Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 13 April 2011 in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative (attending in place of Ms Susan Ashworth), Mr David Anderson General Council Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Dr Olwyn Byron Senate Member, Professor Muffy Calder Senate Member, Ms Susan Dunsmore General Council Member, Dr Robin Easton Co-opted Member, Professor Eleanor Gordon Senate Member, Mr Tommy Gore SRC President, Dr Gordon Hay Senate Member, Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP Rector (Chair), Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Member, Cllr Jim Mackechnie Glasgow City Council Representative, Professor William Martin Senate Member, Mr Matt Morrison SRC Member on Court, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Dr Alan Owen Senate Member, Mr Alex Ross Employee Representative, Mr David Ross General Council Member (Convener of Court), Professor Michael Scott-Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Adrienne Scullion Senate Member, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Member

In attendance:

Ms Christine Barr (HR Manager, attending in place of Mr Ian Black Director of Human Resources), Professor Steve Beaumont (Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise), Professor Graham Caie (Clerk of Senate and Vice-Principal), Professor John Chapman (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Neal Juster (Vice-Principal Strategy & Resources), Mr Jim McConnell (Director of Estates & Buildings), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Farhad Noorbakhsh (Head of Business School, attending in place of Professor Anne Anderson Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Murray Pittock (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal), Ms Susan Stewart (Director of Corporate Communications)

Apologies:

Members: Ms Susan Ashworth Employee Representative, Mr Peter Daniels Co-opted Member, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Representative

Attenders: Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Ian Black (Director of Human Resources), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Andrea Nolan (Senior Vice-Principal)

CRT/2010/34. Announcements

Court congratulated Rt Hon Charles Kennedy on his re-election as Rector.

CRT/2010/35. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 16 February 2011

The minutes were approved subject to the following changes:

Under item CRT/2010/26.3 Cost Reduction, a sentence would be added to the effect that
it had been asked on behalf of the Senate Assessors whether each consultation panel could contain an external representative.

Under item CRT/2010/27.2 *Ordinance Relating to Court membership*, the reference to a Green Paper on governance would be amended to refer to a Green Paper on options for the future of higher education in Scotland.

It was requested that minutes of meetings be provided to Court members earlier than in the despatch of Court papers.

**CRT/2010/36. Matters Arising**

With regard to minute CRT/2010/27.2 *Ordinance Relating to Court Membership*, Olwyn Byron advised that she had received a request to ask Court temporarily to withdraw from the process relating to the Ordinance on Court membership. This would be with a view to revisiting the proposals contained in it. David Ross responded that the process was ongoing and that the need for additional lay resource was pressing: deferring the process would not help matters; it would simply delay recruitment. He did not believe there was a wish by Court to revisit the decision in February about what the new Ordinance should say, even if Court agreed to suspend the process. Mr Ross would be attending the 28 April Senate meeting to discuss the proposed ordinance and the thinking behind it. Relevant papers, including the governance working party’s report and details of Court’s agreement, following consultation, to amend its original proposal, would be circulated ahead of that meeting. The correct course was however to continue with the process, as agreed by Court.

Muffy Calder expressed concern that the timing was not good, given other issues raised by Senate. Mr Ross reiterated that he would be attending Senate on 28 April, and that he would aim to address Senate’s concerns about the Ordinance at that time. There would also be discussion on improving communication between Court and Senate. However, it was not appropriate to reopen the debate on the Ordinance. Court agreed with this approach, and was not minded to suspend the process.

**CRT/2010/37. Report from the Principal**

*CRT/2010/37.1 Scottish Funding Council Grant 2011/12*

Court noted the main allocations in the SFC funding letter for 2011/12.

The Principal commented that the sector as a whole had suffered a large cut in funding, mostly in the form of a cut to the teaching grant and to some funded places. It remained to be seen what might occur after the election to the Scottish Parliament in early May.

