Court – Wednesday 20 June 2012

Principal’s Report

Items A: For Discussion

1. Funding Environment

Court will receive further details of the University budget and financial forecasts, from Professor Neal Juster, at the June meeting.

The budget and financial forecast features a very broad-based and substantial investment plan, mainly focused on our academic units, with even pro-rata investments across the 4 colleges. The main investments in services focused on the estate, international recruitment, and college-focused alumni engagement and fundraising.

2. Outcome Agreements

The Scottish Government has indicated that it expects the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) to ensure that improved outcomes are delivered by the universities across the following areas:

- Retention
- Articulation from college
- Accelerated degrees, including entry into the second year of the undergraduate degree programme from school
- Access to university for people from the widest possible range of backgrounds
- International competitiveness in research
- University/industry collaboration and the exploitation of research
- The pattern and spread of provision
- Efficiency, both in the learning journey and of institutions
- The entrepreneurial and employability skills of graduates.

In seeking to deliver the government agenda, SFC has indicated that it will establish an outcome agreement (OA) with each university that will contain targets, to allow the SFC and the sector to quantify improvements across the areas identified in the Cabinet Secretary’s letter of guidance (21 September 2011), as well as other specific outcomes currently set out in offers and conditions of grant. The OA will incorporate and take precedence over the conditions of grant. The institutional OA must be in place by the start of Academic Year 2012-13. Signing of the OA will indicate the acceptance of the updated funding allocation by the University.

SFC has indicated that progress with developing OAs will be iterative, such that OAs will continue to evolve and be refined and redefined through engagement on an individual basis with institutions supported by discussion at a national level. Core underpinning principles of the process and engagement with institutions have been outlined as follows

- robust approach that enables comparisons across the sector
- ambitious but appropriately informed outcomes
- ensure that outcomes are contextualised
- basket of outcomes that capture the breadth of challenges faced by institutions;
• approach is responsive to changes internally and externally.

Due to the short timescale for delivering OAs for the year 2012/13, the focus will be on

• Widening access
• Knowledge exchange (enhance University/Industry collaboration and the exploitation of research)
• Pattern of provision

Within these priorities SFC have noted that Government is considering giving the widening access element of outcome agreements statutory force, and that the Cabinet Secretary has requested priority be given to university-industry collaboration and the exploitation of research.

The UoG team (Professors Nolan, Juster, Beaumont, Coton and Martin Boyle and James Harrison) met with SFC staff (Lead, Stuart Fancey) on 23rd May. SFC noted that the OA will be an expression of the Council’s wish to introduce a new way of working, with the Council keen to support universities on a ‘needs basis’. OAs are intended to be dynamic ‘living’ documents, reflective of the University and SFC ambition and of an ongoing interactive approach. The OAs will be ‘bespoke’ agreements with the 10 research intensive institutions and Small Specialist Institutions, while the post-92 universities will be dealt with on a regional basis along with FE colleges that provide HE. The future relationship with funding has not been decided by the Council (and thus it will remain for 2012/13 as driven currently), but OAs will be central. It is the SFC’s intention to seek to use common measures across the sector where possible. All OAs will be published, with the facility to protect commercially sensitive information. The SFC clarified that the University and SFC should be in a position to sign off the institutional OA by the 31st July.

In preparation for the meeting, the UoG group considered how the University’s strategy and its associated 20 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) mapped on to the SFC priorities. There are areas where work is required to clarify our approach to delivering outcomes for SFC and the government in the medium term. Our goal in developing a Glasgow OA is to ensure that it reflects the outcomes we are committed to for 2014/15 and beyond. The initial priorities for work were identified as

a. developing relevant measures of performance against our emerging Widening Access strategy that delivers our ambition (focused on access to the professions) while addressing SFC and government priorities.

b. agreeing indicators to monitor progress in Knowledge Exchange (University/Industry collaboration) and to lay out our ambition in this area for the longer term.

c. gaining greater understanding of the SFC approach to Pattern of Provision.

UoG received a set of 38 questions on the 30th May, focused on the three priorities for 2012/13 with a subset of questions regarding the Joint Academic Strategy for Crichton Campus, our ambitions with respect to research, the impact of each initiative in receipt of strategic funding from SFC, and progress with our estates strategy. The questions are intended to guide institutional responses and provide the OA framework.

The UoG team is articulating its objectives and developing its preferred targets re WA and KE, highlighting our priorities in these areas. Furthermore we will outline our ambition in each area (e.g. Technology Innovation Centres) and the investment required to deliver. An ‘internal’ OA is currently being drafted for discussion by SMG. The SRC has also been involved in discussions through the President-elect. The high level goals and targets will be used as a basis for further discussion with SFC at the next meeting on 18th June. Thereafter further work will be done to produce a near final OA for 2012/13 for SMG on 18th July; a third meeting with SFC will be scheduled near the end of July.

Given the short timescale for agreement this year, it is proposed that the draft paper that goes to SMG is also circulated to Court at the same time, and that authority to sign off the OA is delegated to the Convenor of Court and the Principal. It is not envisaged that the 2012-13 OA will involve any deviation from our strategic KPIs or budgeting decisions, given the approach being taken by SFC. Future OAs will be
likely to impact more directly on University strategic goals and the discussion and negotiation of these agreements for 2013-14 onwards will require much greater discussion by Court.

3. REF Selection Criteria - Quality Thresholds

As Court heard at the last meeting, the University's submission to REF will be selective, with selection informed by the mini-REF and assessment of more recent outputs. The SMG has considered the matter in more detail and has approved a minimum institutional quality threshold, together with raised thresholds for a number of individual Units of Assessment. **Court’s ratification of the decisions is sought.**

4. UK Border Agency Audit: Update

The University’s Highly Trusted Sponsor Status was approved by UKBA on 11 May and will be valid until 23 September 2012. UKBA are expected to visit the University to carry out a compliance audit focusing on the way on which the University exercises its sponsor duties. As yet we have no date but expect the visit will take place before September.

Information obtained from other HEIs who have already been audited indicates that we will require to be able to produce evidence of compliance and have fully documented procedures and processes that clearly delineate individual responsibilities for exercising sponsor duties across University Services and Colleges.

The Project Team carrying out the preparatory work is chaired by the Deputy Secretary and comprises the Director of HR, representatives from the Senate Office, each of the Colleges, SMG, Registry, Student Lifecycle Support and Development (SLSD) and Recruitment & International Office RIO (Admissions).

The areas being considered in detail are: Admissions and Confirmation of Acceptance for Studies (CAS), Academic Technology Approval Scheme (ATAS), English Language; Record Keeping and Reporting Duties; Partners and Agents; Place of Study; Writing Up PGs and Sponsorship Ends

A second meeting of the Project Team will be held on 22 June 2012, when reports on the agreed actions will be received and reviewed.

4.1 International Students and migration

UUK arranged a letter which was sent on 29 May to the Prime Minister on behalf of 67 Chancellors and Chairs of Council from universities across the UK, asking the Prime Minister to support the proposal to take international students out of the definition of net migration. The letter was signed by our Chancellor, Sir Kenneth Calman.

4.2 Northern Ireland Students and Fees

The advice that we are giving students is that we will be assessing new entrants on the basis of their status on the 1st August 2012. We are advising them that we expect students holding an EU passport on that date will be considered by SAAS to be eligible for EU Tuition fee support and we are indicating that we expect to treat all students who are deemed eligible for EU tuition fee support by SAAS as EU students in terms of their fee status at the University of Glasgow.

5. Stevenson Building Extension and GUU Social Facility

On 20 June, Court will receive the minutes of Estates and Finance Committees, both of which have recently discussed the proposed investment in the Stevenson Building Extension and GUU Social facility. Both Committees approved this capital project, and in discussion both recorded a concern that, in approving substantial investment in a facility that will not meet the University’s normal return on investment thresholds and that will be leased to GUU for nil consideration, the University ought to stipulate certain conditions that should be attached to the lease. SMG took a similar view when it discussed the proposal on 11 June,
approving the project, and asking that arrangements be put in place to ensure the University community as a whole secures good value from the investment.

With Court's approval, the Student Finance Committee* will continuously monitor GUU's financial performance and its management of the new social facility, conducting an annual dialogue with GUU's officials, and reporting annually to Court. Court will reserve the right, should GUU fail to meet the terms of the lease, to terminate the lease, giving one year's notice.

The terms of the lease will be:

1. that GUU submits quarterly management accounts within 4 weeks of each quarter-end;
2. that there is effective financial management and budgetary control;
3. that GUU budgets for and delivers an annual operating surplus;
4. that GUU makes good its pledge to reduce its reliance on University grant, with grant to be reduced from £225K to £150K following completion of the capital project;
5. that GUU maintains the accommodation in good condition; and
6. that GUU cooperates with the University to secure best value for the University community from the new facility: i.e. that it should be made available for wider University use on days when it is not required by GUU.

In addition, during the period of capital works, the Student Finance Committee should:

1. require GUU - working with the University and the other student organisations - to take reasonable steps to mitigate the impact of revenue loss.
2. having regard to 1 above, allocate sufficient grant to allow GUU to return a break-even position in the financial years affected by the capital works.

**Is Court content to approve this approach?**

* Current membership of the Student Finance Committee is: David Newall (convener), Graham Caie, Robert Fraser, Neal Juster, Alan MacFarlane, Michael Scott Morton, Dorothy Welch.

6. **Government Proposal to introduce a cap on the amount of tax relief that donors can claim on charitable donations**

Court members will have heard or read that the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced on 31 May 2012 that the Government will not now be introducing a cap on the tax relief available for donations to charities. This is good news and an excellent outcome following the strong and concerted lobbying from Charities and Universities.

**Items B: For Information**

7. **Key activities**

Below is a summary of some of the main activities I have been involved in since the last meeting of Court (18 April).

I have divided the report into 4 themes: Academic Development and Strategy; Internationalisation activities; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; Internal activities and Communications.
7.1 Academic Development and Strategy
I have continued to be involved in interviewing for key appointments including: a Chair in Economics; the Samson Gemmell Chair (Child Health); Stevenson Chair in Hispanic Studies; the MacDowell Chair in Greek; the Chair in Business History and candidates for the Clerk of Senate.
I attended the Russell Group VC Board meeting and dinner on 26 April and the UUK Board Meeting on the 27 April.
I attended the Universitas 21 meeting in Lund on 10 May which included the U21 AGM and Presidential Symposium. Professor Andrea Nolan and Fiona Docherty, Director of Recruitment & International Office also attended as the key focus for the conference was Internationalisation. The very exciting news to emerge from this meeting was that Glasgow has been chosen to host the U21 Presidents Symposium in 2014, the first time it has come to the UK.
On the 18 May, I attended the UUK Members Meeting in London.

7.2 International Activities
On 1 May, I hosted a Lodging dinner for Professor Alan Brinkley, Allan Nevins Professor of American History and Professor Sandro Galea, the Gelman Professor and Chair of Epidemiology both of Columbia University, one of our key international partner Universities. The Professors were both delivering lectures at the University and this was an ideal opportunity to further develop our partnership.
I hosted a visit and Lodging dinner for the Bavarian Minister of Education and Culture Dr Ludwig Spaenle and his party and was delighted that Mike Russell, Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning was also able to join us.
On 17 May I met a delegation from Zhongnan University of Economics & Law, China. ZUEL is seeking to develop links with Glasgow particularly in Mathematics, though there is potential to extend this to Economics and Law.
The Portuguese Ambassador to the UK, HE João de Vallera, visited the University on the 25 May to give a lecture in association with the Business School Seminar and Research events. He was able to join me for lunch prior to the lecture: the lecture focused on the Portuguese economy.
I will be singing an MoU on 12 May with Ahmedabad University, Gujarat, India.
On the 29 May I travelled to McGill University, Montreal, to receive an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree. McGill University has close connections with Glasgow as its founder John McGill hailed from Glasgow and attended the University before setting off to Canada for a new life. Founded in 1821, McGill in celebrating its 190 years, was recognizing its connections with us through this honour and I am proud and privileged to follow in the footsteps of two distinguished Principals of the University of Glasgow, Sir Donald MacAllister and Sir Hector Hetherington who also received honorary degrees of LLD from McGill, in 1906 and 1946 respectively. McGill’s hospitality was warm and welcoming; it was a special occasion indeed, and reaffirmed our desire to build and develop our existing collaborations. I also used the occasion to meet some of our alumni and donors in Montreal.
On 5 June we hosted a visit and dinner from the Chancellor and senior colleagues from Nankai University, and the Director-General and Deputy-Director General of the Hanban, the Chinese Government agency responsible for the Confucius Institutes. We were able to progress our discussions with Nankai on possible transnational education opportunities in Tianjin, and the Hanban were most pleased with the progress of our Confucius Institute after 6-9 months of operation. The Director of the Hanban, Madame Xu Lin was extremely complimentary of her visit to Glasgow.

