

University of Glasgow

University Court – Wednesday 12 October 2016

Communications to Court from the meeting of Senate held on 06 October 2016

Dr Jack Aitken, Director, Senate Office

(All matters are for noting)

1. Update on Counselling & Psychological Services

At its meeting on 2 June 2016, the Council of Senate had noted with concern the waiting times experienced by some students seeking support from the Counselling and Psychological Service (CaPS). The Head of the Service, Dr Phil Quinn, and the Director of Student Services, Mrs Christine Lowther, provided an update on the position for the 8 October meeting, highlighting the rise in demand for the service the actions being taken to address these.

CaPS had seen a 22% increase in referrals to the service during the last academic year. This approximately translated to an additional 400 students requiring mental health support compared to the previous year. This increase was observed nationally throughout the sector. In the first semester alone there were almost 960 referrals, with the remaining increase continuing throughout semester 2 and over the recent summer period. CaPS would have assisted over 2000 student referrals during last year. However, these numbers did not include emergency ad hoc cases or consultations.

CaPS had made a number of changes and improvements to try and address the length of time that students are waiting for support. While significant improvements had been made, the scale of the challenge around student mental health across the sector could not be underestimated and there was expectation that demands on services would continue to increase. Student demand and waiting lists were closely monitored and would continue to be over the coming months to assess the impact of the changes made and, as part of planning and budget discussions, looking at the potential need for additional resources for CaPS.

It was noted that demand was continuing to rise for the service, with a 22% increase on demand this semester, as compared with the same period last year. Managing the increased demand continued to be challenging. While there was a perception that there may be many more students with mental health issues at the University of Glasgow, the level was lower than the national average, but was nonetheless an issue for the University of Glasgow.

The Principal noted that there was an awareness of dissatisfaction amongst students having to wait for the service due to the fact that demand continued to outweigh resource. This would be considered in the next budget round.

2. Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 Working Group update

A report was provided to the Council of Senate from the HE Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 Working Group concerning the implementation of the Act at the University of Glasgow in respect of its implications for the University Senate. The report noted options considered by the Working Group and the rationales for twenty recommendations.

Council of Senate was asked to consider the report and provide comment on its recommendations. The Working Group would then consider the Council's comments at a meeting later in the autumn, with a view to submitting final recommendations to the Council meeting on 8 December 2016. Legal advice would also be obtained on the Working Group's recommendations prior to the 8 December meeting of the Council of Senate.

Views were particularly sought in respect of the election and appointment of the Clerk of Senate and the gender balance of Senate Assessors on Court.

The Clerk of Senate was presently elected by and from the members of Senate. That Working Group had considered the constituency from which the Clerk of Senate would be selected in future, and whether that should be the full membership of the new Senate, the elected members of Senate only, or whether it should be a requirement that the person elected was necessarily appointed from the membership of Senate as opposed to any suitably qualified member of academic staff. If the constituency was the academic body as a whole, the person appointed could be co-opted onto new Senate if they were not already a member. Consideration was also given to the electorate – whether it should be the full membership of the new Senate or confined to elected Senate members. A decision was also required regarding whether an appointment of the Clerk from the elected membership of Senate would create a vacancy for a further elected member.

If the Clerk of Senate were to be appointed from the new Senate, which would be consistent with current arrangements, that would provide a significantly smaller field, and it may be difficult to find willing and able candidates. As a means of future proofing, the Working Group recommended that the Clerk of Senate be elected and appointed from among the academic staff community, even if the potential candidate was not already a member of the new Senate. Council of Senate shared the concern that the new Senate would only provide a small field from which to appoint a Clerk of Senate; however, the Council was also keen that future Clerk of Senate appointments would have demonstrated commitment to academic governance. The Principal noted that he would expect the Finding Committee that would be established to identify candidates for nomination to the post would wish to see evidence of such commitment. The suggestion was made that the Clerk of Senate could be appointed from existing and former members of the new Senate. Although this would initially be a small field, it would grow it time. An alternative suggestion was that the criteria could state that the appointment would 'normally' be drawn from the members of the new Senate. This would indicate that this was the preferred route, but also allow some flexibility. It was agreed that the Working Group would further consider the suggestions of the Council of Senate.