*CRT/2010/37.2 Cost Reduction*

At its February meeting, Court had received a paper from SMG outlining the proposed approach to closing the financial gap identified at the Court Strategy Day in September 2010. SMG had been asked by Court to produce a plan to bridge an estimated £35M+ funding gap through the generation of new income and the removal of £20M of costs, split £3M, £10M and £7M over financial years 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13 respectively. As part of possible cost removal, the SMG had identified a number of areas which it believed should be subject to further scrutiny in terms of their alignment with the University’s strategic plan. With Court’s approval, these were currently the subject of a consultation exercise.
It had been agreed by Court in February that further information would be provided at
the present meeting in the form of interim details on the achievement of financial
targets (including those arising from voluntary severance), as well as information on
the method by which the areas named for consultation, as opposed to other areas, had
been identified and on how proposed investments fitted with University strategy. Court
noted a paper providing these details, together with a paper summarising current
forecasts and including details of SFC funding for 2011/12, which provided
background to discussions on current academic investment priorities. Court was
reminded that the University strategy had been developed ‘bottom-up’, with input from
the then Faculties and latterly the Colleges, who were driving the priorities for
investments in their areas.

Court noted that Senate would be receiving a paper discussing alternatives that had
been considered for cost reduction. In response to a question about what suggestions
had been made for savings via the website for staff input on cost reduction, it was noted
that many of the suggestions had related to energy savings. The Carbon Management
Committee was developing proposals in this area.

Court received a verbal update on voluntary severance (VS) applications as at 11 April
2011 and that the current estimate for salary savings from VS was about £8M. It was
noted that the current government cuts accounted for the largest part of the present
funding gap. If the cuts were not reversed, the sector was facing a very significant gap.
In the circumstances there remained continuing uncertainty about the funding position.

**CRT/2010/37.3. Student Occupation – Independent Investigation**

Court members were aware of the events relating to the attempt to end the occupation
of the Hetherington Building. Court noted that the Principal had set up an independent
University investigation, chaired by the Rector, with a Panel consisting of
representatives of the University Court, Senate and SRC. The investigation, which
would include a strong focus on lessons for the future, was now under way and Court
members would be kept informed on progress.

**CRT/2010/37.4. 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 daily operational management and strategy meetings. The activities were under
the broad headings of: Lobbying and profile-raising; Internal consultation and events;
Academic Development; and Alumni Events. Court noted in particular the positive
reception to the University’s new structure from Research Council visitors; the very
successful visit to Beijing/Tianjin in support of the University’s internationalisation
strategy; and receipt of agreement from the relevant authorities in China for the
establishment of a Confucius Institute at Glasgow.

Court also noted an increase in overseas applications for study at the University. This
would be reported in more detail at the June meeting. There remained some concerns
about the UK Border Agency approach to visas for students from abroad. The sector’s
views had been conveyed to the government.

**CRT/2010/38. Report from the Secretary of Court**

**CRT/2010/38.1 Consultation Exercise on Cost Reduction**

At its February meeting, Court had agreed to take forward a consultation process on the
cost reduction proposals formulated by SMG. Court’s intention had been that the
consultations should be advanced as early as practicable, with a view to a report being
submitted to the meeting of Senate on 28 April. It had been agreed to arrange a special
meeting of Court in May, so as to allow Court to receive Senate's advice as it
considered the outcome of the consultation exercise.

There had been some criticisms of the approach adopted to consultation. These had
been discussed at a special Senate meeting on 18 March, a note of which had been
provided to Court members for the present meeting. One criticism had related to
membership of the panels. Senate had asked that Senate Assessors and SRC
representatives be full members of the consultation panels. Senate Assessors' preference would have been for there to be an external academic expert on each panel,
while other colleagues had suggested that trade union representatives and/or MSPs
ought to be panel members. A message from David Ross to Senate members had
explained that the consultation process was a robust one and that the views of staff and
students would be taken into account, while noting that it was neither practical nor
desirable to undo the current consultation process and restart it.

