faculty, teaching only staff were not precluded from doing research and some had progressed further than under the previous system. It was felt that the new structure in this area had increased agility.

The former Dean of Engineering noted that the negotiations on continued funding had been ongoing for some time and congratulated his successor on securing funding from the Government and NHS in a tough external environment. He emphasised the need to focus on teaching as that was what the focus of the core funding. He also noted that this was a special case and would not set a precedent for contracts across the University.

The Vice Principal confirmed that the opportunity to move across contracts in both directions, as appropriate to the individual, was always available to staff.

The Dean confirmed that NCPO staff would be able to supervise research students provided they were appropriately trained. They could also be Principal Investigators but that this would be dependent on any stipulations made by the Funder.

The Dean noted that the Centre’s history of isolation could not continue and that, as part of the Health Research Agenda, the Centre would have the opportunity to secure resources for wider engagement. The protection of the Centre ensured the continuation of its current activity and brought opportunities for development.

The Head of Department noted that this had been a demoralising time for her staff and that the University had been left to propose a solution.

The Principal assured Senate that a review would take place within the next 12 months. The findings of this would be brought back to Senate for comment on academic matters. He congratulated the Dean on getting to this stage, noting that there had been no precedent for him to draw on. The Principal expressed his hope that all involved could move forward more positively now.

11425 Recommendations for Approval nem con

.1 2011-12 Tuition fees

Senate approved the proposed levels of non standard fees for 2011-12 as detailed in paper 5.1.

.2 Collaborative Arrangements
.1 Proposal to collaborate with Northeast Normal University, China, Mathematics degrees

Senate approved the collaborative agreement between the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and the NENU School of Mathematics and Statistics detailed in Annex B1 of B04.

.2 International Medical University, Kuala Lumpur, MPharm

Senate approved the collaborative agreement between SIPBS and the International Medical University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia underpinning the programme leading to the MPharm in Pharmacy (2+2) detailed in Annex B2 of BP04.

.3 International Medical University, Kuala Lumpur, BSc (Hons) Forensic Biology and BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science

Senate approved the collaborative agreement between SIPBS and the International Medical University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia for articulation onto the BSc (Hons) Forensic Biology and BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science degrees detailed in Annex B3 of BP04.

.4 Ocean University of China BEng and MSc Degrees in NAME

Senate approved the collaborative agreement between NAME and Ocean University of China for articulation onto BEng and MSc degrees provided by NAME, staff exchange and joint PhD supervision, as detailed in Appendix 1 of BP05, subject to scrutiny by Ordinances and Regulations Committee.

.3 Introduction of Courses and Classes

.1 MSc in International Human Resources Management

Senate approved the MSc in International Human Resources Management to be introduced with effect from session 2011/12, subject to the scrutiny of regulations by Ordinances and Regulations Committee.

.2 Introduction of New Postgraduate Classes

Senate approved the introduction of new classes to the MSc Entrepreneurship, Postgraduate Certificate in Advanced Management Learning and MSc Human Resource Management as detailed in Section A.4 of BP06.

.3 Introduction of New Undergraduate Classes

Senate approved the introduction of new classes to the degrees with the principal subjects of Marketing, Accounting and Finance and Economics as detailed in Section A.5 of BP06.

.4 Withdrawal of Courses

.1 MSc in Science, Technology and Sustainability (Civil Eng)

Senate approved the withdrawal of the MSc in Science, Technology and Sustainability, currently offered by the Department of Civil Engineering, from September 2011 as set out in Appendix 3 of BP05.
.5 New Prizes

.1 The Professor DC Sherrington FRS Undergraduate Prize

Senate approved the terms of the Professor DC Sherrington FRS Undergraduate Prize with immediate effect. BP04

.2 The Professor DC Sherrington FRS Postgraduate Prize

Senate approved the terms of the Professor DC Sherrington FRS Postgraduate Prize with immediate effect. BP04

.6 Withdrawal of Prizes

.1 Royal Pharmaceutical Branch Prize

Senate approved removal of the Royal Pharmaceutical Branch Prize from the University Calendar. BP04

.2 RS Undergraduate Project Prize (EEE)

Senate approved removal of the RS Undergraduate Project Prize from the University Calendar. BP05

.7 General Boards of Examiners: Waiver of Progress Regulations

Senate approved the waiver of progress regulations as detailed in Annex B4 of BP04.

11426 Items for Information

Senate noted the following items of information and noted also that items 4, 6 and 7 were reserved under the Freedom of Information Act as being commercially sensitive:

.1 Outcome of Governance Review - Statutory Advisory Committee on Safety & Occupational Health Paper 6.1
.2 ELIR Action Plan Paper 6.2
.3 Reference 160-164: Strategy Meeting, 1, BP02
.4 Reference 168: Foundation Programme, 2, BP02
.5 Reference 186.2: Internationalisation, 4, BP02
.6 Financial Position of the University, CM 4460, BP03
.7 Technology Innovation Centre (TIC), CM 4461, BP03
.8 Review of Governance, CM 4467, BP03
.9 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, CM 4468, BP03
.10 Corporate Risk Register, CM 4470, BP03
.11 Schedule of Delegated Authority, CM 4471, BP03
.12 Appointment of Associate Deans
   .1 Associate Dean (Undergraduate), A3, BP05
   .2 Associate Deans (International)(2x0.2FTE), C, BP06
.13 Research Audit, C, BP06
.14 Building Clusters, C, BP06
.15 REF, C, BP06
.16 Knowledge Exchange, C, BP06
.17 PGR, C, BP06
.18 Neptune, C, BP06
.19 Spring School, C, BP06
Senate Business Committee had noted the robustness of the work undertaken by the QMC in monitoring the quality of the learning and teaching provision within the University. The Committee commended the thoroughness of the QMC’s work and the quality of the paperwork produced.

Minutes of the meeting of Senate Appeals Committee held on 9th September 2010, BP12

Minutes of the meetings of Senate Discipline Committee 142 – 144 held on 14th September and 5th October 2010, BP14