Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 13 October 2010
in the Senate Room

Present:

Ms Susan Ashworth Employee Representative, Mr David Anderson General Council Assessor, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Dr Olwyn Byron Senate Assessor, Professor Muffy Calder Senate Assessor, Mr Peter Daniels Co-opted Member, Dr Robin Easton Co-opted Member, Mr Tommy Gore SRC President, Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP Rector (Chair), Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Assessor, Cllr Jim Mackechnie Glasgow City Council Assessor, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Assessor, Professor William Martin Senate Assessor, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Dr Alan Owen Senate Assessor, Mr Alex Ross Employee Representative, Mr David Ross General Council Assessor, Professor Michael Scott-Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Adrienne Scullion Senate Assessor, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Assessor

In attendance:

Professor Steve Beaumont (Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise), Mr Ian Black (Director of Human Resources), Professor Graham Caie (Clerk of Senate and Vice-Principal), Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Vice-Principal Strategy & Resources), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Andrea Nolan (Senior Vice-Principal), Ms Susan Stewart (Director of Corporate Communications)

Apologies:

Members: Ms Susan Dunsmore General Council Assessor, Professor Eleanor Gordon Senate Assessor, Dr Gordon Hay Senate Assessor

Attenders: Mr Jim McConnell (Director of Estates and Buildings)

CRT/2010/1. Announcements

Court welcomed Tommy Gore to his first meeting as SRC President.

CRT/2010/2. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23 June 2010

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2010/3. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.
CRT/2010/4.1 Funding Environment

Court was aware of the renewed debate about the future funding of Higher Education in Scotland. It noted that the Principal had intervened in the debate and that this had been welcomed by the main political parties, particularly on the key point that the funding issue must be addressed in the next 12 months. The Principal explained that a possible model for future funding was a graduate contribution system, but any further information on the government’s position was unlikely to be available before the Scottish Parliament election in May 2011, and detailed decisions either nationally or by individual institutions in Scotland were unlikely to emerge before the impact of the Browne report on English institutions was clearer. However, universities in Scotland would need to act to implement measures to coincide with actions taken by institutions in England. These measures were likely to be required by 2012/13.

The financial scenarios for Glasgow, discussed at the 3 September Court Strategy Day, remained and needed to be addressed.

The Rector advised that revision of the funding system would be a lengthy process, given the need for Parliamentary debate on the details. Mr Gore advised Court that the SRC position was that realism was needed and that its support would be given to something achievable but fair; however, a detailed student view was not possible given the current uncertainties.

CRT/2010/4.2 University Rankings and Teaching Performance

Court noted information on the latest QS World University and Times Higher Education (THE) rankings. There had been debate about the methodology of the latter, with it having been criticised by many institutions as producing highly flawed results, as well as anomalies. The way in which the THE had developed its methodology, and the fact that there were very many more world tables emerging, supported the view which Court had taken, that the University’s strategic plan should not make reference to a world league table position. Success would not be measured in terms of published league tables, because the metrics used in some of these tables changed periodically, and did not necessarily reflect the criteria which must be met for the University to achieve its vision.

Court noted strong results in the 2010 National Student Survey and the International Student Barometer. The University had a reputation for providing an excellent student experience and the results showed that the teaching and learning element of that experience was recognised by its students.

CRT/2010/4.3 Organisational Structure

Court noted a paper from the Senior Vice Principal, providing a summary of the new structure, outlining the key steps involved in achieving and implementing it, and detailing future plans for measuring its success. The process of developing new structures had identified areas for further work in the year ahead. College Secretaries, in conjunction with HR Managers, were reviewing support functions during 2010-11 with a view to achieving a more efficient use of resources. Estates matters were also being taken forward, with efforts being made to co-locate related activities. The SMG would
have oversight of this work and would consider progress as part of the first year review of the new structure in September 2011. Court would receive a report on that review in October 2011.

Changes in the organisational structure had led to changes in the operation of the Senior Management Group and the Principal’s Advisory Group, with (broadly) the former being focused on wider strategy issues and the latter more on work in progress and operational matters.