There were also presently six Senate Assessors on Court. However, the composition of the University Court was also affected by the new legislation and Court was also currently considering its future composition in light of the changes. It has been agreed that the Principal would be invited to establish a Court-Senate Working Group to take forward consideration of options/possibilities regarding the number of Senate Assessors¹. While there may be a question regarding the number of Senate Assessors in future, there were other aspects of the appointment of Senate Assessors that could be addressed now.

The essential stipulation was that Senate Assessors on Court were appointed from the membership of Senate. (At present, they were elected from the constituency of the full Senate, not the Council of Senate.) In the past, it had been at times difficult to identify members of Senate to stand for election as Senate Assessors. With a significantly smaller body, it could be expected that this difficulty would increase, and that there would be a commensurately increased requirement for members to take on Senate-related responsibilities.

One means of addressing this issue would be to allow any member of academic staff (whether Research and Teaching, Teaching-only or Research-only) to stand for election as an Assessor, and, in the event that they are not already a member of the new Senate, to include provision in the composition of the new Senate for their co-option as Senate members. (There was already provision in University Ordinances for anyone appointed as an Assessor to retain membership of Senate for the duration of their appointment as an Assessor.)

With the inclusion in future of student members on the new Senate, a stipulation would be needed on restricting or otherwise nomination as a Senate Assessor to academic staff - on the basis that there were already two student members on the University Court.

Traditionally, Senate Assessors had been appointed on a territorial basis. There was, however, concern here also about the need to secure a good gender balance as well as territorial representation. Currently, there was one Senate Assessor per College and two who were not College-specific. The Working Group had considered the alternative whereby Senate Assessors on Court are not selected by College, but by gender, together with the guideline of two women and two men, and two of any gender, regardless of academic background. It had been suggested at the Council of Senate in April 2016 that combining these two considerations might be best.

The Working Group was of the view that Senate Assessors should continue to be selected by College first, to ensure that there was representation from each of the Colleges, as some issues for consideration were College specific. It was agreed that the selection process should also be mindful of the gender balance, but that this should not be prioritised above academic discipline.

¹ Provision for such groups was made several years ago – please see http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_239124_en.pdf

The Working Group had also considered the alternative whereby (as was not the case currently) the Heads of College have the opportunity to speak at Court on College-specific matters. This measure would be pursued in addition to the selection of Senate Assessors on a territorial basis.

Council of Senate supported the recommendation that any member of academic staff should be eligible to stand for election as an Assessor, and, in the event that they were not already a member of Senate, to include provision in the composition of Senate for their co-option to Senate.

Council of Senate agreed that Senate Assessors should continue to be selected to include representation from each College, although it was also the view that greater steps were required in order to ensure that gender balance was achieved, and that, if necessary nominations should be restricted, when necessary, to ensure that the gender balance was maintained.

There was discussion about whether there was a requirement to hold a meeting of the full Senate prior to the changes in relation to the Act being brought into effect. Council of Senate was reminded that it had been established as a sub-committee of Senate, and therefore had the power to make decisions on behalf of Senate; however, it was agreed that legal advice would be sought. The Council endorsed the Working Group recommendation that the Council of Senate should form the basis of the new Senate. Legal advice would also be sought on whether the Council of Senate or present Senate could decide the constitution of the new Senate.

Council of Senate supported the other recommendations made by the Working Group as set out in the report.

3. Research Beacons

Professor Miles Padgett, Vice-Principal, Research presented to Council of Senate about the introduction of Research Beacons, Broad-based themed area of research excellence that had attracted major external investment. The idea for the Beacons was to provide a focus for the development of marketing campaigns and content, raising the profile of the institution with key audiences: prospective staff & students, potential research partners, policymakers and funders, and the media. It was reported that other research intensive universities had adopted a similar approach. Six Research Beacons had been proposed by SMG, these were:

- Precision Medicine & Chronic Diseases
- One Health
- Addressing Inequalities
- Cultural & Creative Economies
- Nano & Quantum Technology
- Future Life

There was recognition that the Research Beacons needed to be dynamic and have flexibility to evolve, however, it was anticipated that they would not change too frequently and if this was the

case, it would suggest that perhaps they had not been correctly identified. There was also recognition that there were a number of areas of specific research that would not fall within one of the Beacons, as they could not capture every area of research excellence across the University. It had been identified that there was necessary compromise with regards to what areas of research were included, but that the Beacons should span Schools and Institutes and capture quality and depth. It was not the intention that the Beacons would represent the direction for investment, although this would not necessarily be disconnected. The Research Beacons would be delivered through a coordinated approach from RSIO and MaRIO. RSIO would work with the Colleges to identify three academic theme leads per Beacon and to ensure that each Beacon captured relevant research and impact activities at Glasgow.