7.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University
On the 25 April, I had the pleasure of speaking to a UK gathering of College Secretaries who were visiting the University for a day and half conference. The group is based around Universities that have undergone
recent restructuring and provides College Secretaries with the opportunity to share and learn from each other. As requested, I spoke on the subject Entrepreneurialism in Managing universities.

On the 3 May I attended and spoke at an Alumni lunch at the Athenaeum Club in London which focused on graduates from the 1950s. Later that evening I hosted a dinner for donors and potential supporters at Scott’s restaurant. Both events provided me with the opportunity to update our London based alumni and supporters on the University, our strategic direction and progress and to thank them for their continuing support and interest.

I attended my first strategy meeting of the Scottish Funding Council Board on 11 May, with the first business meeting planned for 29 June.

On the 15 May I chaired a further meeting of the Higher and Further Education work stream, which is one of six workstreams under the Glasgow Economic Leadership (GEL) initiative. As Court members will recall from my last report, GEL was established in 2011 to provide independent leadership and direction to economic development activity in Glasgow and to champion the implementation of the recommendations made by the Glasgow Economic Commission.

I had the opportunity of meeting with John Swinney and the Chief Economic Adviser at St Andrews House on 22 May.

On the 24 May I had a lunch meeting with Professor Gordon Marshall, Director of Leverhulme and in the evening attended a Royal Society of Edinburgh/David Hume Institute roundtable discussion on aspects of Higher Education.

I will join the Head of College, MVLS, and colleagues in a meeting (15 June) with Declan Mulkeen, Director of Research Programmes, MRC, to update him and the Council on research activity currently supported and funded by them at the University.

7.4. Internal activities and Communications

I recorded a further podcast for staff, continued with staff surgeries, my monthly meetings with the SRC and on 18 June will host a reception in the Lodging for major grant award winners.

By the time of Court, I will also have held three staff talks, two on Gilmorehill and one at the Vet School. These talks focus on delivering our strategy, our investment plans and the progress we are making to meet our targets.

I was delighted to attend and say a few words at the reception hosted by MVLS in honour and celebration of Professor Eddy Liew becoming a Fellow of the Royal Society. Becoming a fellow is a tremendous accolade and honour not just for the recipient but for the University.

I was due to attend the first China Lecture organized jointly by our Confucius Institute and the Scottish Centre for China Research based at the University but sadly was unable to attend due to illness. Professor Anne Anderson hosted the lecture in my place. The lecture, entitled Riding the Tiger: Challenges of China’s Municipal Finance in the 21st Century was given by Professor Christine Wong, Professor of Chinese Public Finance, and Director of Chinese Studies, School of Interdisciplinary Area Studies, University of Oxford. I understand it was extremely well attended which was very encouraging for our Institute, which hopes to make the China lecture an annual event.

I had the pleasure of attending the SRC Annual Council Dinner and Sabbatical Handover Ceremony on the 18 May. Always a happy occasion, I was delighted to offer a toast to the SRC, which was no chore given the excellent work the Council does for and on behalf of our students. It was an opportunity to thank and acknowledge their contribution to campus life and to express my appreciation for the good and cooperative working relationship the SRC and SMG enjoy.

At the time of writing, we are looking forward to Commemoration Day (13 June) and to hosting the Glasgow School of Art graduations (15 June).
8. Senior Management Group business

In addition to standing items, the following issues were discussed.

**SMG Meeting 19 April 2012**
- UoG/Hunterian and Moroccan University museums
- REF2014: quality thresholds and shape of submission
- Scottish Innovation Centres
- Graduate Entrepreneurship Invitation
- Management of Teaching Space
- Campus Network Upgrade Proposal

**SMG Meeting 16 May 2012**
- Progress Report on Workload Modeling
- Widening Participation – proposals for a new approach to WP.
- Draft Budget 2012/13 and Four Year Forecast
SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Management of Organisational Change: Accounts Receivable function

At its last meeting, Court received details of a proposal to restructure the accounts receivable function within the University, involving the transfer of activity from Registry to Finance Office, which will help to ensure a better integrated approach to debt collection and accounting. The transfer would mean that three posts, currently based in the Registry, will no longer be required. Court approved the recommendations that a Redundancy Committee be established, along with a Structural Change Committee to advise the Redundancy Committee for the purposes of the Management of Compulsory Redundancy Protocol. Court asked that information be provided on how the University will ensure that there is no detriment to the quality of front-line support service to students.

The Redundancy Committee met on 12 June. It received an update and recommendations from the Structural Change Committee.

The Redundancy Committee noted that the potential redundancy in relation to the Grade 8 post has been fully mitigated with the postholder having been redeployed into a Financial Aid role in Student Services. The postholder is therefore no longer at risk of potential redundancy and the matter will not form part of further deliberations by the Redundancy Committee. Court is asked to note this.

With regard to the two other posts, the Grade 7 member of staff took up a secondment in the Graduate School in the College of Science & Engineering on 7 May, for the period to 31 October 2012. The Grade 6 member of staff was seconded to the Graduate School in the College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences (MVLS) on 14 May, until January 2013. The Structural Change Committee will engage in discussions in the coming weeks to establish the viability for potential longer-term roles for the staff within these two Colleges.

If redeployment discussions fail to achieve a successful outcome for the longer term, and if no further mitigation measures become available, the Redundancy Committee will be required to meet again, in advance of the October Court meeting, to approve recommendations relating to two potential redundancies. Voluntary Severance (on the terms publicised in the 2011 scheme) has been offered to the two affected staff, in the event that the University is unable fully to mitigate the two potential redundancies.

At the last meeting of Court, concern was expressed regarding possible detriment to the quality of front-line support to students. In that regard, it should be noted that the three posts affected were not part of the front-line support team in the Fraser Building.
and that, given the difficult experience of Registration and Enrolment at the start of
the current session, additional resources are being committed to enhance the front-
line team for the start of session 2012/13.

A further update will be provided to Court at its next meeting.

A.2 Review of Court’s Effectiveness

At the last meeting, Court noted from David Ross that a review of Court’s
effectiveness will be undertaken and that this might include input from members by
way of interview. Since the meeting, a small group of Court members has been
convened to oversee the effectiveness review. The group comprises David Ross,
Susan Ashworth, James Harrison and Alan Owen, and its intention is to engage the
services of someone with extensive experience of higher education governance to
conduct the review. A suitably qualified individual has been identified, and the
group had a preliminary meeting with him in early June to brief him on University
governance at Glasgow and ask about his experience of undertaking effectiveness
reviews and his likely approach to conducting such a review at Glasgow.

Subject to agreeing satisfactory terms and conditions, the group would like Court's
authority to engage the consultant, and to agree with him a schedule for his work,
which will include attendance at Court and committee meetings, and interviews with
members of Court.

A.3 Western Infirmary

The University is in continuing discussion with NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde
regarding the possible acquisition by the University of 'Western Infirmary Site B', a
four-acre site that remains in the ownership of the Health Board, following the
University's acquisition of the larger part of the Site (10 acres) in March 2011.

Court has asked a sub-group of governors and University officers to oversee this
transaction, and the group met on 12 June and reviewed the possible terms of
acquisition. It has now given University officers authority to take forward final
negotiations with the Health Board with a view to acquiring the site. The proposed
date of purchase is 30 June 2012.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR
APPROVAL

B.1 Senate Communications Working Group

As part of its work, a subgroup of the Senate Communications Working Group has
drafted a guide on governance in the University. The guide is being finalised. Court
members will receive a copy.

More details on the Group’s activities and recommendations appear in the
Communications from Senate.
B.2 Review of Higher Education Governance

At the last meeting, Court approved a document as a fair reflection of its views on the von Prondzynski report on the Review of Higher Education Governance. It is still not clear how Ministers will be taking forward the outcomes of the review. More information should be forthcoming over the summer.

B.3 Student Lifecycle Project / MyCampus

At the last meeting, Court received a progress report on the implementation of MyCampus, identifying in particular the steps being taken to help ensure that Registration and Enrolment will run more satisfactorily in 2012. Court also received details of the recommendations of the Lessons Learned Group and progress against each.

Annex 1 provides an update on the current position.

B.4 University of Glasgow Pension Scheme

In March 2012, the Pension Regulator wrote to June Crombie, Chair of the Trustees of the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme, intimating the Regulator's concerns regarding the proposed Recovery Plan, by which it is intended that the University will address the deficit in the Pension Scheme. The Pension Regulator's letter also suggested that the Pension Trustees should undertake an independent assessment of the strength of the University's financial covenant (in recent years, the Trustees have assessed the strength of the covenant on the basis of an annual presentation from the Director of Finance).

The Trustees have now engaged an independent party to conduct an assessment of the University's financial covenant, and will consider the advice received in August 2012. They will then enter into discussion with the Pension Regulator regarding the terms of the pension scheme recovery plan. I will update Court on these discussions in October.

Meanwhile, in view of the clear conflict of interest associated with his position on the Trustee Board, the Director of Finance has decided to stand down as a Trustee. In his place, Court is asked to approve the appointment of the Vice-Principal (Strategy & Resources) to serve as an employer-nominated member of the Pension Trustees.

B.5 University Trust

Many gifts and donations to the University are made to and administered by the University of Glasgow Trust, which is an independent charitable trust for the benefit of the University. The board of trustees contains a number of external members, as well as University staff, including the Clerk of Senate, Graham Caie. Following Graham’s retirement from the University in the summer, there will be a vacancy on the board. Court’s approval is sought for a recommendation from Court to the Trust that Frank Coton, Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching), replace Graham Caie on the board.
B.6 Court Strategy Day

The annual strategy day will be held on Tuesday 25 September. Further details will be sent nearer the time.

B.7 Employee Representative

Alex Ross’s term on Court ends on 31 July 2012. Having served three terms of two years on Court, he was not eligible for re-nomination to the position. The Joint Union Liaison Committee has nominated a member of staff to succeed Alex, and in accordance with established procedure, further nominations are being sought from among other eligible staff members in the University. An election will be held if required, for a two-year term starting on 1 August.

B.8 General Council Assessors on Court

At its half-yearly meeting on 23 June, the General Council will be asked to approve the re-appointments of David Anderson and David Ross as nominees to two General Council positions on Court, to serve for four years from 1 August 2012; and to accept the nomination of Mr Brian McBride to the vacancy created by the retirement from Court of Susan Dunsmore, to serve for four years from 1 August 2012.

B.9 Senate Assessor on Court

Dr Marie Freel from the College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences has been elected to Court until 31 July 2016, replacing Gordon Hay.

B.10 Media Report

The latest media report is at Annex 2.

Susan Stewart will brief Court members on external communications, at the pre-Court meeting on 20 June.

B.11 Resolutions

The following Resolution has been approved:

RESOLUTION 654 - CHANGE OF NAME OF THE MCLEOD/ARTHRITIS & RHEUMATISM COUNCIL CHAIR OF RHEUMATOLOGY (AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION NO 331)

The following draft Resolution has been approved and is with the Senate and General Council for comment:

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 652 - CHANGE OF NAME OF THE RANKINE CHAIR OF ENGINEERING (MECHANICS AND MECHANISM) (AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE No. 313 (GLASGOW No. 86))

The following draft Resolutions have been approved. They relate to academic matters including degree regulations, and were drafted in the Senate Office, incorporating comments from the General Council:
DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 564-4 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 564 – CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 564-5 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 564 – CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 552-4 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 552 - GENERIC REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREES GAINED BY THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 557-3 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 557 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF RESEARCH

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 564-6 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 564 – CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 596-1 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 596 - DEGREES OF BACHELOR OF ENGINEERING, BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING AND MASTER OF ENGINEERING

DRAFT RESOLUTION 605-1 – AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION 605 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE AND DEGREE OF MASTER IN SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 609-1 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 609 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS (SCOTTISH AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE) AND BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (SCOTTISH AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE)

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 363-1 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN VETERINARY SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 552-5 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 552 - GENERIC REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREES GAINED BY THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 557-4 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 557 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF RESEARCH

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 564-7 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 564 – CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 596-2 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 596 - DEGREES OF BACHELOR OF ENGINEERING, BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING AND MASTER OF ENGINEERING

DRAFT RESOLUTION 605-2 – AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION 605 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE AND DEGREE OF MASTER IN SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 609-2 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 609 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS (SCOTTISH AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE) AND BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (SCOTTISH AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE)

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 621 – DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 626 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF THEOLOGY IN SCOTTISH CHURCH HISTORY AND THEOLOGY

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 627 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY IN TEXTILE CONSERVATION

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 628 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF NURSING

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 629 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DESIGN IN FASHION AND TEXTILES
DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 363-2 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN VETERINARY SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 382-1 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN DENTAL SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 533-1 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MEDICAL SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 552-6 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 552 - GENERIC REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREES GAINED BY THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 557-5 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 557 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF RESEARCH

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 558-2 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 558 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 564-8 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 564 – CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 575-3 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 575 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 576-2 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 576 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF LETTERS

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 596-3 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 596 - DEGREES OF BACHELOR OF ENGINEERING, BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING AND MASTER OF ENGINEERING

DRAFT RESOLUTION 605-3 – AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION 605 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE AND DEGREE OF MASTER IN SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 636 – DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LETTERS

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 643 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DESIGN IN DIGITAL CULTURE (GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART)

DN/DM
This paper provides a brief overview of the current status of the MyCampus student system implementation. In recent months, much work has been focused on addressing the recommendations contained in the Lessons Learned Group's Report, and in preparing generally to ensure that the Registration and Enrolment process in 2012 will operate much more efficiently than it did in 2011.