It was noted that headhunters had been employed in recruiting to senior College management posts. Members and attenders who had been involved in these recruitment processes expressed some doubt as to whether the headhunters had provided good value for money. It was recognised, however, that in recruiting to senior positions, headhunters were often instrumental in encouraging candidates to come forward.

**CRT/2010.4.4 Student Admissions**

Court noted data on the 2009 applications and admissions processes.

As an average across the University, Undergraduate applications had been 12% ahead of last year and in line with national average growth. Admissions would exceed target, particularly in Arts, Social Sciences and Sciences. A new Admissions Policy had been agreed for 2011 which would substantially reduce the size and increase the quality of students held in the ‘Gathered Field’ (all qualifying applications). The aim of this policy was to facilitate faster communication of decisions to students and minimise over-recruitment, through increased control. A tariff had been set which would guarantee applicants would receive unconditional offers, and a minimum level set below which applicants would not be considered for entry.

Postgraduate (PG) applications (Teaching and Research) had grown by 29%, with major growth across all Colleges. Predicted international PG registrations would present a 42% year on year growth, an outstanding result which reflected much work undertaken on ‘conversion marketing’ by Schools and University Services, and which supported projections outlined at the Court Strategy Day for the potential of additional income growth in 2010-15. The additional numbers had necessitated additional space being found for some lectures, and were likely to require additional teaching resource, which would be funded from the additional income.

**CRT/2010/4.5. Key Activities**

Court noted a summary of some of the main activities in which the Principal had been involved since the last meeting of Court, covering internal and external activities beyond the daily operational management and strategy meetings. The activities were under the broad headings of: Lobbying and influencing; Building international profile and links; University-led events internal & external; raising the profile; Building relations with the sector and other institutions. Court agreed that the summary was informative.

**CRT/2010/4.6. Vice Principal Appointments**

Court noted Professor Steve Beaumont’s reappointment as Vice-Principal (Research and Enterprise) from 1 August 2011 until 31 July 2014.
CRT/2010/4.7. Impact Study

Court noted that an impact study had been commissioned with regard to the University’s external profile, which would mirror the recent internal impact study done as part of the strategic planning process and would provide case studies and quantitative data on the University’s work in terms of its social, cultural, health-related and economic benefits.

CRT/2010/5. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2010/5.1 Review of Governance Arrangements

Over the summer, a Court working group - convened by David Ross and including David Anderson, Ken Brown, Olwyn Byron, Muffy Calder, Peter Daniels, David Newall and Kevin Sweeney - had considered how the operation of Court might be improved. The Governance Code of Practice, published by the Committee of University Chairs, recommended that a University governing body should review its own effectiveness at least once every five years. As part of the review, the group had looked at arrangements at other Scottish universities and at a recent internal audit report on governance.

David Ross explained that as part of the review, he had had discussions with his counterparts at some other institutions, covering areas including the balance of external and internal members of governing bodies, and the desirability of having a spread of professional expertise available, particularly in light of the complexities and challenges facing modern universities. A principle reflected in the CUC's Governance Code of Practice was that the governing body should have a majority of lay members, who should be 'both external and independent of the institution'. It was arguable that Glasgow did not in fact have such a lay majority. The other 'ancient' Scottish universities, whose constitutional arrangements were similar to Glasgow's, had a clear lay majority on their governing bodies. These factors being the case, the Working Group had strongly supported the need to increase the proportion of external members, recognising the value of securing a strong skills mix. With only 5 Co-opted places currently available, vacancies for which were advertised widely, limited opportunities existed to select members with skills and experience relevant to the University.

Mr Ross added that there had been two main areas of discussion for the group: membership and attendance; and management of Court business. Court noted the report. The group’s recommendations to Court, as contained in the report were approved, as follows:

1. In relation to membership and attendance:

   .1 that the membership of Court should be revisited, such as to:
      - increase the number of Co-opted Members from 5 to 11;
      - reduce the number of General Council Assessors from 5 to 2; and
      - reduce the number of Senate Assessors from 7 to 4.

   .2 that the role of Senate Assessor should no longer carry a portfolio of HR management responsibilities.