A second concern had been about the timescale for the consultation process. The
experience of the consultation panels to date had been variable: some consultations
were more complex and required a larger range of people to be consulted in order to be
fair and transparent. Not all panels would be in a position to report their conclusions to
Senate in April and to Court in May as originally planned. Court was therefore asked
to consider extending the timescale for the process such that final decisions would be
made on all the cost reduction proposals at the Court meeting on 22 June. This
extension would allow the panels to prepare reports on a timescale that would be
achievable for all. The extended timescale would have the added benefit of responding
to concerns from Senate that, in view of apparent promises being made by Scottish
political leaders regarding higher education funding, the University should allow some
time after the Scottish Parliamentary election before finalising its discussion of the
current cost reduction proposals.

Court approved the proposed change to the consultation timescale and agreed that the
special meeting of Court scheduled for 11 May would be cancelled. Senate would be
able to consider the outcome of the consultation process at its meeting on 2 June, and
Court would have the benefit of Senate's input, as intended, when it revisited the cost
reduction proposals on 22 June.

**CRT/2010/38.2 Voluntary Severance Scheme**

Court had noted an update on the Voluntary Severance (VS) scheme under the earlier
item on Cost Reduction.

In February, Court had announced that the VS Scheme could be terminated on Court's
giving two weeks' notice. It had agreed at that time to let the VS Scheme run until at
least two weeks after the special meeting of Court scheduled for May 2011. Given
Court’s decision under the previous agenda item to change the consultation timescale,
Court confirmed that the scheme would now run until at least 2 weeks after the Court
meeting on 22 June.

**CRT/2010/38.3 Western Infirmary Site**

At its December meeting, Court had approved in principle the acquisition of the larger
part of the Western Infirmary Site (10 acres, referred to as 'Site A', out of a total site
area of 14 acres), at a maximum cost of £10M. Court had delegated to a Project Group
responsibility for reviewing the terms of the transfer, and authority to approve the
transaction on Court's behalf. The Project Group (comprising David Ross, Ken Brown,
Margaret Morton, The Principal, the Secretary of Court and the Directors of Estates & Buildings and Finance) had met on three occasions to review the issues associated with the proposed acquisition, and had been satisfied that the terms of the acquisition were satisfactory from the University's perspective. Transfer of the 10-acre site had been effected on 31 March, at a price of £9.277M. The NHS had also agreed to offer the University, at a later date, the opportunity of an off-market purchase of the remaining 4 acres ('Site B'). It was agreed that the existing Project Group should look at the details in due course.

Acquisition of the Western Infirmary site was key to the University's estates strategy, which would now be revisited such as to ensure that maximum benefit was derived from the opportunity it provided. The University would have vacant occupancy of the site when the new South Glasgow Hospital opened, estimated to be in the latter part of 2015.

**CRT/2010/38.4 Redundancy Committee Halls of Residence Cleaning**

At its December meeting, Court had been advised that two of the University's student residences, Lister House and Wolfson Hall, currently offered a high level of cleaning support that was out of line with service levels in other university halls at Glasgow and elsewhere in the UK. With effect from session 2011/12, it was intended to reduce this level of service in Lister and Wolfson, to the level provided in other halls. At the meeting, Court had approved the establishment of a Structural Change Committee and a Redundancy Committee to oversee the management of the staff reduction.

The Structural Change Committee had been able to report to the Redundancy Committee at a meeting chaired by Professor Neal Juster on 4 March that avoidance measures had been taken in relation to all the posts which were the subject of the Structural Change Committee’s consultation, through a combination of redeployment; a retirement; voluntary severance/early retirement; and transfer of some staff into revised domestic and housekeeping posts at Wolfson Hall and Lister House on different contractual hours of work. The Redundancy Committee had noted the position and was able to report to Court that no compulsory measures were required. Court noted the position.

**CRT/2010/38.5 Redundancy Committee Glasgow University Archaeological Research Division (GUARD)**

At its December meeting, Court had agreed that Structural Change and Redundancy Committees should be established in respect of posts in GUARD, where some current members of staff had not applied for voluntary severance, following earlier agreement by Court that voluntary severance might be offered if this would assist GUARD in bringing forward proposals to establish a new company. Five such staff were involved.