The main current issues are as follows.

1. **Programme plan rule checking**
   This has proceeded well, with each College undertaking a substantial exercise to check plan rules. Robust programme plan rules are required for students to progress smoothly to enrolment for the next year of study.

2. **Software Enhancements**
   A range of software enhancements has been developed, following the Lessons Learned Group report, and with the involvement of Specialist User Groups, which include experts from Schools and service departments. Software development is on schedule.

3. **Training**
   A comprehensive training schedule has been published, including the impact of the recent software enhancements, and the Project Team, Deans (Learning & Teaching) and service managers are monitoring the uptake so as to ensure that all those who need training do indeed register for it and participate in it.

   This is one of the key areas of activity at this time. It is important that, within each College, School, Institute and Service Department, there is clarity regarding which tasks are being performed by which staff, and that the relevant staff take the training that is being provided.

   Training for advisers of study has been discussed with the Chief Advisers, and is being tailored to the needs they have identified: i.e. the needs of advisers for general degrees are different from those of other advisers.

4. **Financial issues**
   The credit control team is addressing the remaining issues with student debt, which is higher than usual at this time of year. Many of the debt queries have demonstrated a lack of clarity among University staff regarding ownership of processes for applying financial aid to student accounts. Senior administrative staff in University Services and Colleges have met to discuss areas of concern and to clarify responsibilities where doubts remain.
5. **Support Model for Registration and Enrolment**

The Project Board has approved an enhanced first-line support model for the Registration and Enrolment period and a protocol governing which enquiries will be handled by the first-line team and which will require academic guidance from College-based staff, or technical guidance from the SLP Team.

6. **Graduation Enrolment**

Self service enrolment for graduation has proceeded satisfactorily with over 3,500 students having enrolled and paid the general council fee. As is always the case at this time of year, there is a short turnaround time between exam-mark return and the organisation of graduations. Staff have therefore been reminded, through Campus eNews, that it is important that they adhere to deadlines for exam mark return.

7. **Registration & Enrolment : Key Performance Indicators**

Court asked at its last meeting that thought be given as to how the Project Board will measure the success or otherwise of the steps it is taking to improve the Registration and Enrolment process this summer. The Board has discussed this and agreed to monitor a range of indicators, as set out on the following page. Several indicators will not allow for easy comparison with the position in 2011/12. However, comparisons can meaningfully be made of: Total number of calls logged with Supportworks; Volume of calls not resolved after 3 days; and Number of students not fully Registered at the start of term. In addition, Focus groups will explore with a range of staff and students their experience of using the system in 2012 compared with 2011.

---

David Newall  
Convener of Project Board  
10 June 2012
Registration & Enrolment – Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

To assess the effectiveness of the new support model and to determine whether the registration and enrolment process has been improved since 2011, the following measures are proposed:

- Number of calls logged in Supportworks
  - By type
  - By student group (e.g. UG, PG, International)
- Number of aged calls (unresolved after 3 days)
- Number of calls closed by 1st line support team
- Number of calls closed by 2nd line support
- Number of calls closed by 3rd line support

The statistics will be drawn from Supportworks.

- Number of requests received through other channels (e.g. phone, email & face to face)
- Number of requests through other channels which resulted in supportworks calls being logged

These 2 items will be captured through manual means by staff involved in the 1st line team.

- Number of students fully registered (measured at end of each week)
- Number of students started enrolment (measured at end of each week)
- Number of students not fully registered at start of term
- Number of students not enrolled by start of term

This final set of statistics will be generated from MyCampus according to agreed definitions.

In addition to the quantitative measures above, some qualitative assessment of the experience should be conducted. It is proposed that a series of focus groups be conducted during October/November to explore this. This would mirror the approach taken during the Lessons Learned Review last year and provide a basis for comparison.

The range of focus groups should include:
- Students (by group, UG/PG/International, full-time/part-time) For international students the intention would be to include relevant questions in the focus groups sessions routinely conducted by RIO.
- Academics (mainly advisers)
- Admin staff (University Services and Colleges)
- Support staff (1st Line Team)
- SRC officers
- SLSD staff

The remit of these discussions should, where appropriate, consider the preparatory activity as well as the experience during the registration and enrolment period.
It should be anticipated that regular statistical reports be produced throughout the period (e.g. weekly) based on the items listed above.

A full report should then be compiled during November, reflecting the Lessons Learned Review conducted last year and incorporating both qualitative and quantitative information.

Early consideration should be given to the data capture and reporting requirements to support the statistical analysis in order that we can ensure these are in place prior to the registration and enrolment period starting.
Media Activity Report

The University of Glasgow
Corporate Communications

1st January to 31st May 2012

Summary

This report summarises the University of Glasgow media coverage during the first five months of 2012. The report also includes detail of the launch of I-Tunes U, of our growing social media presence, and of traffic using the University of Glasgow website.

Monthly summaries of press coverage have also been written up for Campus E-News since January 2012, providing a regular digest of the University of Glasgow in the media for the wider university community.

Although there is detail on quantity and output within the report, it needs to be stated that the team is also working hard to identify and exploit media opportunities – particularly in broadcast and online - that deliver quality audiences that may not register as easily as the number of cuttings. This reflects an appreciation that securing prominent exposure on websites such as BBC Online leads to substantial diverse international pick-up for the University of Glasgow.

Most of the prominent stories in the media over the last five months have been research focussed, and have been well spread out across the colleges.

These have included the world’s largest study into Parkinson’s disease; a report on sugary drinks and health; research into the impact of the smoking ban on the health of pregnant women and their babies; a study into the length of specialised pieces of DNA which can be an indicator of longevity; a separate report into DNA and deprivation; a project examining the changing accent of Glaswegians; a study into how the brain interprets and “talks over” boring speech pattern; potential new methods for treating head and neck cancer; the use of space technology to chart the rate of growth of mountain ranges such as the Sierra Nevada; male fertility and the natural environment; and the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre marked the Queen’s Jubilee by producing the world’s smallest diamond tribute. All of these stories secured significant media exposure across a range of Scottish, UK and international outlets including Today on Radio 4, BBC Breakfast News, ITV News and the Channel 4 website.

We have also sought to extend our good relationships with influential reporters, such as the BBC Science correspondent Ken Macdonald. Two of the many pieces that he produced are worthy of comment, and both aired on Newsnight Scotland. The first concerned research into solar fuels technology, whilst the second focussed on the potential for 3D drugs printing. The former was posted on the BBC website, where it was the third most watched video by users from around the world. We also secured excellent television coverage on the BBC for the Centre for Textile Conservation and Technical Art History.
In other areas we have worked with colleagues from the College of Arts to secure the Scotsman as our media partner to promote the seminar series Vox Populi, which will run from this autumn until the summer of 2013. The Scotsman will publish eight articles each of around 1300 words that will focus on different aspects of when, and how, the voice of the Scottish people was heard in past history. We continue to meet with journalists, editors and reporters on a regular basis to promote the university and all that takes place here.

Beyond the obvious high measure media successes, there was also significant reporting of other stories such as the announcement of a group to champion Scottish studies; the launch of our Partner Schools initiative in Irvine; the revival of a chair in Greek; coverage around Burns Night with colleagues from the Centre for the Study of Robert Burns; a TV, radio and online report on research from a PhD student in Dumfries on a new way of delivering clean water in Africa; and continued reporting of our Young Alumnus, the singer-songwriter Emeli Sande. This included a cover story in the magazine supplement of the Sunday edition of the Sun where Emile made mention, as she invariably does, to her happy time at the University of Glasgow.

Corporate communications staff have also held “meet-the-media-relations-team” sessions with all four colleges. The media relations team can only work effectively if provided with timely information, and would encourage colleagues to get in touch for advice on any story or piece of research that might be of interest to the press.

Formal media training sessions will be offered later in the year.

**Media Activity Report – United Kingdom**

From 1 January 2012 to 31 May 2012 a total of 1473 media clips were generated across the UK media. These had an advertising value {AVE} of £7,773,606 and a total potential circulation of 1,457,444,660

There are no comparable statistics for the same period in 2011, but for the previous quarter covering October – December 2011, 823 clips were generated with an AVE of £3,843,731 and a total potential circulation of 676,765,684.

All press releases are available on the web at [http://www.gla.ac.uk/news](http://www.gla.ac.uk/news)

The quantitative output for the University of Glasgow continues to be strong, with significant successes recorded across mainstream print, online, social and broadcast media. Beyond maximising the number of media appearances, corporate communications has sought to target quality and influential output. Over the past five months this has seen broadcast appearances on programmes such as Horizon, PM, Today, Breakfast News and Newsnight and print exposure in all main UK, as well as Scottish titles.

The following graph illustrates the number of media clips received while subsequent table and pie chart illustrate how this figure translates across the separate sections of the University.
Corporate University includes all corporate services and other general university stories.

The following pie chart breaks down media coverage by media category:

Figure 1

Monthly UK Media Clips

- January - 358
- February - 265
- March - 284
- April - 283
- May - 283

Figure 2

Media Clips by University Section

- Arts - 12%
- MVLS - 46%
- Science and Engineering - 16%
- Social Sciences - 20%
- Corporate - 6%

* Corporate University includes all corporate services and other general university stories

The following pie chart breaks down media coverage by media category.
* Regional press includes Scottish newspapers such as the Daily Record, the Herald and the Scotsman. National refers, in the main, to London based UK-wide print media.

### Media Output:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Clips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Prof Naveed Sattar</td>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>Sugar in Drinks</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Prof Jill Pell</td>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>Smoking ban impact on pregnancy</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dr Donald Grossat</td>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>Parkinson’s Disease</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Prof Pat Monaghan</td>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>DNA Telomere research</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dr David Moran/Andrew Greer</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Jubilee nano diamond</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lecture by Lord Wallace of Tankerness</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Lecture on Scotland’s constitution</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7= Prof James Conroy</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>RE in Schools</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7= Bo Yao</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Brain Voice Study</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Macdowall Bequest</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Announcement of new chair in Greek</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Prof Neil Evans/Dr Michelle Bellingham</td>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>Fertility Study</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11= Prof Lee Cronin/Prof Richard Cogdell</td>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering/MVLS</td>
<td>Solar Fuels</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11= Lecture by Nicola Sturgeon MSP</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Lecture on Scotland’s constitution</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11= Centre for Robert Burns Studies</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Robert Burns</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11= Dr Jane Stuart-Smith</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Glasgow accent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Coverage

Over the period, a total of 3,063 international media clips were generated by news from the University. This compares to 3,077 in the preceding five months. As usual, the bulk of overseas coverage is in the USA (59%), but India is also strongly represented (10.5%), reflecting the increased focus and activity in that region. China remains low at (1.5%) but is a tough market and difficult to monitor effectively. Canada (9%) and Australia (8.5%) are notable this period too.

The chart below shows the geographical spread of international (non-European) coverage.

In European countries there were 372 articles generated over the period (compared to 440 in the previous period), the bulk of them in, Germany (20%), Sweden (13%) Ireland (10%), France (7%) and Spain (4.5%).
Over the period, there was a major event in Singapore (New partner programmes launched, alumni dinners, and academic events) in March. Stuart Forsyth from the Media Relations Office travelled to Singapore to assist with generating coverage of the event. Several journalists were invited to attend the networking receptions though none were able to make it, although two journalists: Lin Zhaowei of the Straits Times and Soon Weilun of Lianhe Zaobao attended the course launch event and interviewed the Principal. Coverage from this event has not yet been published/obtained.

The February instalment of the World 100 Reputation Network’s Aggregated University Online Reputational Assessor report recorded 10 international articles for Glasgow (compared to 24 last month). The report states that Glasgow achieved comparatively high impact scores for the quality of coverage received in relation to volume.