   .3 that all Vice- Principals, including Heads of College, should be invited to attend meetings of Court, allowing Court to communicate more directly with senior executives. It was recognised that there may on occasion be a need for the agenda to include items of reserved business, which would be discussed by Court members only; and
that positions on Court should be re-styled as follows:
- ‘General Council Assessor’ to ‘General Council Member’
- ‘Senate Assessor’ to ‘Senate Member’
- ‘SRC Assessor’ to ‘SRC Member’
- ‘Chancellor’s Assessor’ to ‘Chancellor’s representative’

Court noted that changes to Court membership (1.1 above) required consultation with Senate and the General Council, and that thereafter the Privy Council must approve changes to the relevant ordinance.

2. In relation to Management of Court business:

.1 that Court should continue to have 5 regular meetings each year, together with a one-day Strategy Day and two half-day briefings; one on Governance, Funding and HE Policy, the other on the University's Finances. These would be built into the calendar of Court meetings.
.2 that, in order to allow for Court to be better briefed - including receiving performance reports from Heads of College/University Services - meetings of Court should in future begin at, for example, 12.00: this would allow for a briefing session to take place before proceeding to the formal business of Court.
.3 that the business of each Court meeting should be scheduled such as to take the most significant items early in the agenda.
.4 that the Court papers in October should include a schedule of anticipated business for the coming year, and a report on members' attendance in the previous year.
.5 that Court committees should be encouraged where appropriate to make recommendations to Court on co-opting expertise.
.6 that future reports to Court from Finance Committee should include a summary Income & Expenditure statement.
.7 that the senior lay governor/member should in future be referred to as the Convener. It was acknowledged that the Rector was the ordinary President of the Court.
.8 that the Senior Senate Assessor and the Chancellor's Assessor should have joint responsibility for receiving any concern felt by a Court member about the conduct of Court business, where the member did not wish to raise this directly with the Senior Lay Member, for identifying any concerns among Court members about the conduct of Court business, and for raising these with the Senior Lay Member.
.9 that Court members should be encouraged to attend relevant training events; and
.10 that Court's Standing Orders should be updated.

Michael Scott-Morton commented that he would be supportive of expertise in research being available to Court via a Co-opted member, to address in part the need for Court to focus more attention on that aspect of the University’s activities.

Court agreed that in order to ensure appropriate input on matters affecting research and teaching, it would be important that Senate representatives, as with all Court members, were able to commit to all Court meetings, if their numbers were being reduced to four. Court noted that the removal of much of the HR workload from Senate representatives would facilitate their attendance and that attendance in future by the Heads of Colleges would also enable Court to obtain such input at its meetings, albeit that the latter group would not have voting rights.
CRT/2010/5.2 Court Strategy Day

Court noted a report on the Court Strategy Day held on 3 September. With regard to the agreed cost reduction scenario, the five main budgetholders had each been set an indicative savings target and were working within their areas of responsibility to identify how these might be achieved. In addition, a SMG Working Group, chaired by Professor Nolan, would oversee workstreams aimed at re-shaping academic and support activities and would ensure these were coordinated effectively and that the associated HR Management and Communications needs were identified. Court would be updated on this work at its December meeting. The SMG was aiming to have a fully developed strategy on cost reduction ready for discussion by Court in February. This would necessitate a reduction in staff during the second half of the current financial year, and SMG members were concerned that Court should put in place a voluntary severance scheme that would allow the required reduction in staff numbers to be achieved swiftly. The terms of a possible voluntary severance scheme would be considered by the Remuneration Committee at its November meeting and Remuneration Committee would report to Court in December.

CRT/2010/5.3 Glasgow University Archaeological Research Division (GUARD)

As Court was aware from its June meeting, the review committee set up to look at GUARD had concluded that the University could not continue to subsidise GUARD’s work and that a Structural Change Committee and Redundancy Committee should be set up. This has been suspended until December to allow GUARD to look at alternative business models that could establish it on a commercial basis independent of the University. Court noted that University officials had met with representatives of GUARD in recent weeks to offer advice as they considered a possible commercial model. One aspect of these discussions, as reflected in the minutes of the Remuneration Committee, had been an inquiry from GUARD’s management as to whether the University would offer voluntary severance terms to members of staff in GUARD. Court agreed to offer voluntary severance terms, if this would assist GUARD in bringing forward proposals to establish a viable commercial entity, with no continuing financial liability for the University. On the advice of the Remuneration Committee, Court agreed that the terms should be the same as those offered in the spring of 2010 to staff in the Faculties of Education and Biomedical & Life Sciences.