The timescale identified was to have developed and published the new Beacon content on the University website by the end of December 2016. By the end of January 2017 a Beacons toolkit for staff would be in place and marketing campaigns would be implemented between January – December 2017.

It was reported that the Communications and Public Affairs Office would continue to source stories from across the University, the website and main University homepage would still be used to promote research excellence from across the institution and high-profile research stories would continue to be supported by MaRIO.

Council of Senate noted that the wording used in the descriptors for each of the Beacons was important both to the internal and external audiences. The Beacons needed to reflect activity and people needed to be able understand where specific areas of research fitted. It was recognised that there was a danger for those who did not identify with one of the Beacons, particularly Early Career Researchers.

There was also recognition that it was important that there was not a negative impact on student recruitment if prospective students did see their subject area as a distinctive area for the University and whether not being included in a Beacon would detract from key areas. Council of Senate was reassured that the proposal was not to replace the home page of the website with the Research Beacons and that the fact that the news reel was to be maintained research excellence from across the institution would continue to be promoted.

There was discussion about whether there should be a rolling programme of Beacons and the requirement for the correct balance to ensure inclusivity without being too general. It was noted that three of the proposed Beacons covered Health and whether this was an appropriate balance. It was anticipated that material used for the Research Beacons would include impact and outputs relevant for the REF.

There was recognition that the Beacons would need to evolve, however it was difficult to see how some would change, for example 'Addressing Inequalities' as this would potentially send a dangerous message that it was no longer a priority if it were to not be identified as a Beacon in the future.

It was agreed that the wording used to describe each of the Research Beacons would require careful consideration, to ensure that the messages worked for different audiences. An update would be provided at the next meeting of Council of Senate.

4. Education and Policy Strategy Committee: TEF update

Vice-Principal, Professor Frank Coton, provided an update on the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). Council of Senate was reminded that TEF was, formally, an English initiative by BIS/DfE and participation was voluntary, although the Westminster Government was content for HE providers elsewhere in the UK to participate, and the Scottish Government had indicated it was content for Scottish universities to participate, provided they continued to comply fully with the requirements of the Scottish Quality Enhancement Framework. The TEF would be developed and implemented by the Department for Education (DfE).

HE Providers would be assessed against their teaching quality, learning environment and student outcomes/learning gain. The assessment was by means of a combination of metrics and a submission by the HEP. The metrics to be used were: NSS (Qus on: teaching on course; assessment and feedback; and academic support); HESA (non-continuation); and DLHE – the latter potentially being succeeded by a highly-skilled jobs metric (MHRC may provide). In addition to the metrics, institutions may submit an additional narrative of no more than 15 pages only – though this would likely be weighted much less than the metrics.

The grades that would be available were:

- Bronze (Entry level)
- Silver
- Gold

While DfE had indicated that a strict bell curve would not be applied to the awarding of grades, they expected results would approximately be: 20% Bronze; 50-60% Silver; 20-30% Gold. It would be possible to achieve any / all of these outcomes based on metrics only.

- DfE expect as many as 550 HEPs would participate – the bulk English FE Colleges which offered HE level provision.
- For English participants, outcomes would be linked to fee increases.
- Assessment of higher levels of TEF would be by means of assessor groups overseen by a single panel assessment.
- DfE has published a list of HEPs – including all Scottish HEIs – that have met the baseline Bronze grade. This entry level (TEF Yr 1) is awarded to HEPs that have successfully undergone ELIR/other form of institutional review.
- The intention is to progress from institution-level TEF to subject-level TEF. The timetable for implementation remains as previously announced:

- 2016-17 (Yr2): Provider-level TEF
- 2017-18 (Yr3): Provider-level TEF and subject-level TEF piloted*.
- 2018-19 (Yr4): Subject-level TEF and likely to include PGT provision
- 'Pilot' means that the exercise is developmental only; for those involved in the pilot, the formal TEF rating for the HEP is the HEP-level score.
- However, the outcome of the 'Technical Consultation', run in the early summer, would be delayed.

Regarding the Subject-level TEF, there was little that had been decided. The definition of the units of assessment had not yet been determined. Possibilities included: alignment with REF UoAs; use of HESA JACS Codes (at what level is also undecided). It had also been suggested that HEPs might decide on subject areas for themselves. It was not clear how subject-level ratings would be aggregated to produce an overall institutional rating or whether there would be a combination of subject-level and provider-level assessment.