Glasgow’s research stories accounted for 98.8% of its total impact score. For February, Glasgow’s overall reputational score dropped considerably from 53,918 to 10,123 due to a lack of high-profile stories in the monitored period (The World 100 report only looks at one week within the month so results can vary widely depending on the time a story was issued). In January Glasgow was amongst the top 40 in terms of amount of coverage and achieved the highest-average impact score on its stories.

Social Media Monitoring

The Media Relations Office participates in and monitors various social media websites. Higher education institutions are increasingly using social media platforms as a way to supplement traditional news releases. Media Relations officers regularly update key news stories and events on Twitter and Facebook. We also respond to questions and comments and have created a “social media voice” that appears to resonate with the wider university community.

The success of our social media strategy can be seen in the tables below. We calculate that if all of our Facebook and twitter followers re-posted information, we would reach in excess of six million people. Using social media can also be important at times when we need to inform the community quickly. This was shown during last December’s storms, when corporate communications staff were able to advise of the closure of the university and then offer advice on issues such as the rescheduling of exams.

Twitter

The University of Glasgow currently ranks as 3rd in the UK (behind Oxford and Cambridge in number of followers and closely followed by Birmingham and Sheffield) and 1st in Scotland.

Since the end of December, the University of Glasgow has seen an increase of over 1500 Twitter followers. During this period we have maintained a narrow lead on Birmingham and Sheffield who have also added significant numbers of followers.
As of 31 May 2012 the University had 27,714 people (45%/54% male/female) who ‘like’ the page/institution. The majority are in Scotland and Glasgow – which is to be expected. Indonesia still has the second highest number of people engaging with us through Facebook (2702), ahead of the US who have our third highest number of followers (1,665). The locations in the world with the highest-group of fans are: Glasgow, London, Jakarta, Edinburgh, Lahore, Bagkok and Karachi.

Facebook cannot quantify figures over 90 days and so we have reported on ‘likes’ across the world from 31 December 2011 to March 2012.

### Twitter Followers Scotland - 31 May 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Followers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>16662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>13752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>9624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>8649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>7590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facebook Page 'likes' - 31 Dec 2011 - 31 Mar 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Followers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>10359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Website

External visitors to the University of Glasgow site showed a 29% increase in the first five months of 2012 compared to the same five months in 2011.

There were 2,194,500 unique visitors to the website, compared to 1,695,377 in the same January - May period last year.

Over the same time frames, the following also happened:

- The total number of page views increased by 45.57%
- The average visit duration increased by 9.63%
- Our bounce rate decreased by 3.39% (a bounce rate measures visitors who exit our site without clicking on anything; a low bounce rate is good)
- The percentage of visits from overseas has risen from 22% to 33%

These figures show that we have more we have more visitors, looking at more pages for a longer time for each visit. It seems fair to conclude that visitors are reaping the benefits of the increasing usability of our website and are finding a greater depth of information than at the same period last year.

iTunes U

The University of Glasgow’s iTunes U site was launched on 30 April 2012. We currently have 266 pieces of individual content in 58 different collections. As of 7 June, our ‘browse’ total (number of visitors browsing our content) was 69,612 and content has been accessed (downloaded, streamed, etc) 47,045 times.

The global iTunes U site holds more than 500,000 video and audio recordings of lectures, courses and other education content provided by higher education institutions from 26 countries. All content is offered free of charge (although course offerings can be restricted to those registered and approved by the course manager). Stanford University was the first university to feature on iTunes U; most of the major universities have now followed suit.

Since going live at the end of April, the University of Glasgow has consistently featured on the iTunes U home page, in the 'What's Hot' section which reflects popularity in downloads (for the collections 'Clinical Skills' and 'Writing for the Web'), and recently we had the top 8 downloaded videos for the whole of iTunes U in the UK (all eight from the School of Medicine’s Clinical Skills collection).

Other popular collections are the lectures from last year’s conference Transatlantic Slave Trade: the Scottish Connection, Prof Fergus McNeill's lectures on Punishment and Society, and the Afternow (public health) collection.
Court – Wednesday 20 June 2012

Report from the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on
30 May 2012

Cover Sheet

Brief description of the paper
This report sets out those items considered at the Finance Committe's last ordinary meeting which require Court approval or which it was considered should be brought to Court's attention.

Action Requested

A Items – for action

CA/2011/72. Budget 2012/13 and four year forecast
The Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources) presented the University Budget for 2012/13 and four year forecast to Finance Committee. Finance Committee noted that the budget and forecasts were predicated on a number of assumptions which were detailed in the papers. The papers also included a review of the University Key Performance Indicators and the extent to which they had been met or were on target to be met. The Committee noted that the University was performing well against KPIs particularly in the area of Undergraduate student satisfaction, international student growth and the number of PGR students per Academic FTE. However, the Vice Principal noted areas where the University has not yet met the KPI including in relation to percentage of staff holding research grants, research output quality and total postgraduate population. Despite this the University is performing well against Russell Group competitors.

Finance Committee recommended the budget to Court.

B Items – for noting

CA/2011/73. Stevenson Building extension and GUU Social Facility extension
The Committee considered two capex applications to extend and develop the sports facilities at the Stevenson Building, to replace the space currently leased at the Kelvin Hall, and to develop a new extension for the Glasgow University Union. The
Stevenson Extension application requested £9.2m with cashflow showing a net present value of -£3.936m at ten years but a positive net present value of £0.372m at twenty years.

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for the development of a GUU Social Facility for £4.148m. The preferred development included the creation of an additional ground floor social facility beneath the Stevenson building extension to house a nightclub, and bar or cafe space and adaptation of the existing basement to provide a link to the extension, a further bar or cafe facility, suitable toilet facilities and improved use of the rear courtyard. Additionally, while reviewing the GUU facilities it was recommended that a fire escape facility was added. The final element of the capex application was to compensate the GUU for loss of earnings during the development works. The Secretary of Court confirmed that this was the preferred option of the University and GUU officers who had, over several months, been involved in discussions to develop a satisfactory proposal.

Finance Committee noted concerns from the Director of Finance and Convener with regards to the GUU Social Facility capex application. 

Finance Committee approved the capex applications with the reservations noted, noting that the Principal would discuss the GUU proposal further with the Senior Management Group and advise Court of SMGs views.

CA/2011/74. Library Level 5 Annex Development

The Committee received a £1.705m capex application to create a postgraduate centre in Level 5 of the Library and £50,000 request to scope potential future developments to levels 2 and 3 of the library. The proposed development is to create a contemporary study space for postgraduate students to accommodate the increased number of postgraduate students the University has recruited and to provide facilities to allow further increase in postgraduate student numbers.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2011/79. Credit Ratings and Banking Limits

The Committee received a paper noting the considerations when managing the risk in banking the University’s cash deposits. The Committee noted that the Finance Office employ a risk management approach reviewing concentration and credit risk.

CA/2011/80. Treasury Management Policy Update

Annex contains an amendment to the University Financial Regulations section 3.04 Treasury Management. The amendment reflected issues discussed in agenda point CA/2011/79 in relation to management of credit and concentration risk. The proposed policy permitted investment of up to £30m in UK registered banks, building societies and money markets with a credit rating of A- or above (or where they are quasi nationalised) and up to £25m in non-UK banks and money market funds with a credit rating of AA- or above.

Finance Committee approved the revised policy.
CA/2011/81. Overview of Performance as at 30 April 2012
Finance Committee noted that the Period 9 results were £5.3m ahead of budget with a projected operation surplus at year end of £7.9m.

CA/2011/82. Debtors Reports as at 30 April 2012
The Finance Committee received the Period 9 overview of debtors and analysis of student and sponsor debt. Current total debt at 30 April 2012 sat at £31.58m versus £29.39m in April 2011. All forms of debt, with the exception of student and sponsor tuition fee debt and Small Animal Hospital debt, were lower than at 30 April 2011.

The Group Financial Controller presented an additional paper providing an analysis of the current position with student and sponsor tuition fee debt which stood at £12.60m in April 2012 in comparison to £7.87m at 30 April 2011. It was noted that the overall debt level had been impacted by the introduction of MyCampus and the delay in collecting student fees and the split in debt (Student debt £8.7m, Sponsor debt £3.9m) had been impacted by late or inaccurate application of sponsorship details or financial aid.
University of Glasgow
Finance Committee
Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday, 30 May 2012
in Melville Room

Present:
Mr Ken Brown (Convener), Mr Peter Daniels, Mr Robert Fraser, Ms Amy Johnson, Prof Miles Padgett, Mr David Ross, Prof Adrienne Scullion, Mr Iain Stewart

In attendance:
Mrs Ann Allen, Mr Andrew Charters, Mr James Harrison (SRC President-elect), Prof Neal Juster, Mr Gavin Lee, Mr David Newall, Mr Steve Sutton, Ms Carolyn Timar

Apologies:
Prof Anton Muscatelli, Mr Kevin Sweeney

Professor Andrea Nolan (Senior Vice Principal) and Ms Julie Ommer (Director of Sport and Recreation Service) attended for item CA/2011/73.

The Convener thanked the SRC Vice President (Student Support) for her contribution to the Committee and wished her well for the future.

The Convener welcomed Mrs Ann Allen to Finance Committee as Director of Estates and Buildings and Mr James Harrison (SRC President-elect) who would be joining Finance Committee in 2012-13.

CA/2011/69. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 28 March 2012

The minutes of meeting held on Wednesday 28 March 2012 were approved.

CA/2011/70. Matters Arising


Finance Committee received a report from Finance Office responding to the Universities UK report on Efficiency and Effectiveness in Higher Education. Finance Committee noted that the University is already meeting a number of the recommendations and is making progress on a number of others.

CA/2011/71. Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were noted.

CA/2011/72. Budget 2012/13 and four year forecast (paper 5.1)

The Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources) presented the University Budget for 2012/13 and four year forecast to Finance Committee. Finance Committee noted that the budget and forecasts were predicated on a number of assumptions which were detailed in Annex 1. The papers also included a review of the University Key Performance Indicators and the extent to which they had been met or were on target to be met. The Committee noted that the University was performing well against KPIs particularly in the area of Undergraduate student satisfaction, international student growth and the number of PGR students per Academic FTE. However, the Vice Principal noted areas where the University has not yet met the KPI including in
relation to percentage of staff holding research grants, research output quality and total postgraduate population. Despite this the University is performing well against Russell Group competitors.

The Committee noted that over the four year forecast there were significant positive year on year moments in Scottish Funding Council income and tuition fee growth and negative year on year movements in relation to consumables and salaries. The Committee noted that the draft budget for 2012/13 projected a management accounting surplus of £5.5m, with forecast surpluses of £13.6m, £20.4m and £25.8m in 2013/14, 14/15 and 15/16 respectively. The Committee noted that the projected surplus for 2012/13 was lower than the KPI target of 2% due to investment in recruiting new staff in advance of REF and estates developments. A full list of requested investments was contained in Annex II. The Committee noted that the requested investment in new appointments was significant and was exceptional in preparation for the Research Excellence Framework.

The forecast projects an increase in fees from RUK students from £4.8m to £15.7m in 2015/16. It was acknowledged that this did not represent an increase in the number of students attending the University from the rest of the United Kingdom but reflected the increasing annual impact of the new RUK Fees policy. The budget and forecast did include projected increases in international student numbers across all Colleges with targets agreed by Colleges and Recruitment and International Office.

It was noted that the Scottish Funding Council had announced an intention to introduce Outcome Agreements from 2012/13. These would require Universities to commit to specific outcomes covering a wide range of areas including; widening participation, retention, industry collaboration, patents and pattern of subject provision, all as a condition of the receipt of funding from the SFC. Finance Committee noted that the introduction of Outcome Agreements raised the possibility that the relationship between the Scottish Government, Scottish Funding Council and Universities could be fundamentally altered with much greater emphasis on meeting government directives. Universities Scotland was coordinating a response to Outcome Agreements on behalf of Universities in Scotland.

The Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources) informed Finance Committee that the contribution from research grants would be decreasing due to the Wakeham Review recommendations that overhead and estates costs would be funded to a lesser degree. This recommendation was retroactive so impacted current research projects as well as future research projects.

The Convener noted the Committee's thanks to the Director of Finance and Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources) for the presentation.

Finance Committee recommended the Budget to Court.

CA/2011/73. Stevenson Building extension and GUU Social Facility extension (paper 5.2.1)

The Committee considered two capex applications to extend and develop the sports facilities at the Stevenson Building, to replace the space currently leased at the Kelvin Hall, and to develop a new extension for the Glasgow University Union. The Secretary of Court reminded the Committee that the extension of the Stevenson Building required the demolition of the GUU Extension and that following discussion at Estates and Finance Committee in 2011 the Principal had made a public commitment to replacing the lost GUU facilities.