The Structural Change Committee had provided an update on its consultations, and some proposals with regard to possible mitigation, to the Redundancy Committee at a meeting chaired by Professor Neal Juster on 4 March. The Redundancy Committee had been content with these proposals. Since then, and in line with the proposals, steps in mitigation had occurred with respect to the 2 FTE Research & Teaching posts, with redeployment of both staff. A Technical & Related staff member had been employed for a further period of 6 months from March 2011, with steps in mitigation to continue during that time. With respect to a Zero Hours Research & Teaching staff member and a MPA staff member, steps in mitigation would continue and a further report would be made to Court. Court noted the position.
Rectorial Election

The Rectorial Election had been held on Monday 21 to Tuesday 22 February. The Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP had been elected as University Rector for a further three years.

Court Committee appointments

Court approved a recommendation made on behalf of the Nominations Committee that Mr Kevin Sweeney be re-appointed to the Audit Committee and to its convenership from 1 May 2011 until his demission as General Council Member on Court on 31 July 2014.

Court approved a recommendation made on behalf of Nominations Committee that Mr Steven Scott be invited to serve on the University's Investment Advisory Committee.

Court noted that, following an advertisement placed in the press for 2 Co-opted Committee members, for the Finance Committee and Human Resources Committee, informal interviews had taken place, and a recommendation in respect of each committee would be made to the Nominations Committee.

Glasgow City Council Representative

Court noted that with the extension of the term of the Glasgow City Council for 1 year, Councillor Jim Mackechnie would now serve on Court until May 2012.

SRC Elections

Court noted that the following candidates had been successful in the Spring 2011 SRC elections and would take up sabbatical officer posts on 1st July 2011:

- President: Stuart Ritchie
- VP (Media & Communications): Iain Smith
- VP (Learning & Development): James Harrison
- VP (Student Support): Amy Johnson

University of Glasgow Pension Scheme

David Anderson, General Council Representative and chair of the University's Pension Scheme Trustees, left the meeting for this item.

Mr Newall explained that following the three-yearly actuarial valuation of the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme (UGPS), of which most of the University's clerical, operational and technical staff were members, the Trustees had requested that the University maintain its current funding commitment to the Scheme. This was set at the level of 19.5% of salaries. The Trustees' advice was that the Pensions Regulator would consider this continuing level of institutional support as sufficient to sustain the scheme, bearing in mind the need to close a deficit of over £40M, and taking into account the Trustees' decision that future pensions increases should be referenced to the Consumer Price Index, rather than the Retail Price Index as at present. On this understanding, Court approved the University's continued financial commitment to UGPS, involving an employer's contribution of 19.5% of salaries. Court noted that, with changes envisaged to the contribution and benefits structure of the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS), it might revisit the terms of the UGPS at a future date,
with a view to promoting a consistent approach between the two schemes. This would reflect the decision in 2005 that the UGPS should be consistent with the USS.

On a related matter, Court's views were sought on the Statement of Investment Principles for the UGPS, as approved by the Scheme's Trustees on 28 February. Dr Easton, as chair of a Court working group which had looked at Socially Responsible Investment during 2009, requested that the wording in section 3.3 of the Statement be reviewed. Although it was acknowledged that Court was not in a position to require the Trustees to amend the investment principles, Mr Easton was concerned that the recently revised wording gave more latitude on investments, particularly relating to the tobacco industry, than the Court working group had recommended. Mr Newall agreed to discuss the matter with the Trustees.

CRT/2010/38.11 Appointment Committee for Head of Research Institute

Court noted that the following Senate Assessor would be on an appointing committee for the Headship of the Institute of Health and Wellbeing, which was a Court appointment. The Institute had been set up following the restructuring on 1 August 2010.

College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences
Institute for Health & Wellbeing

Senate Assessor: Alan Owen

For Heads of Research Institutes, the appointing committee would normally comprise the Principal or nominated Vice-Principal (Convener); the Head of College; a Head of School; Research Institute staff representative; and a Senate Assessor on Court.

CRT/2010/39. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2010/39.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2010/39.1.1 SFC Return

Court noted the details of a mid-year financial return made to the SFC. The request for the return and the proposed format had been discussed at the previous meeting.