CRT/2010/5.4 Employment Ordinance

In February 2010, Court had approved draft Ordinances related to the University's employment procedures for academic and related staff. The substantive Ordinance would allow the University to simplify its HR procedures in line with good employment practice. It was accompanied by an enabling Ordinance, which was technical in nature and established the University's power to vary or revoke an Ordinance of 1992 which (unusually) had been issued by the University Commissioners. There had been extensive informal discussion with the Privy Council ahead of final versions of the Ordinances being sent to the Council for formal approval. The ‘technical’ Ordinance was now in the final stages of approval. Once this was approved, the substantive Ordinance would be submitted. Court noted the text of both Ordinances.
CRT/2010/5.5 Standing Orders and Committee memberships

Standing Orders for Court had been provided for reference and included details of Court committee dates and memberships for the coming session. Court noted the proposal that Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences) and Professor Stuart Reid (Head of School of Veterinary Medicine) would replace Professor Jim Conroy and Professor Paul Hagan who had been the two Deans on the Human Resources Committee.

CRT/2010/5.6 Employment-related Tribunals and Grievance Stage 2

Court noted the outcomes of two employment related tribunals and a stage 2 grievance.

CRT/2010/5.7 USS Pension Fund

At its last meeting Court had noted an update on pensions that included reference to current discussions about the possible restructuring of the Universities Superannuation Scheme. Court had agreed to invite the lay members of the Remuneration Committee and Ken Brown as chair of the Finance Committee to decide how to respond to a letter received from the chair of the Employers Pension Forum and the chair of the Universities & Colleges Employers' Association, which had asked if Court would endorse the position adopted by the Employers Pensions Forum in the discussions. Court noted the text of the letter of reply which had been sent.

CRT/2010/5.8 Campus Solutions (Student Lifecycle Project)

Following Oracle UK Consulting’s decision to terminate its service agreement with the University, Court had been advised in June that the University would now employ contracting staff directly to manage implementation of the Student Lifecycle Project through to completion. The key expert appointments had now been made, and the project was proceeding within budget and in line with its scheduled timescale. Implementation was due to be complete by November 2011.

CRT/2010/5.9 Key Performance Indicators

The October Court agenda contained a report from the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) on progress in implementing the Learning and Teaching Strategy. The report included analysis of performance against the University's Key Performance Indicators for Learning & Teaching. Future meetings of Court would receive reports on performance against KPIs as follows: HR Management (December Court); Financial Management (February); Research (April); and Estates Management (June).

CRT/2010/5.10 Nominations Committee

Court approved a recommendation made on behalf of the Nominations Committee that Ms Margaret Morton be appointed to the Estates Committee for the period 1 November 2010 to 31 December 2013.
Court agreed that it would consider a recommendation from the Nominations Committee, hopefully to be made by email in the coming weeks, with regard to the nomination of a third lay member to serve on Human Resources Committee.

**CRT/2010/5.11 Heads of Schools and Research Institutes**

Court noted that the following appointments had been made:

**College of Arts**
School of Modern Languages & Cultures  
Professor John Macklin - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2014  
(Dr John McCulloch, previously recommended to Court for this appointment, subsequently advised that he was unable to take up the position)

**College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences**
School of Life Sciences  
Dr Rob Aitken - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2014

School of Veterinary Medicine  
Professor Stuart Reid - 1 August 2010 to 31 December 2012

**Research Institutes**
Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine  
Professor Dan Haydon - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2015

Cancer Sciences  
Professor Karen Vousden - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2015

Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences  
Professor Andy Baker - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2011

Infection, Immunity and Inflammation  
Professor Iain McInnes - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2015

Molecular, Cell and Systems Biology  
Professor Richard Cogdell - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2015

Psychology and Neuroscience  
Professor Philippe Schyns - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2015