The Committee noted that the capex application for the Stevenson Building extension had been revised following the initial review at Estates and Finance Committee. It was noted that, following feedback from Finance Committee, the revised capex application projected the number of student memberships would be maintained rather than reduced and the student membership price would be set at £85 not £95 as in the original application. The revised application was intended to ensure that the student experience was maintained at a high
The Committee noted that these revisions impacted on the financial model. The application requested £9.2m with the revised cashflow showing a net present value of -£3.936m at ten years but a positive net present value of £0.372m at twenty years. These projections were revised down from a net present value of £0.391m and £8.048m at ten and twenty years respectively.

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for the development of a GUU Social Facility for £4.148m. The application noted that three options had been reviewed; a new extension for the GUU to the rear of the building to fully replace services lost at a cost of £7-8m and revision of space within the ground floor of the 1930s building. The latter option was not costed as the possible costs of developing within a listed building prevented a costing being predicted accurately. The initial development was rejected on the basis of cost and the latter was rejected on the basis that it would risk corrupting the character of the building and would require the ground floor to become alcohol focussed which it was not currently. The preferred development included the creation of an additional ground floor social facility beneath the Stevenson building extension to house a nightclub, and bar or café space costing £1.645m, and adaptation of the existing basement to provide a link to the extension, a further bar or café facility, suitable toilet facilities and improved use of the rear courtyard costing £1.068m. Additionally, while reviewing the GUU facilities it was recommended that a fire escape facility was added at the cost of £0.951m. The final element of the capex application was to compensate the GUU for loss of earnings during the development works. The GUU estimated this loss at £0.484m. The Secretary of Court confirmed that this was the preferred option of the University and GUU officers who had, over several months, been involved in discussions to develop a satisfactory proposal.

The Committee noted that the proposed extension would be developed with a sufficient flexibility to permit the space to be used for a range of purposes in future should that be required. The Assistant Director of Estates and Buildings confirmed that element one of the capex application (development of an extension) was dependent upon element two (alteration of the existing basement) as planning permission would require the upgrade of toilet facilities in order to allow the development of the extension.

The Director of Finance noted a number of concerns in relation to the proposed development of the GUU Social Facility. Finance Committee noted that the University had recently been required to support the GUU to prevent bankruptcy due to poor financial management and that the current financial stability of the GUU relied heavily upon one individual. It was also reported that the student union market was in decline across the HE sector due to increased competition from high street pubs and clubs. The Director of Finance noted that the GUU capex application was not expected to return any profit and had a net present value of -£4.148m. The Director of Finance also noted that the GUU was based at the eastern-side of Gilmorehill and following the purchase of the Western Infirmary site there was a risk that the focus of campus would move west leaving the GUU on the periphery.

The Convener of the Committee shared a number of the concerns expressed by the Director of Finance. It was further noted that the level of expenditure requested in the capex application was significant for the extent and sophistication of the completed development.

The Convener of Estates Committee reported that Estates Committee had approved both Stevenson and GUU capex applications. It was noted that Estates Committee considered it essential that student facilities were not reduced, particularly given the University’s intentions to grow the student numbers, and the Committee considered on-campus social facilities, rather than high street pubs and clubs, important in terms of student safety and wellbeing.

Finance Committee were reassured that the Student Finance Sub Committee would retain oversight of the impact on income for the GUU during the developments and would recompense as the loss was evidenced and not as a block grant. It was noted that the £0.484m was an estimate and it was not expected that the loss would reach this level.
Finance Committee Wednesday, 30 May 2012

Finance Committee noted that the Principal wished to discuss the GUU proposal further with the Senior Management Group. It was suggested that Senior Management Group might consider appropriate conditions which could be included in the lease to assure the University regarding GUU’s future management of the facility.

Finance Committee approved the capex applications with the reservations noted, noting that the Principal would discuss the GUU proposal further with the Senior Management Group and advise Court of SMG’s views.

CA/2011/74. Library Level 5 Annex Development (paper 5.2.2)

The Committee received a £1.705m capex application to create a postgraduate centre in Level 5 of the Library and £50,000 request to scope potential future developments to levels 2 and 3 of the library. The proposed development is to develop a contemporary study space for postgraduate students to accommodate the increased number of postgraduate students the University has recruited and to provide facilities to allow further increase in postgraduate student numbers.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2011/75. Endowment Investment Reports (paper 6.1)

Finance Committee noted the Endowment Investment Reports.

CA/2011/76. Draft minutes Student Finance Sub Committee held on 1 April 2012 (paper 6.2)

The Committee received draft minutes of the Student Finance Sub Committee. Finance Committee noted that in 2010/11 GUSA reported a £9.6k deficit and QMU reported a £13k deficit while the GUU reported a small operating surplus of £1.4k and the SRC reported a surplus of £18k. The Student Finance Sub Committee agreed to fund a block grant in 2012/13 of:

- GUSA - £200k
- QMU - £225k
- GUU - £225k
- SRC - £475k

Finance Committee noted that Student Finance Sub Committee would be meeting again in July 2012 to discuss with representatives of the student bodies how they could work together more effectively to obtain best value for the students of the University.

CA/2011/78. Review of Capital Expenditure (papers 6.4 and 6.5)

The Committee received a capex post-investment analysis and a capital expenditure update as at Period 9. The post-investment analysis showed that the capex projects approved by Finance Committee had in the main met the financial and non-financial benefits as per the business cases. It was noted that the majority of applications had also met, or were within reasonable margin, of budgeted costs.

Finance Committee noted the capital expenditure as at Period 9.

CA/2011/79. Credit Ratings and Banking Limits (paper 6.6)

The Committee received a paper noting the considerations when managing the risk in banking the University’s cash deposits. The Committee noted that the Finance Office employ a risk management approach reviewing concentration and credit risk. Concentration risk is the extent to which the University’s cash funds are spread across a number of different institutions. The current policy permits no more than £15m deposited in a foreign registered bank and no more than £25m deposited in a UK registered bank. Credit risk is the likelihood of an institution
defaulting based on credit ratings issued by credit ratings agency Standard & Poor. The current policy allows investment in institutions with an A rating or above. The Committee noted the challenge in maintaining a balance between the two risks given the current economic climate and the trend in banks credit rating being downgraded.


Finance Committee were invited to approve an amendment to the University Financial Regulations section 3.04 Treasury Management. The amendment reflected issues discussed in agenda point CA/2011/79 in relation to management of credit and concentration risk. The proposed policy permitted investment of up to £30m in UK registered banks, building societies and money markets with a credit rating of A- or above (or where they are quasi-nationalised) and up to £25m in non-UK banks and money market funds with a credit rating of AA- or above.

Finance Committee approved the revised policy.

CA/2011/81. Overview of Performance as at 30 April 2012 (paper 7.1)

The Group Financial Controller provided an Overview of Performance as at 30 April 2012. Finance Committee noted that the Period 9 results were £5.3m ahead of budget with a projected operational surplus at year end of £7.9m. The full year surplus represents a £0.1m increase on full year budgeted surplus. The projected surplus at Period 9 was a reduction of £1.0m from Period 8 projection due to strategic investment in the College of Science and Engineering and salary costs. The main year to date variances include tuition fees £1.3m higher than budget due to strong performance in College of Social Sciences, salary costs at £3.5m lower than budget and research contributions £0.3m below budget.

The full year outlook is impacted by a £5.0m lower than budget spend on salaries across all areas of the University and tuition fee income £1.0m above budget. These increases are offset against forecast consumable spending £7.1m ahead of budget due in large part to expenditure brought forward from 2012/13 and a reduction in research contribution of £0.5m below budget.

It was noted that net funds at Period 9 were £128.8m with closing cash forecast of £121.1m. This reflected a forecasted cash inflow of £12.8m in the year against a budgeted outflow of £6.9m. Due to the continued fail in gilt yields as noted in Finance Committee March 2012 the year end outlook projected a pension liability of £101.1m against a budgeted £65.8m. The Group Financial Controller noted that gilt yields had continued to fall and future projections were likely to show further movement in the pension deficit. It was noted that the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme trustees would be meeting in August and Finance Committee would receive an updated briefing following that.

CA/2011/82. Debtors Reports as at 30 April 2012 (papers 6.8 and 7.2)

The Committee received an update on debtor levels as at 30 April 2012. Finance Committee noted that overall debt levels were slightly higher than the equivalent period in 2011. Current total debt at 30 April 2012 sat at £31.58m versus £29.39m in April 2011. All forms of debt, with the exception of student and sponsor tuition fee debt and Small Animal Hospital debt, were lower than at 30 April 2011.

The Group Financial Controller presented an additional paper providing an analysis of the current position with student and sponsor tuition fee debt which stood at £12.60m in April 2012 in comparison to £7.87m at 30 April 2011. It was noted that the overall debt level had been impacted by the introduction of MyCampus and the delay in collecting student fees and the split in debt (Student debt £8.7m, Sponsor debt £3.9m) had been impacted by late or inaccurate application of sponsorship details or financial aid.
Finance Committee noted that 3477 student accounts remained with outstanding queries with an overall outstanding debtor balance at 25 May 2012 of £5.5m. It was noted that 6106 students have been contacted in March to notify them that they had an outstanding balance on their account which required to be reviewed with the Accounts Receivable Team. It was reported to Finance Committee that a number of students, estimated to be 1200, had raised queries on their accounts and their balances had subsequently been adjusted. It was acknowledged that and this had caused unnecessary distress.

It was noted that a number of actions had been undertaken or would be undertaken to resolve the current issue and prevent the issue arising in future. These included the transfer of the Registry Fees Team to Finance Office as part of an enhanced Accounts Receivable Team, faster application of sponsorship details and financial aid, quicker withdrawal of students who have left the University or chose not to attend and clearer channels of communication between central teams and those in Schools and Colleges with responsibility for student support and student finance.

It was noted that a combination of the introduction of MyCampus, adoption of policy changes in relation to financial registration and tuition fee refund and the impact of restructuring had contributed to the challenges faced in recovering student and sponsor debt in 2011/12. It was agreed to review the number of outstanding student debtors in May 2012/13 to assess the improvement in processes.

The Convener and the Secretary of Court thanked the Finance Office for their efforts in analysing the outstanding student and sponsor debt and successfully reducing the outstanding balances.

**CA/2011/83. Proposed dates of Finance Committee in 2012-13**

- Wednesday, 5th Sept 2012 at 2pm
- Wednesday, 14th Nov 2012 at 2pm
- Wednesday, 16th Jan 2013 at 2pm
- Wednesday, 27th March 2013 at 2pm
- Thursday, 30th May 2013 at 2pm
Finance Committee

During the week of the 14th May, for various reasons, our cash deposits with Barclays and Santander were pulled back, consequently requiring a change to our policy limits. The changes as detailed below were approved by the Chairman until further discussions at Finance Committee.

Financial regulations

3.04 Treasury Management – extract of Financial Regulations *

The non endowment cash balances of the University can be invested in temporary cash deposits with the major UK clearing banks, building societies and money market funds up to a maximum of twenty five million pounds with any one institution. The institution (or money market fund) must be rated at a minimum of AA (as per Standard and Poor's long term rate), or have been quasi nationalised. Up to a maximum of fifteen million pounds can be invested with non UK banks and money market funds with a minimum rating of AA. This is for a maximum of three months per deposit.

*Requires to be updated (in published Finance Documentation) to reflect the recent policy changes and any other changes from this meeting.

Proposed policy

The non endowment cash balances of the University can be invested in temporary cash deposits with the major UK clearing banks, building societies and UK registered money market funds up to a maximum of thirty million pounds with any one institution. The institution must be rated at a minimum of A- (as per Standard and Poor's long term rate) with money market funds at a minimum of AA- rated. Banks with stronger ratings or quasi nationalised will be utilised first. Up to a maximum of twenty five million pounds can be invested with non UK registered banks and money market funds. The institution must be rated at a minimum of A- (as per Standard and Poor's long term rate) with money market funds at a minimum of AA- rated. This is for a maximum of three months per deposit.
Period 9 Management Pack
2011/12
The P9 results are £5.3m higher than year to date budget. The projected operating surplus for the full year is £7.9m, £0.1m higher than budget. This is a reduction of £1.0m from P8, including £0.6m strategic investment in S&E to be brought forward from 12/13, £0.2m IPSC investment and £0.2m salaries in Social Sciences.

The main year to date variances against budget are as follows:

- Tuition fees are £1.3m higher than budget, +£3.2m in SS offset by -£1.5m in MVLS and -£0.5m in Arts
- Salaries are £4.5m lower than budget relating to the timing of vacancies being filled across the Colleges and University Services.
- Research contribution is £0.3m below budget driven by vacancies in professorial posts.