There were concerns regarding the metrics: 'POLAR' –v- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation SIMD. The bases of these measurements were different and had been devised to be able to capture the specific features of English and Scottish patterns of deprivation. And also regarding retention – the presumption had long been that the Scottish four-year degree impacted negatively on this, but the statistics were actually more complicated and work was being done to identify the detail on this.

Thus far, no Scottish-based academic had been appointed to assessment panel. Herriot-Watt; Robert Gordon and St Andrews Universities had indicated that they would possibly participate in TEF2 (provider-level). This followed deliberations between Scottish institutions and a recommendation that efforts be collectively focused on articulating a 'different but equivalent' approach.

Universities Scotland had established a working group to provide advice on Scotland's position on TEF, in particular subject-level TEF. The group, chaired by Professor Jeffrey, Senior Vice-Principal at the university of Edinburgh, had met once and would so again on 11 October 2016. The group had agreed Scotland should be party to the development of TEF, on the basis that further adaptation to Scottish circumstances could be negotiated and it was easier to do so with direct involvement.

There were potential risks - global marketing, reputation – to Scottish universities if they did not participate. If the Scottish sector decided to participate, it would be important to manage to hold onto the integrity of the national enhancement-led approach by somehow finding a way to accommodate TEF within the Scottish system without subverting it or incurring a significant increase in administrative burden.

5. Proposal for Organisational Change in the Learning and Teaching Centre

Council of Senate received for comment a Proposal for Organisational Change in the Learning and Teaching Centre (LTC). Dr Matthew Williamson, Director of the Centre, presented the proposal.

Council of Senate was reminded that the current Centre comprised the Academic Development Unit (ADU), the Learning Technology Unit (LTU), The Media Production Unit (MPU), the Student Learning Service (SLS) and an administrative team which supported staff across the Centre. The Learning and Teaching Centre had been in existence for c. 10 years in its current form, and the identities of the units had remained largely unchanged during that time. The Centre supported and delivered a number of areas of activity. The Centre, unusually for a University Services Directorate, had a number of staff on academic contracts, including one member of staff on a Senior Lecturer contract.

In November 2015, Dr Williamson had been appointed to lead the Centre and tasked with reviewing the structure and role of the Centre and to make recommendations on how the Centre could better support the University's strategic objectives and enhance and lead the development of best practice in learning and teaching across the institution. As part of this, a new Learning and Teaching Centre strategy had been developed by the Centre Management team. This had been shared with and discussed with all members of staff across the Centre and had been approved in principle by University Learning and Teaching Committee and Education Policy and Strategy Committee.

As the new Director, Dr Williamson had met with key stakeholders across the University and sought feedback regarding opportunities for enhancement. Whilst it was clear that much of the work of the Centre was well-regarded and valued by those who interacted with it and that the staff of the Centre were knowledgeable, professional and hard-working, it had been identified through these discussions that the 'reach' of the Centre was not as wide as it could be; that many staff did not interact with the Centre; and that the demand from students for the services the Centre offered was significantly larger than could currently be supported.

In order to enhance and extend the work of the Centre, the vision for the future was:

- Central, not just a centre – the LTC would become a key service within the University, seen as a centre of expertise and experience which could support, enhance and develop the learning experience for students at all levels, on all routes of study and in all disciplines;
- Integral to student success – the work of the LTC would be aimed at improving the quality of the student learning experience both through direct support of student learning, and through support and development of pedagogy and curricula;
- Integral to success of schools and colleges – the LTC would be better linked with the areas of the University that deliver teaching and support student learning. Schools and Colleges needed to be more aware of the work of the LTC and be inextricably linked to the work that the LTC undertakes;

- Integral to development of excellent teaching and learning support – the LTC would ensure that all its work linked directly to the aspirations of the University, but it would also be more proactive. The LTC would lead change and enhancement around learning and teaching and support and lead the dissemination of best practice within the University. Also demonstrating the quality of the University’s learning and teaching practices to the wider HE community;
- Credible at all levels – The LTC would work with all staff across the University who teach or support student learning and would enhance, develop and maintain a reputation for knowledgeable and professional engagement.