CRT/2010/39.1.2 Financial Information

Court noted Period 7 2010/11 Financial Information, including details on capital projects.

CRT/2010/39.2 Audit Committee

The report was noted. With regard to a reference in the report to contracts with overseas agents, in the context of the University’s forthcoming new obligations under the Bribery Act 2010, it was explained that the University would need to examine contracts carefully in respect of payment of funds to overseas recruitment agents who assisted with recruiting students. With regard to a reference in the report to a risk workshop, Olwyn Byron asked about the use of external facilitators and whether this had been beneficial. Court noted that there had been benefits from focusing on external as well as internal risks and from College perspectives having been sought; it had also been useful to have an independent scoring system applied to risks. In the context of a question
about how the effectiveness of risk assessment was monitored, Mr Kevin Sweeney explained how risks were managed and mitigated. Court agreed that a retrospective review of any unforeseen risks would be useful.

**CRT/2010/39.3 Human Resources Committee**

The report was noted.

**CRT/2010/39.4 Estates Committee**

Court noted and endorsed Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications in respect of the Carbon Reduction Programme in the sum of £1.52m; a Lift Replacement Programme in the sum of £3m over a five year programme; and proposed refurbishment of Boyd Orr Labs Level 9 in the sum of £910k.

**CRT/2010/39.5 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee**

The annual report of the Committee was noted.

**CRT/2010/40. Research Report**

Professor Steve Beaumont, Vice Principal Research & Enterprise, provided a report on Research performance. Court was reminded that when it has last been updated in 2010, the environmental factors affecting research had included possible threats in the form of ‘ringfencing’ of the science budget, possible efficiency savings in FEC uplift, the SFC Research Excellence Grant (QR) being unknown at that time, and threats to the Knowledge Transfer Grant. Opportunities had been highlighted in the area of European funding and other international sources, particularly the USA.

Since then, institutions had been advised that the science budget would be protected; within that ‘ringfence’, the Medical Research Council budget would increase by 5%, other Research Councils would be cut by 3%, and Universities would be expected to make ‘efficiency savings’ through cuts to the proportion of Full Economic Cost overhead rates paid by Research Councils. Research Councils were adopting measures to manage demand, were focusing funding on Early Career Researchers and ‘outstanding’ performers, and in some cases were intending to shape the research landscape. Within Scotland, the Research Excellence Grant had been protected in cash terms; funding for 4* and 3* research had been protected in real terms by axing support for 1* research and cutting support for 2*. The Knowledge Transfer Grant had been cut by 10%, £3M had been cut from budget for Research Pools, and the budget for competitive Knowledge Transfer funding had been halved.

Court noted KPIs relating to Research, covering Research income per FTE, percentage of staff holding research grants, research output quality, PGR students per academic FTE, and PGR satisfaction. There were signs that growth in new awards was slowing. 2010 had not been a strong year for applications and overall success rate, with consequent impact on growth; this was an issue affecting other institutions. Research Council success rates had however showed an improvement on 2008-09 performance, and the run-rate of new applications had increased in the current year, with a significant growth in applications to Europe. With regard to quality of research output, there had been a small but steady growth in output volume over a period of about a decade, and a
very stable distribution of outputs between journal quality categories. However, a high proportion of publications in B and C categories was being tackled, via feedback to staff from the mini-REF.

Court noted details of risks relating to research, particularly in relation to a possible decrease in research funding, to the outcome of the REF2014 and to a possible loss of momentum when Pooling came to an end.

Research highlights included the launch of the Institute of Health & Wellbeing, an increase in European awards and applications, the launch of EasyAccessIP, 2 new transatlantic projects aimed at improving the efficiency of photosynthesis, the award of a Scotland-wide ESRC Doctoral Training Centre, Glasgow’s involvement in the first Technology & Innovation Centre for High Value Manufacturing, and the first Advanced Investigator award.

In summary, while the outcome of the spending review for the research budget was better than expected, the Research and Funding Councils were entering a period of austerity in ways which could affect the University disproportionately. Following restructuring in 2010, the University was better aligned to compete in this environment, particularly with regard to thematic research, but the dip in new awards required to be addressed rapidly. There were indications of improvement. Measures and actions to increase competitiveness and support excellence remained essential.