**College of Science and Engineering**
School of Psychology  
Professor Mike Burton - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2012

**College of Social Sciences**
School of Education  
Professor Robert Davis - 1 August 2010 to 31 July 2014

**CRT/2010/6.12 College Secretaries**

Court noted that the four College Secretary posts had now been filled:

College of Arts - Dr Catherine Martin
CRT/2010/6.13 Resolutions relating to Degree Regulations

Court noted that on the recommendation of the Senate, the Secretary of Court had agreed the following Resolutions, which had been drafted following comments from the Senate and General Council. A copy of the Resolutions was available from the Court Office.

552-2 - AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 552 - GENERIC REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREES GAINED BY THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

552-3 - AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 552 - GENERIC REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREES GAINED BY THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

557-2 - AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 557 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF RESEARCH

575-2 - AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 575 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

612 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT & ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE

613 - DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF CLINICAL DENTISTRY

614 - DEGREES OF MASTER OF FINE ARTS IN CREATIVE WRITING AND MASTER OF FINE ARTS IN CREATIVE WRITING (APPLIED)

615 - DEGREE OF INTERNATIONAL MASTER IN RUSSIAN, CENTRAL & EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

616 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY OF ART AND ART-WORLD PRACTICE

CRT/2010/6. Learning and Teaching Strategy

Professor Frank Coton updated Court on the Learning and Teaching Strategy, including performance against Key Performance Indicators.

The University continued to be involved in the Enhancement-led Institutional Review Process (ELIR). ELIR was a key component of the Scottish Funding Council’s Quality Enhancement Framework, and was in effect the Learning and Teaching equivalent of the RAE/REF in Research. The exercise focused on strategies for continually improving the student learning experience; ability to manage standards; and the quality of the learning opportunities for students. The most recent outcome had been ‘Confidence’ in the University’s current, and likely future, management of the academic standards of its awards and the quality of the student learning experience it provided. This was the highest form of endorsement of institutional practice available from ELIR. Professor Coton recorded his thanks to all University colleagues involved in the process.
In terms of student satisfaction, levels had been maintained or increased across all of the student surveys in which the University had participated. National Student Survey highlights were that the University had been placed 3rd in the Russell Group for overall satisfaction, with 25 subjects achieving the University’s Learning & Teaching Strategy Key Performance Indicator of more than 90% for overall satisfaction. In 10 subjects, the University had been 1st or joint 1st in the whole of the UK University sector for overall satisfaction.

The University had achieved its target of 30,000 applications for Undergraduate (UG) places in 2010 and was a “selecting” university for most UG provision. In 2010 no students had been admitted under the general tariff and fewer than 1% had been admitted under the published tariff. This, together with the raising of the tariff, was likely to have a knock-on effect in terms of improved retention rates. As Court had heard in the Principal’s report, a new Admissions Policy had now been approved.

The use of the Virtual Learning Environment (Moodle) had continued to grow, as had the use of electronic voting systems in classrooms. There was also increasing demand for distance and blended learning technologies and for student e-PDP (Personal Development Plan) tools.

Court noted KPIs relating to first year continuation rates, the course completion rate after six years, Postgraduate student numbers growth, graduate employment numbers, student satisfaction, and average tariff at entry. The last of these was used as a general indicator of quality of intake and a broad gauge of the appeal of the institution for recruitment purposes; it was also used as a quality indicator by some international students. The choice of a KPI for a six year completion rate allowed data to be captured in relation to students who chose to take a year off from studies. In response to a question about comparative data on graduate employment numbers from other institutions, Professor Coton explained that given the general UK employment situation, Glasgow’s results were good; comparisons with other institutions were not easy because different institutions had different subject mixes, but in general the University’s professional courses did very well, with some other areas being less successful in terms of graduate employment.

The revised Learning and Teaching Strategy for 2010-2015 would focus on the following key priority areas: retention; assessment and feedback; recruitment and admissions; graduate attributes; sustainable Postgraduate Taught growth; and innovation in provision.

Court thanked Professor Coton for the update.