The organisational change proposed, therefore, was that:

- the boundaries of existing units within the Centre would be redefined and the concept of the ‘unit’ removed to enable more cohesive service delivery and effective user support. This would lead to two teams within the new Centre supported by an Admin team. One team would be largely focussed on supporting students and the other largely focussed on supporting staff, but each would inform and develop the work of the other.
- The new student-facing team (Student Learning Development) would include the currently separate Writing and Maths ‘Centres’. The work of the new team would be presented to students as embracing ‘writing advice’, ‘mathematics advice’ and ‘study skills advice’ and the roles within the team refocussed to deliver this.
- The new staff-facing team (Academic and Digital Development) would be created by bringing together staff who lead curriculum and pedagogic development from the current Academic Development Unit (ADU) with those who lead pedagogic engagement with learning technologies from the Learning Technology Unit (LTU) and the Media Production Unit (MPU) team who deliver and support media production for learning and teaching. It was proposed that those staff who work on the technical aspects of learning technology be relocated into IT Services.
- the Learning and Teaching Centre would cease to have a research focus. Staff across the Centre would be encouraged and supported to engage in scholarly activity and to disseminate this, but there would be no expectation that any staff in the new structure would be REF-returnable.

This proposed new structure would mean that the LTC would be able to support Colleges and Schools more effectively by being a coherent and integrated team working across all areas of learning and teaching. This would improve the service that the Centre offers to both staff and students. The LTC would offer an enhanced and wider set of support services to those delivering teaching and supporting learning.

The Centre’s new strategy focussed on the development, identification and dissemination of good practice and the new structure would facilitate this. This would impact directly on the wider academic activities of the University, by supporting and developing more staff, by providing joined-up resources and services to colleagues and by empowering students to take more

control of their learning. The intention was make the new LTC a centre of excellence around learning and teaching, and so enhance learning and teaching across the University.

The proposed changes in makeup and focus of what was now the Student Learning Service would make the services the LTC provides to UG and PGT students better and easier to understand. Increased Maths and Stats support would have a directly beneficial impact on a large number of students. Being clearer about the LTC's mission, and focussing more closely on development, would mean that LTC should be able to increase its impact on L&T practices and, therefore, have an indirect beneficial effect on students. The proposal was presented on a cost-neutral basis and was not attempting to save money; rather, it was an attempt to use the available resource of the Centre to support and enhance learning and teaching across the University.

The nature of the change proposed was such that there was potential impact on staff, but this would be mitigated as much as possible and would be managed through the University's Management of Organisational Change process.

The proposal to remove Research from the activity of the Centre and therefore separate from the Learning and Teaching within the Centre, when it was important elsewhere in the University was questioned by Council of Senate. The proposal to not have REF returnable research staff within the Centre was in response to the view that, if returnable in the REF, that research should be done through a School or Research Institute with the infrastructure and income to support that activity.

Members of Council of Senate expressed concerns that the Centre was considered to be working well in supporting scholarship and that that might suffer as a result of the proposed changes. Dr Williamson, assured Council that the intention behind the proposal was to enable the service to be better positioned to work as collaborators with academic staff and to operate as a hub for identifying, encouraging and promoting good practice and to be better placed to help Schools support students.

Members also discussed the proposal in relation to the moving of staff from the Centre who currently supported technology-enhanced activity to IT Services. There was concern that this would be detrimental to enhancing innovation in this area if the LTU were separated from the support around scholarship. Dr Williamson reported that there were staff who were keen to move, as they thought that they would be better placed to support Moodle for example, if they located in IT services.

Dr Williamson highlighted that the aim was for the Centre to be more than a delivery unit and to undertake more co-working, across a broader range of Colleges and Schools.

6. Library Committee: Elsevier Science Direct Negotiation

Ms Susan Ashworth, University Librarian, presented a paper on the progress of renegotiation of access to Elsevier's Science Direct collection of electronic journals for UK Higher Education Institutions. It was reported that the extensive and growing cash and non-cash contributions that UK HEIs make to Elsevier and that the sector had been in negotiations to obtain a fair agreement from Elsevier, an important and highly profitable scholarly publisher. The agreement with Elsevier was one of the largest and most important journal agreement which universities in the UK and globally subscribe to, accounting for roughly 40% of annual spend by the sector on major journal agreements. The sector had maintained a united front, consistently and robustly arguing for the objectives and, had this week, accepted a much more reasonable offer from Elsevier than originally proposed. It was anticipated however, that similar negotiations with other publisher's may follow.