The main full year outlook variances against budget are as follows:

- Salaries are £5.0m lower than budget reflecting the impact of year to date savings, a lower than budgeted pay award and delays in recruitment to vacancies (Arts £0.6m, MVLS £1.8m, S&E £2.1m, US £0.5m)
- Consumables forecast is £7.1m higher than budget - S&E £0.9m, US £6.9m including £0.7m Research System review, £0.8m SLP system, £3.2m Estates & Buildings (£2.6m brought forward from 2012/13), £1.3m additional in year investment (£0.4m brought forward from 2012/13). Central provision +£0.5m against capital contribution due from Beatson. MVLS -£0.7m including reduced dowry spend caused by delays in appointing senior staff and reduced spend caused by downturn in student numbers
- Tuition fees outlook is £1.0m higher than budget based on current expectations on student numbers. Gross fees are £1.5m higher than budget - Arts -£0.7m, MVLS -£2.0m (predominantly overseas PGT), S&E -£0.1m, SS +£4.2m (predominantly overseas PGT). In addition, a provision of £0.5m has been made for potential bad debt.
- Research contribution is £0.5m below budget (Arts -£0.1m, S&E -£0.6m, MVLS +£0.2m)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Balance of Year</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Balance of Year</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>YTD Actual 2010/11</th>
<th>YTD Var vs Prior Year</th>
<th>Full Year Outlook</th>
<th>Full Year Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Funds
- **SFC Income**: 98,995 89,777 217 33,039 32,908 131 107,009 (8,014) 132,034 131,685 349
- **Tuition Fees net of Discounts**: 62,197 60,877 1,320 19,972 20,282 (310) 56,552 5,645 82,169 81,159 1,010
- **Gross Salaries**: (121,313) (125,817) 4,505 41,742 (42,197) 455 (125,794) 4,481 (163,055) (168,014) 4,960
- **Salary Recoups**: 9,280 10,174 (895) 3,448 3,390 58 10,268 (988) 12,727 13,564 (837)
- **Consumables**: (59,776) (59,917) (59) (29,476) (22,436) (7,040) (54,349) (5,428) (89,252) (82,153) (7,099)
- **Depreciation / DCG**: (4,891) (5,756) 866 (1,870) (2,102) 232 (5,030) (3,19) (6,761) (7,858) 1,097
- **Endowments**: (0) 0 (8) 0 6 (6) 19 (19) (0) (14) (14)
- **RTSG**: 27 (13) 40 (15) 6 (9) (114) 141 (12) (19) 31
- **Other Income**: 24,956 24,575 381 2,199 3,488 (1,289) 24,923 32 27,155 28,063 (908)
- **Interest**: 519 217 303 72 (72) 502 18 519 289 230

**Total General Funds**: 9,993 3,324 6,669 (14,445) (6,595) (7,850) 13,986 (3,992) (4,452) (3,271) (1,180)

### Research
- **Income**: 59,567 65,442 (5,875) 20,771 21,933 (1,162) 62,942 (3,375) 80,338 78,757 (7,037)
- **Salaries**: (26,407) (28,384) 1,976 (9,216) (9,592) 376 (27,367) 960 (35,624) (37,976) 2,352
- **Salary Recoups**: (7,467) (8,614) 1,146 (2,926) (2,938) 11 (8,118) 651 (10,394) (11,552) 1,158
- **Consumables / Depreciation**: (19,119) (21,605) 2,495 (6,461) (6,955) 494 (19,375) 264 (25,572) (28,561) 2,989

**Contribution after recoups**: 6,682 6,839 (258) 2,167 2,447 (280) 8,082 (1,500) 8,749 9,287 (537)

**% Contribution**: 11.0% 10.5% 0.6%

**Contribution before recoups**: 14,049 15,453 (1,404) 5,094 5,385 (291) 16,200 (2,151) 19,143 20,838 (1,695)

**% Contribution**: 23.6% 23.6% 0.0%

### Commercial
- **Income**: 32,440 30,198 2,241 9,208 10,079 (871) 34,276 (1,837) 41,648 40,278 1,370
- **Salaries**: (17,346) (16,367) (979) (4,877) (5,451) 574 (17,176) (170) (22,223) (21,818) (405)
- **Salary Recoups**: (1,220) (1,090) (130) (199) (363) 164 (1,551) 332 (1,419) (1,453) 34
- **Consumables / Depreciation**: (9,929) (8,916) (1,013) (3,389) (2,950) (439) (9,821) (108) (13,318) (11,866) (1,452)

**Contribution after recoups**: 3,945 3,826 119 743 1,315 (572) 5,728 (1,783) 4,688 5,140 (453)

**% Contribution**: 12.2% 12.7% 0.5%

**Contribution before recoups**: 5,165 4,916 249 942 1,678 (736) 7,280 (2,115) 6,107 6,593 (487)

**% Contribution**: 15.9% 16.3% 0.4%

### Other Funds
- **Income**: 1,174 1,150 24 49 383 (334) 1,019 155 1,223 1,533 (310)
- **Expenditure**: (1,269) (1,403) 134 (75) (468) 393 (1,268) (2) (1,344) (1,671) 527

**Total Other Funds**: (95) (253) 158 (26) (84) 59 (249) 153 (121) (337) 217

**Operating Surplus Before Overlays**: 20,425 13,736 6,689 (11,561) (2,918) (8,643) 27,547 (7,122) 8,864 10,818 (1,954)

**Singapore Institute of Technology**: 400 400 400 400 400 400 400 400 400 400 400

**Total Commercial**: (1,303) (1,303) (1,303) (1,303) (1,303) (1,303) (1,303) (1,303) (1,303) (1,303) (1,303)

**Operating Surplus**: 19,122 13,736 5,386 (11,158) (5,918) (5,240) 27,547 (8,425) 7,964 7,818 146
### Operating Summary By College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YTD Actual Apr 2012</th>
<th>YTD Budget Apr 2012</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
<th>YTD Actual Apr 2011</th>
<th>Variance vs Prior Year</th>
<th>Full Year Outlook (FY)</th>
<th>Original Budget (FY)</th>
<th>Full Year Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>8,880</td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>9,283</td>
<td>(561)</td>
<td>11,645</td>
<td>11,549</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences</td>
<td>32,680</td>
<td>31,924</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>37,012</td>
<td>(4,332)</td>
<td>40,571</td>
<td>40,461</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>20,275</td>
<td>18,954</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>21,173</td>
<td>(898)</td>
<td>24,186</td>
<td>24,186</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>20,762</td>
<td>17,280</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>17,774</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>26,731</td>
<td>22,056</td>
<td>4,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Colleges</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,439</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,038</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,242</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,803)</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,132</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,252</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Services</td>
<td>(36,290)</td>
<td>(34,231)</td>
<td>(2,059)</td>
<td>(36,448)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>(46,949)</td>
<td>(43,610)</td>
<td>(3,339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>(31,489)</td>
<td>(32,492)</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>(30,289)</td>
<td>(1,199)</td>
<td>(46,817)</td>
<td>(44,291)</td>
<td>(2,526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>(105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residences</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>6,407</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>(588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>(889)</td>
<td>(2,753)</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>(3,408)</td>
<td>(2,810)</td>
<td>(2,535)</td>
<td>(275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Central Costs</strong></td>
<td>(62,014)</td>
<td>(63,302)</td>
<td><strong>1,289</strong></td>
<td>(57,694)</td>
<td>(4,319)</td>
<td>(94,268)</td>
<td>(87,434)</td>
<td>(6,834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Surplus Before Overlays</td>
<td>20,425</td>
<td>13,736</td>
<td>6,689</td>
<td>27,547</td>
<td>(7,122)</td>
<td>8,864</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>(1,954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Institute of Technology</td>
<td>(1,303)</td>
<td>(1,303)</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,300)</td>
<td>(3,400)</td>
<td>(2,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Surplus</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,122</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,736</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,386</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,547</strong></td>
<td><strong>(8,425)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,964</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,818</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operating Summary – Full Year Main Movements vs Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences</th>
<th>Science and Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Corporate Services</th>
<th>Total Before Overlays</th>
<th>Strategic Investments</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Year Budget</strong></td>
<td>11,549</td>
<td>40,461</td>
<td>24,186</td>
<td>22,056</td>
<td>(87,434)</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td>7,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>(652)</td>
<td>(2,003)</td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Salaries</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td></td>
<td>673</td>
<td>(855)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(6,879)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Contribution before Recoups</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(452)</td>
<td>(890)</td>
<td>(176)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Contribution before Recoups</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>(529)</td>
<td>(319)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Income</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(868)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Movements</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Movements</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4,674</td>
<td>(6,834)</td>
<td>(1,954)</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Year Outlook</strong></td>
<td>11,645</td>
<td>40,571</td>
<td>24,186</td>
<td>26,731</td>
<td>(94,268)</td>
<td>8,864</td>
<td>(900)</td>
<td>7,964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESEARCH

% of Year Elapsed = 75%

#### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Year to date vs Budget</th>
<th>Full Year Outlook</th>
<th>% of Full Year Outlook Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>(527)</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences</td>
<td>37,209</td>
<td>(2,486)</td>
<td>49,807</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>17,554</td>
<td>(2,082)</td>
<td>24,036</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>(419)</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>(361)</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,567</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5,875)</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONTRIBUTION BEFORE RECOUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Year to date vs Budget</th>
<th>Full Year Outlook</th>
<th>% of Full Year Outlook Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences</td>
<td>7,099</td>
<td>(411)</td>
<td>9,560</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>5,286</td>
<td>(731)</td>
<td>7,368</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,404)</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### % MARGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Year to date vs Full Year Outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TUITION FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Home &amp; EU Students</th>
<th>Overseas Students</th>
<th>Discounts</th>
<th>Net Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outlook</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>8,158</td>
<td>8,537</td>
<td>(379)</td>
<td>2,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>11,987</td>
<td>(661)</td>
<td>12,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>9,607</td>
<td>9,382</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>12,776</td>
<td>12,702</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>41,932</td>
<td>42,673</td>
<td>(741)</td>
<td>44,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Commentary**

- Net Funds as at P9 are £128.8m, which is a cash inflow of £20.4m for the year to date.

- The main year to date cash movements are:
  - Operating cashflow of £23.9m underpinned by the operating surplus as outlined in the I&E commentary;
  - An increase in working capital of £0.9m;
  - Capital expenditure of £10.5m offset by grant income of £6.0m

- The closing cash forecast is £121.1m. A cash inflow of £12.8m is forecast for the year versus a budgeted cash outflow of £6.9m. The key drivers of the variance are forecast capital expenditure and timing of working capital.

- Pension liability continues to reflect the impact of falling gilt yields recognised in P8.

### Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Period 9</th>
<th>Year End</th>
<th>Outlook As At P9</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>11/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Sheet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>466,359</td>
<td>467,775</td>
<td>478,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Assets</td>
<td>128,436</td>
<td>122,014</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital &amp; Provisions</td>
<td>(91,491)</td>
<td>(92,517)</td>
<td>(72,372)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Overdraft &amp; Deposits</td>
<td>128,778</td>
<td>121,138</td>
<td>88,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Liability</td>
<td>(101,100)</td>
<td>(101,100)</td>
<td>(65,885)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>530,982</td>
<td>517,311</td>
<td>548,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Grants</td>
<td>(215,654)</td>
<td>(220,157)</td>
<td>(215,052)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Reserve</td>
<td>(128,436)</td>
<td>(122,014)</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revaluation Reserve</td>
<td>(160,289)</td>
<td>(159,195)</td>
<td>(159,594)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reserve</td>
<td>(26,602)</td>
<td>(15,944)</td>
<td>(54,094)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserves</strong></td>
<td>(530,982)</td>
<td>(517,311)</td>
<td>(548,740)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cashflow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Period 9</th>
<th>Year End</th>
<th>Outlook As At P9</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>11/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash from Operations</td>
<td>23,927</td>
<td>16,062</td>
<td>15,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>(10,510)</td>
<td>(19,911)</td>
<td>(29,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Income</td>
<td>5,999</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movements in Working Capital / Provisions</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(10,350)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Cashflow</strong></td>
<td>20,391</td>
<td>12,751</td>
<td>(6,900)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Net Funds</td>
<td>108,387</td>
<td>108,387</td>
<td>95,412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net In / Out Flow</td>
<td>20,391</td>
<td>12,751</td>
<td>(6,900)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Net Funds</td>
<td>128,778</td>
<td>121,138</td>
<td>88,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detail By College / Service Area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Balance of Year Forecast</th>
<th>Balance of Year Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>YTD Actual 2010/11</th>
<th>YTD Var vs Prior Year</th>
<th>Full Year Outlook</th>
<th>Full Year Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC Income</td>
<td>11,957</td>
<td>11,957</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>13,114</td>
<td>(1,157)</td>
<td>15,940</td>
<td>15,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees net of Discounts</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>8,510</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>(162)</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>10,694</td>
<td>11,346</td>
<td>(652)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Salaries</td>
<td>(11,967)</td>
<td>(11,790)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>(3,636)</td>
<td>(3,967)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>(11,666)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>(15,203)</td>
<td>(15,758)</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td>(652)</td>
<td>(598)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(395)</td>
<td>(449)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(732)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(1,047)</td>
<td>(1,047)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation / DCG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSG</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Funds</td>
<td>8,302</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>(231)</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>9,025</td>
<td>(724)</td>
<td>11,111</td>
<td>11,087</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>(527)</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>(342)</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>(869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>(1,007)</td>
<td>(1,340)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>(286)</td>
<td>(447)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>(880)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>(1,305)</td>
<td>(1,787)</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>(278)</td>
<td>(285)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(270)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(369)</td>
<td>(380)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables / Depreciation</td>
<td>(365)</td>
<td>(511)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(170)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>(337)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(400)</td>
<td>(681)</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>(94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution before recoups</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>(106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>(412)</td>
<td>(107)</td>
<td>(305)</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>(728)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>(563)</td>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>(420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables / Depreciation</td>
<td>(311)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(293)</td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>(242)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(452)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(428)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-15.7%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution before recoups</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Funds</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>8,880</td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>9,283</td>
<td>(561)</td>
<td>11,645</td>
<td>11,549</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year to Date</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>YTD Var</td>
<td>Full Year</td>
<td>Full Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Of Year</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>vs Prior</td>
<td>Outlook</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC Income</td>
<td>43,365</td>
<td>43,365</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,548</td>
<td>14,447</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,886</td>
<td>(3,521)</td>
<td>57,913</td>
<td>57,812</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees net of</td>
<td>(19,757)</td>
<td>18,897</td>
<td>(1,505)</td>
<td>(5,798)</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>(498)</td>
<td>17,972</td>
<td>(579)</td>
<td>23,190</td>
<td>25,193</td>
<td>(2,003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Salaries</td>
<td>(33,918)</td>
<td>(35,269)</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>(11,487)</td>
<td>(11,908)</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>(35,469)</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>(46,404)</td>
<td>(47,177)</td>
<td>1,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>4,967</td>
<td>5,569</td>
<td>(602)</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,858</td>
<td>7,424</td>
<td>(566)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td>(3,717)</td>
<td>(5,210)</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>(4,360)</td>
<td>(3,540)</td>
<td>(820)</td>
<td>(3,465)</td>
<td>(252)</td>
<td>(8,077)</td>
<td>(8,750)</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation / DCG</td>
<td>(498)</td>
<td>(606)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(385)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>(477)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(677)</td>
<td>(991)</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>(186)</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Funds</strong></td>
<td>28,296</td>
<td>27,389</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>6,364</td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>(615)</td>
<td>31,231</td>
<td>(2,935)</td>
<td>34,660</td>
<td>34,368</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>37,299</td>
<td>39,695</td>
<td>(2,486)</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>13,225</td>
<td>(626)</td>
<td>37,969</td>
<td>(760)</td>
<td>49,807</td>
<td>52,919</td>
<td>(3,112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>(17,306)</td>
<td>(17,740)</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>(5,537)</td>
<td>(5,910)</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>(18,090)</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>(22,843)</td>
<td>(23,650)</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>(4,342)</td>
<td>(4,801)</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>(1,445)</td>
<td>(1,599)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>(4,348)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5,787)</td>
<td>(6,400)</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables / Depreciation</td>
<td>(12,803)</td>
<td>(14,445)</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>(4,601)</td>
<td>(4,813)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>(12,099)</td>
<td>(704)</td>
<td>(17,404)</td>
<td>(19,257)</td>
<td>1,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>(674)</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution before recoups</td>
<td>7,099</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>(411)</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>7,780</td>
<td>(680)</td>
<td>9,560</td>
<td>10,012</td>
<td>(452)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>17,774</td>
<td>18,289</td>
<td>(514)</td>
<td>5,592</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>(549)</td>
<td>18,281</td>
<td>(506)</td>
<td>23,366</td>
<td>24,429</td>
<td>(1,063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>(11,018)</td>
<td>(11,264)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>(3,452)</td>
<td>(3,753)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>(10,895)</td>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>(14,470)</td>
<td>(15,016)</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>(384)</td>
<td>(440)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(203)</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(380)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(587)</td>
<td>(587)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables / Depreciation</td>
<td>(4,709)</td>
<td>(4,582)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>(1,411)</td>
<td>(1,526)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>(4,542)</td>
<td>(167)</td>
<td>(6,121)</td>
<td>(6,108)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>(339)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>(190)</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>(530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution before recoups</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>(396)</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>(796)</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>(529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>(368)</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>(171)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>(395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(490)</td>
<td>(998)</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>(260)</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(738)</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>(750)</td>
<td>(1,331)</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Funds</strong></td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(177)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(237)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>32,680</td>
<td>31,924</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>7,891</td>
<td>8,537</td>
<td>(646)</td>
<td>37,012</td>
<td>(4,332)</td>
<td>40,571</td>
<td>40,461</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>Year to Date</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Balance Of Year Forecast</td>
<td>Balance Of Year Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>YTD Actual 2010/11</td>
<td>YTD Var vs Prior Year</td>
<td>Full Year Outlook</td>
<td>Full Year Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC Income</td>
<td>25,760</td>
<td>25,760</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>8,557</td>
<td>8,582 (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,666 (1,906)</td>
<td>34,317</td>
<td>34,342 (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees net of Discounts</td>
<td>10,979</td>
<td>10,844</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3,399</td>
<td>3,613 (214)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,326</td>
<td>14,378</td>
<td>14,457 (79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Salaries</td>
<td>(18,840)</td>
<td>(20,488)</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>(6,488)</td>
<td>(6,934) 446</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20,486) 1,645</td>
<td>(25,328)</td>
<td>(27,422)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>2,880 (404)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>960 54</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,014 (538)</td>
<td>3,490 3,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td>(2,695)</td>
<td>(2,950)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>(3,184)</td>
<td>(2,075) (1,110)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,521) 826</td>
<td>(5,880)</td>
<td>(5,025)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation / DCG</td>
<td>(548)</td>
<td>(674) 126</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(289)</td>
<td>(225) (64)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(524) (24)</td>
<td>(837) (899)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1) 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (19)</td>
<td>0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(9) 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>(100) 101</td>
<td>(0) (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>257 (55)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86 (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>237 75</td>
<td>343 343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Funds</strong></td>
<td>17,443</td>
<td>15,606</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>3,979 (957)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,631 813</td>
<td>20,483 19,603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>17,554</td>
<td>19,636</td>
<td>(2,082)</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>6,673 (191)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,644 2,090</td>
<td>24,036</td>
<td>26,309 (2,273)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>(6,881)</td>
<td>(8,014)</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>(2,990)</td>
<td>(2,806) (183)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,975) 94</td>
<td>(9,870)</td>
<td>(10,820)</td>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>(2,097)</td>
<td>(2,535)</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>(1,066)</td>
<td>(913) 153</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,371) 275</td>
<td>(3,162)</td>
<td>(3,447)</td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables / Depreciation</td>
<td>(5,387)</td>
<td>(5,050)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>(1,404)</td>
<td>(1,625) 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,483) 1,096</td>
<td>(6,797)</td>
<td>(7,730)</td>
<td></td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>3,482 (293)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,329 (312)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,814 (626)</td>
<td>4,206 4,811</td>
<td>(605)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17.7% 0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7% 19.9% -4.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4% -1.3%</td>
<td>17.5% 18.3% -0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution before recoups</td>
<td>5,286</td>
<td>6,017 (731)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>2,241 (159)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,186 (900)</td>
<td>7,368 8,258</td>
<td>(890)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>30.1% 30.6% -0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.1% 33.6% -1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5% -1.4%</td>
<td>30.7% 31.4% -0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3,886</td>
<td>3,194 691</td>
<td></td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1,034 663</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,137 (251)</td>
<td>4,853 4,228</td>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>(1,829)</td>
<td>(1,978) 149</td>
<td></td>
<td>(740)</td>
<td>(659) 81</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,730) 99</td>
<td>(2,569)</td>
<td>(2,637)</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recoups</td>
<td>(205)</td>
<td>(203) 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(68) 46</td>
<td></td>
<td>(642) 338</td>
<td>(226) (270)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables / Depreciation</td>
<td>(2,197)</td>
<td>(1,129) (1,072)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(335)</td>
<td>(395) 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,109) (1,088)</td>
<td>(2,532)</td>
<td>(1,520)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(111) (234)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>(87) 41</td>
<td></td>
<td>756 (1,100)</td>
<td>(473) 198 275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>-8.9% 3.5%-5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-13.3% -8.4% -4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.3% -27.1%</td>
<td>-9.8% -4.7% -5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution before recoups</td>
<td>(140) 91</td>
<td>(232)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(107)</td>
<td>(20) 87</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,298 (1,438)</td>
<td>(247) 72</td>
<td>(319)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>-3.6% 2.9%-6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.1% -1.9% -9.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.4% -35.0%</td>
<td>-5.1% 1.7% -6.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>45 139</td>
<td></td>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>15 (139)</td>
<td></td>
<td>45 138</td>
<td>60 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(196)</td>
<td>(68) (129)</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>(22) 129</td>
<td></td>
<td>(73) (123)</td>
<td>(90) (90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Funds</strong></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(23) 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(7) 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>(28) 15</td>
<td>(30) 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>20,275</td>
<td>18,954 1,321</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,911</td>
<td>5,231 (1,321)</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,173 (898)</td>
<td>24,186 24,186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### College of Social Sciences

#### General Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFC Income</th>
<th>15,339</th>
<th>15,121</th>
<th>217</th>
<th>5,093</th>
<th>5,038</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>16,502</th>
<th>(1,163)</th>
<th>20,432</th>
<th>20,159</th>
<th>273</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees net of Discounts</td>
<td>25,713</td>
<td>22,533</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>7,507</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>20,394</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>34,285</td>
<td>30,040</td>
<td>4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Salaries</td>
<td>(19,824)</td>
<td>(19,934)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>(6,896)</td>
<td>(6,787)</td>
<td>(109)</td>
<td>(19,225)</td>
<td>(599)</td>
<td>(26,720)</td>
<td>(26,721)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Recuops</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>(153)</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables / Depreciation / DCG</td>
<td>(2,772)</td>
<td>(2,391)</td>
<td>(381)</td>
<td>(1,288)</td>
<td>(1,631)</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>(2,325)</td>
<td>(447)</td>
<td>(4,060)</td>
<td>(4,022)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>15,339</td>
<td>15,121</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>5,093</td>
<td>5,038</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16,502</td>
<td>(1,163)</td>
<td>20,432</td>
<td>20,159</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Funds</strong></td>
<td>19,956</td>
<td>16,704</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>4,585</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>17,003</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>25,756</td>
<td>21,290</td>
<td>4,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Research

| Income                       | 2,550 | 2,969 | (419) | 921 | 989 | (69) | 2,912 | (363) | 3,470 | 3,958 | (488) |
| Salaries                     | (1,010) | (1,042) | 31 | (370) | (347) | (23) | (1,122) | 111 | (1,380) | (1,389) | 9 |
| Salary Recuops               | (668) | (820) | 152 | (208) | (273) | 65 | (910) | 242 | (876) | (1,093) | 217 |
| Consumables / Depreciation   | (526) | (846) | 317 | (296) | (292) | (14) | (455) | 74 | (824) | (1,127) | 303 |
| Contribution after recoups   | 343 | 262 | 81 | 47 | 87 | (40) | 426 | (83) | 390 | 350 | 41 |
| % Contribution               | 13.5% | 8.8% | 4.6% | 5.1% | 8.8% | -3.7% | 14.6% | -1.2% | 11.2% | 8.8% | 2.4% |
| Contribution before recoups  | 1,011 | 1,082 | (70) | 255 | 360 | (106) | 1,336 | (325) | 1,266 | 1,442 | (176) |
| % Contribution               | 39.7% | 36.4% | 3.2% | 27.7% | 36.4% | -8.7% | 45.9% | -6.2% | 36.5% | 36.4% | 0.1% |