**CRT/2010/7. Reports of Court Committees**

**CRT/2010/7.1 Finance Committee**

The report was noted.

**CRT/2010/7.2 Audit Committee**

Kevin Sweeney provided an oral report from the last meeting of the Audit Committee, held on 6 October. The Internal Auditors report received by the committee had revealed concerns about aspects of research management, particularly the interface
between Research & Enterprise and the research section of the Finance Office. There were also concerns about risk management processes for commercial undertakings and due diligence practice in relation to partnership contracts for research. These issues were being addressed by a working group convened by the Secretary of Court. The Auditors had also reported on IT services' helpdesk support and had commented on the lack of a uniform approach across the University.

Mr Newall notified Court that following tendering processes, Deloittes had been reappointed as Internal Auditors for 3 years from 1 November 2010 and Ernst & Young had been reappointed as External Auditors for 3 years from 1 January 2011.

**CRT/2010/7.3 Human Resources Committee**

The report was noted.

**CRT/2010.7.4 Estates Committee**

Court noted the Estates Committee’s Approval of a CapEx Application ‘Enabling Works Centre for Virus Research (CVR)’ in the sum of £500k. Court also noted the Estates Committee’s approval of the proposed Project Governance model.

**CRT/2010/7.5 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee**

*CRT/2010/7.5.1 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee Remit*

Court approved the Committee’s proposed remit.

*CRT/2010/7.5.2 Policy for Managing Stress and Mental Wellbeing in the Workplace and Procedure for Lone Working*

Court approved the Policy for Managing Stress and Mental Wellbeing in the Workplace and the Procedure for Lone Working.

*CRT/2010/7.5.3 Diving Code*

Court noted the Diving Code.

**CRT/2010/7.6 Remuneration Committee**

Court noted the Committee’s discussions regarding GUARD and as previously discussed under the report from the Secretary of Court, Court approved voluntary severance terms being made available to staff in GUARD, on the same terms as those made available to staff in Education and Biomedical and Life Sciences.

Court noted a report from the Rector, which included details of a Parliamentary Question relating to Universities and of the schedule of Rectorial engagements for the current term.

The report also made reference to a concern that the Senate motion highlighting the need for students to be able to set aside Wednesday afternoons for sporting and other recreational purposes (unless essential for course purposes) was being downgraded. Professor Caie agreed to arrange for a reminder to be sent to Colleges.

ACTION G CAIE

Court noted that there had been positive dialogue between the University and the student bodies in relation to the anticipated cuts in funding. The Principal added that he would be holding an open meeting for students as part of his talks to the University community, at which further dialogue could be held.

CRT/2010/9. Communications from meeting of Senate 7 October 2010

The Clerk of Senate advised Court of the 2010/11 honorary degree nominations, on a confidential basis. Members of Court could contact the Clerk of Senate if they had observations to make.

Court noted Communications from a meeting of Senate held on 7 October.

CRT/2010/10. Enhancement-led Institutional Review

Court had received a copy of the University’s draft annual statement to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) on progress with institution-led reviews during 2009-10. The contents were specified by the SFC, and summarised review activity undertaken by the University of its provision for students, namely reviews of Departmental Programmes of Teaching, Learning & Assessment (DPTLA), Faculty Graduate Schools and Administrative Review Process exercises carried out in respect of student-facing University services. Information concerning review activity carried out at the University by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies was also included.

Court approved the statement to the SFC.

CRT/2010/11. Any Other Business

CRT/2010/11.1 Restructuring

In response to a question about the costs of the restructuring, Court noted that there had been some internal appointments to key posts, as well as some redeployment, resulting in a reduction in overhead costs, although in the short term there had been costs in terms of staff time connected with the exercise.

CRT/2010/11.1 Research Institutes
In response to a question about when Court would receive an update on the new Research Institutes, Court noted that information would be supplied as part of the annual report on Research KPIs; as advised in the Principal’s report, there would also be an update report on restructuring in October 2011, which would cover the issue.

**CRT/2010/12. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 15 December 2010 in the Senate Room

The other dates for the 2010/2011 Session are
Wednesday 16 February 2011
Wednesday 13 April 2011
Wednesday 22 June 2011