Court thanked Professor Beaumont for the report.

**CRT/2010/41. Report from the Rector**

The Rector referred to item CRT/2010/37.3 Student Occupation – Independent Investigation and to his role as chair of the inquiry.

Invitations for the Rectorial installation ceremony on 19 April had been sent to Court members.

**CRT/2010/42. Communications from meeting of Senate 18 March 2011**

Court had received a detailed report of the special meeting of Senate held on 18 March. At the special meeting, a series of motions had been agreed regarding the current process of consultation on cost-reduction. Court considered these and agreed to respond as follows (motions in italics):

1. *That the consultation on the proposed 'cost reduction' involve the University as a whole and Senate in particular and not only those 'affected areas' under review*

   Court supported this motion.

2. *That no decisions relating to academic subject areas are made by Court following the consultation until after the policy of the Scottish Government for public funding of universities sin Scotland is clarified following the general election in May, and after the outcome of the Voluntary Severance scheme is known.*

   Court decided, in line with its discussions under item CRT/2010/38.1 Consultation Exercise on Cost Reduction, that no final decisions would be taken until the Court meeting on 22 June. It hoped this decision would help address Senate's concerns.
.3 That the Principal and SMG present to the next meetings of Senate and Court alternative models for achieving 'cost reductions', including one which seeks to avoid the closure of academic subject areas and degree programmes.

The Principal had agreed to this request.

.4 Senate confirms categorically that to date Senate has sanctioned no specific proposed cuts, in any academic subject area anywhere in the University, in connection with the proposals currently before Court.

Court noted this motion as a statement of fact.

.5 Senate request of Court that a Senate Assessor and representative of the Students' Representative Council should serve alongside a lay member of Court on consultation panels set up to carry out consultation with a particular subject area.

The Convener of Court had contacted all Senate members in response to this motion. While it was not felt practical to respond in the terms requested, Court hoped that his comments would have given some assurance regarding the robustness of the consultation process.

.6 That the data held by the Senior Management Group (SMG) (as referred to in Terms of Reference for Consultation Panels) should be released to Senate alongside the data for all subject areas and not just those targeted in the consultation, together with the full version of the plans already presented to Court.

Court noted that the Principal had agreed to this request.

.7 That the reports and conclusions of the Consultation Panels relating to academic subject areas be presented to Senate in full alongside any proposals SMG wishes to present to Court, and before and decisions are made by Court.

Court agreed, and looked forward to receiving Senate's comments before decisions were made on 22 June.

.8 Senate would welcome improved channels of communication with Court, and for that purpose asks for an informal joint meeting between Court and Senate (Perhaps through a delegation of Senators who could be elected by Senate). Senate requests that such a meeting take place prior to the meeting at which Court will make its final decisions regarding the current proposals for cost reductions.

Court agreed that it would also welcome improved communications. The Convener of Court would attend Senate on 28 April, and the lay members of the consultation panels would be happy to attend the following meeting of Senate, when the reports of the Panels would be available. Regarding the suggestion of Senate delegates, Court was conscious that Senate Assessors already served an important function as members of Senate who were also members of Court, and it would not want to introduce a new arrangement that might undermine their role.

Court members who were members of consultation panels were invited to attend the Senate meeting on 2 June subject to their availability.
CRT/2010/43. Enhancement-Led Institutional Review Year-on report

The University had undergone its Enhancement-led Institutional Review by the Quality Assurance Agency in late 2009. The Scottish Funding Council required that, one year after the date the ELIR report was published, universities submit to QAA a one year-on response to the report. The SFC also required that the institutional response be approved by the Governing Body. A draft year-on response had been provided to Court. Professor Frank Coton advised Court that the report had been updated following a recent meeting of Education Policy & Strategy Committee, to include reference to the Student Lifecycle Project and to student partnerships.

Court approved the response being forwarded to the QAA.

CRT/2010/44. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2010/45. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 22 June 2011 in the Senate Room