The negotiating team had included experienced Jisc Collections staff (Liam Earney, Carolyn Alderson and colleagues), senior Library Directors: Dr Paul Ayris (University College London) and Phil Sykes (University of Liverpool) together with two Vice Chancellors: Professor Sir David Eastwood (University of Birmingham) and Professor Sir Ian Diamond (University of Aberdeen), supported by a Negotiation Board made up of Library Directors from across the UK.

7. Convener's Business

7.1 Brexit

The Principal reported that there was concern about attitudes towards immigration following the Referendum vote to leave the EU. The HE sector needed to continue to put pressure on the UK Government with regards to the impact on Higher Education and would continue to push for staff and student mobility. It was noted that the Scottish Government had a different view and was more supportive of the HE sector.

7.2 Guild – New University European Network update

The Principal provided an update on the new University European Network – Guild. It was reported that work ongoing to extend the network with the inclusion of two Eastern European Universities, Ljubljana and Tartu. There were now twelve universities within the network, with the aim of reaching twenty. The Guild was lobbying to ensure that UK researchers were not discriminated against as a result of the changes following Brexit.

It was reported that there was concern from PGR students from the EU about fees increasing to the same as current fees for non-EU students. It was recognised that there needed to be care to ensure that no group of students was discriminated against, and legal advice would be sought. Options including Scholarships were under consideration and a further update would be provided at a future meeting of Council of Senate.

Current PG students required reassurance regarding the fact that fees would not change part way through and that the Government were being pressed to continue to provide funded places for 2017.

In terms of UG student numbers, there may be a requirement to take on more Scottish students if the EU figures were not included and therefore numbers may increase, and with no additional resource.

Council of Senate queried whether the uncertainty and concern amongst students in relation to Brexit was contributing to the increased pressure on the Counselling and Psychological Service and also that there might be some reaction to the increased hostility being experienced by EU and non-EU students, following the Referendum.

It was reported that it was not generally the impression that there had been a fall in interest from prospective EU students, in terms of recruitment. However, the Medical School reported that conversion rate was lower for EU students this year, and they were trying to disentangle the figures to establish whether there was any difference before and after the Brexit vote. It was noted that, particularly for longer degrees like the MBChB, there was a greater risk.

There was recognition that there needed to be future workforce planning and that the whole country was dependent on EU workers. The composition of the academic workforce in the UK was such that all disciplines would be affected. The Scottish and UK Governments were willing to invest to support PG student numbers if visa restrictions were tightened.

It was agreed that there would be further discussion at next meeting

7.3 Funding

The Principal reported that the budget was due to be published on 15 December 2016, and it was anticipated that there would be continued pressure on funding for HE, particularly in relation to spending on healthcare and following on from the cuts made last year.

7.4 Estate Strategy

Senior Vice-Principal Professor Neal Juster reported that the final business case for the Learning and Teaching Hub would be received by Court at its December meeting. It was anticipated that work would start in January 2017. There was ongoing consideration regarding other projects and the potential for borrowing ahead of the next phase.

8. Clerk of Senate's Business

8.1 Senate Guest Night Dinner

The next Senate Guest Night would be held on Thursday, 24 November 2016 at 7.00 for 7.30pm in the Senate Room. The guest speaker on this occasion would be Louise Welsh, Writer in residence at the University of Glasgow and Glasgow School of Art.

Members of Senate or Court who wish to nominate persons for consideration as official guests of the Senate at this or subsequent Senate Guest Nights should write to the Clerk of Senate. Members of Senate and Court are also encouraged to contact the Clerk of Senate with suggestions for speakers at subsequent Senate Guest Nights.

8.2 Remembrance Sunday

Remembrance Sunday falls on 13 November 2016. This year, the Service of Remembrance would be held in the Bute Hall at 10.45am.

Members of Senate who wish to join the academic procession are requested to assemble in the Hunterian Museum by 10.30am (dress: academic gown, hood and dark tie). Members wishing to attend are asked to advise Michelle Leatham, ext 3292, e-mail: Michelle.Leatham@glasgow.ac.uk by 12 noon on Monday 7 November 2016J.

8.3 Honorary Degrees 2017

Senate received the oral report from the Honorary Degrees Committee concerning recommendations for the conferment of honorary Degrees in 2017. The Clerk of Senate would provide a report to Court at its meeting on 12 October 2016.