#### Commercial

| Income                       | 2,966 | 2,276 | 690 | 947 | 758 | 189 | 3,071 | (105) | 3,913 | 3,034 | 879 |
| Salaries                     | (1,597) | (1,035) | (562) | (341) | (345) | 4 | (1,571) | (25) | (1,938) | (1,380) | (558) |
| Salary Recuops               | (374) | (325) | (49) | (71) | (108) | 37 | (310) | (63) | (445) | (433) | (12) |
| Consumables / Depreciation   | (525) | (598) | 73 | (412) | (199) | (213) | (839) | 314 | (937) | (797) | (140) |
| Contribution after recoups   | 140 | 318 | 152 | 123 | 106 | 17 | 350 | 120 | 593 | 424 | 169 |
| % Contribution               | 15.9% | 14.0% | 1.9% | 13.0% | 14.0% | -1.0% | 11.4% | 4.5% | 15.2% | 14.0% | 1.2% |
| Contribution before recoups  | 844 | 643 | 201 | 194 | 214 | (20) | 661 | 183 | 1,038 | 857 | 181 |
| % Contribution               | 28.5% | 28.2% | 0.2% | 20.5% | 28.2% | -7.8% | 21.5% | 6.9% | 26.5% | 28.2% | -1.7% |

#### Other Funds

<p>| Income                       | 44 | 14 | 30 | 16 | 5 | 11 | 20 | 24 | 60 | 19 | 41 |
| Expenditure                  | (52) | (20) | (33) | (17) | (6) | (10) | (26) | (26) | (69) | (26) | (43) |
| <strong>Total Other Funds</strong>        | (8) | (5) | (3) | (1) | (2) | 1 | (5) | (3) | (9) | (7) | (2) |
| <strong>TOTAL</strong>                    | 20,762 | 17,280 | 3,482 | 5,969 | 4,777 | 1,192 | 17,774 | 2,988 | 26,731 | 22,056 | 4,674 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000</th>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Balance Of Year Forecast</th>
<th>Balance Of Year Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Var vs Prior Year</th>
<th>Full Year Outlook</th>
<th>Full Year Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Services Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Salaries</td>
<td>(25,104)</td>
<td>(25,648)</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>(8,709)</td>
<td>(8,378)</td>
<td>(331)</td>
<td>(26,580)</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>(33,812)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td>(16,389)</td>
<td>(13,089)</td>
<td>(3,300)</td>
<td>(2,873)</td>
<td>(2,529)</td>
<td>(344)</td>
<td>(13,135)</td>
<td>(3,254)</td>
<td>(19,262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Funds</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>(189)</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>4,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Contribution</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Contribution</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>(459)</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total University Services</strong></td>
<td>(36,290)</td>
<td>(34,231)</td>
<td>(2,059)</td>
<td>(10,659)</td>
<td>(9,379)</td>
<td>(1,280)</td>
<td>(36,448)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>(46,949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>2,768</td>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>(1,241)</td>
<td>(1,253)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(360)</td>
<td>(419)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(1,194)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(1,602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables / Depreciation</td>
<td>(1,238)</td>
<td>(1,219)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(225)</td>
<td>(302)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(1,166)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(1,663)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>18,465</td>
<td>18,027</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>(706)</td>
<td>17,939</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>19,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(11,971)</td>
<td>(12,150)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>(5,199)</td>
<td>(4,699)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(11,531)</td>
<td>(440)</td>
<td>(17,170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>(4,306)</td>
<td>(3,100)</td>
<td>(1,206)</td>
<td>6,407</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premises</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>(194)</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>(491)</td>
<td>1,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(28,231)</td>
<td>(29,242)</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>(14,377)</td>
<td>(10,716)</td>
<td>(3,662)</td>
<td>(27,109)</td>
<td>(1,122)</td>
<td>(42,608)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation / DCG</td>
<td>(4,567)</td>
<td>(4,753)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>(1,636)</td>
<td>(1,584)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(4,980)</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>(6,203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution after recoups</td>
<td>(31,489)</td>
<td>(32,492)</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>(15,328)</td>
<td>(11,799)</td>
<td>(3,529)</td>
<td>(30,289)</td>
<td>(1,199)</td>
<td>(46,817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>(317)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(353)</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>(211)</td>
<td>(1,341)</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>(595)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(649)</td>
<td>(502)</td>
<td>(502)</td>
<td>(806)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Funds</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>(617)</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>(439)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>(243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>(60,929)</td>
<td>(61,166)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>(30,771)</td>
<td>(24,055)</td>
<td>(6,717)</td>
<td>(60,221)</td>
<td>(708)</td>
<td>(91,701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Overheads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>(499)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>(715)</td>
<td>5,133</td>
<td>(3,837)</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(2,903)</td>
<td>(3,002)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(982)</td>
<td>(366)</td>
<td>(816)</td>
<td>(2,607)</td>
<td>(296)</td>
<td>(3,885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Corporate Overheads</strong></td>
<td>(1,087)</td>
<td>(2,136)</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>(1,480)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>(1,403)</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>(3,614)</td>
<td>(2,567)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Audit Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 23 May 2012
in the Melville Room

Present:
Dr Paul Brady, Mr Jo Elliot, Mr Hamish Guthrie, Mr Neil Menzies, Ms Elizabeth Simpson
(Vice-Convener), Mr Kevin Sweeney (Convener)

In attendance:
Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young), Mr Andrew Charters (Group Financial Controller), Ms
Gillian Connal (Deloitte LLP), Ms Susan Findlay (Ernst & Young), Mr Robert Fraser
(Director of Finance), Mr Colin Gibson (Deloitte LLP), Professor Anton Muscatelli
(Principal), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk),

Apologies:
Mr Jim Bishop (Ernst & Young), Mr Paul McGinty (Deloitte LLP), Mrs Carolyn Timar
(Financial Accountant)

AUDIT/2011/36. Minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2012

The Minutes were approved as a correct record subject to the word “financial” being
changed to “internal” in paragraph AUDIT/2011/24 IT system Passwords (Agresso).

AUDIT/2011/37. Matters Arising

.1 Public Interest Disclosure (Audit 2011/4, 2011/16 and 2011/26.3)
The matter was ongoing. Mr Newall would update the Committee further at its next
meeting.

.2 Misconduct Cases – update (Audit/2011/4, 2011/16 and 2011/26.4)
Investigations relating to 2 members of staff were in progress. Mr Newall would
update the Committee at a future meeting were there matters to report.

.3 General Ledger Adjustments (Audit/2011/27)
The matter was dealt with under the report from the Finance Office, in item

.4 Audits of Schools (Audit/2011/28)
The matter was dealt with under the report from the Internal Auditors, in item
Audit/2011/38.

.5 HE Governance Review (Audit 2011/32)
A University response to the review report had been collated and would be submitted
should this be requested by the government. Mr Newall would update the Committee
later in the year.
.6 Review of Appointments of Non-executive Directors (Audit 2011/19 and 2011/26.7)

It had been confirmed at the last meeting that details of directorships of subsidiary companies had been provided to Court. Mr Menzies commented that his interest in the matter had related to the companies’ apparent lack of activity and to whether Court might be concerned about this. Mr Newall explained that a number of companies had already been wound up. It was agreed that the Committee would maintain its interest in the matter.

AUDIT/2011/38. Internal Audit Update

Reports had been provided in six main areas. A further six reports were approaching completion. The Committee was reminded that Priority 3 areas would no longer be reported to it, as had been agreed at the last meeting. There were no Priority 1s on this occasion.

The key messages for the Committee on completed reviews were as follows:

Review of Campus Solutions Development: The review had been added to the initial audit plan, following the implementation difficulties associated with MyCampus. The overall assessment was that the controls regarding the implementation of customisations and architecture to support Campus Solution were operating effectively, and were well designed. Customisations were controlled using rigorous controls built into the development control system, and the architecture to support the system was based on the vendor recommendations and was appropriately monitored to ensure that capacity was appropriate.

Review of College Management: Science and Engineering: The overall assessment was that the controls regarding the processes and operations of the College were adequate; however, there were a number of additional processes which need to be implemented following the restructure. The findings reflected required improvements in localised procedures such as asset register maintenance, financial procedures and Health and Safety regulations such as PAT testing. In relation to petty cash, purchasing and expenses, although the design of the controls in place was adequate, exceptions had been identified in relation to the operation of these controls. The Committee agreed that it was vital that the individuals responsible for addressing the issues were identified and that matters were followed up with them so that action was taken. The management responses to a number of the recommendations also required to be more detailed and specific. It was agreed that Mr Fraser would follow up these matters with the College management.

ACTION RF

The Committee asked that where details of sampling of compliance to were provided in audit reports, the auditors should quantify these so that the financial implications of non-compliance were clearer.

ACTION CG/GC

The Committee noted that, following agreement at the last meeting, other Schools were undergoing reviews with respect to control and compliance matters.

Review of Janitorial and Security Services: The overall conclusion was that the controls in place within Central Services regarding janitorial and security coverage across the University were adequate. Scope for improvement within the current operational and reporting procedures had been identified. A number of changes to services had already been underway following the appointment of a new head of service, including the infrastructure, management structure and reporting available across the Division. Further work would occur once the infrastructure and management team were fully embedded.
Review of Library Cost Management: The review had found that there were adequate controls in place over cost management within the Library. The University Library continued to receive very favourable feedback from staff, student and external users. The University used the ‘Millennium’ system to order, pay and catalogue purchases for the Main Library and the bank libraries, allowing central control over procurement. The review had highlighted a number of areas where there was scope for improvement, including the lack of an interface with Agresso, resulting in duplication of effort and a lack of segregation of duties within the cash collection procedures at various locations. The Committee noted however that there were some interface problems that meant that it was preferable to leave arrangements as they were.

Review of Partnership Arrangements: Overall, the University’s controls to manage the arrangements and procedures for the partnership with Glasgow International College were adequate. There was scope for improvement within the recording of student reconciliations required to validate funds received by the University from GIC and the identification of the true cost to the University of the partnership. The Committee heard that there was a strategic board with oversight of the partnership arrangement with GIC, which set objectives and performance indicators for the College.

Review of Overall Value for Money (VfM) Arrangements: The overall conclusion was that the University had put significant focus on VfM in recent years through restructuring activities, savings initiatives and system developments. Discussions with management across the University had highlighted a good level of awareness of these issues and of the approach being taken. Strategies and initiatives regarding the achievement of VfM across the University were ongoing in a range of areas. The review had highlighted a number of areas where there was scope for improvement to ensure further VfM measures were in place across the Colleges and University Services. The Committee noted however that savings targets for procurement were considered by management not to be realistic, given the difficulties of measuring or putting a value on these.

The Committee noted that the 2012/13 audit plan would be brought to the September 2012 meeting.

With regard to the College Risk Registers, it was agreed that CG would provide a cross-College overview for the next meeting.

ACTION CG

The Committee was updated on the degree of implementation of the audit recommendations.

Finance Office
Mr Charters informed the Committee that since the last meeting, 12 actions against audit reports had been completed, 3 had been partially implemented and 23 were being progressed, 13 of which would be addressed by the new Research Management System. With regard to General Ledger Adjustments, for which an update had been requested for the present meeting, an analysis of such adjustments was being done, to establish the reasons for them, and the value, with a view to taking steps to rationalise the practice. The Committee would receive a further update at the next meeting.

Departments other than the Finance Office
Mr Newall updated the Committee on the key points to note from audit reports, as follows:
Audit Reports 2005-10:

- **Business Continuity Management**
  Five outstanding recommendations were in this area, and were all linked to the establishment of business continuity plans (BCP), within a standard framework, throughout Schools, Institutes and University Services. A standard template had been agreed and completion would be followed by a regular testing of BCPs coordinated through the University's Emergencies Planning Group.

- **Staff Development**
  Recommendations relating to the staff training record would be addressed using the functionality offered by the new HR/Payroll system.

- **Other**
  Two recommendations on Data Handling remained to be fully implemented. One recommendation from the Health & Safety Governance audit had been only partially addressed. This was on HR reporting and would be fully addressed with the development of functionality through the new HR/Payroll system. One recommendation on Heritage Asset records awaited the implementation of the ‘INCA’ cataloguing system in 2013. One recommendation on estates maintenance awaited the development of an interface between the estates management information service EMIS and Agresso.

Audit Reports 2010/11:

There were no outstanding Priority One recommendations. Of the 12 recommendations still to be fully implemented, three from the International Partnerships audit would soon be fully addressed; two from the Student Feedback Audit would be addressed, assisted by the development of a new ‘Student Voice’ website. All others would be addressed within 2012 with the exception of one within the Student Retention audit which would be addressed by June 2013.

Audit Report 2011/12:

With regard to the recent audit of College Management (MVLS), officers responsible for addressing the five recommendations remaining to be addressed were the College Secretary, the College Head of Finance and the Head of the Research Support Office. All but one recommendation were scheduled to be addressed by July 2012, the remaining one by December 2012.

One recommendation remained to be addressed from the REF planning audit. This was to establish a comprehensive data quality plan to ensure the accuracy of the REF data set. This action would be taken forward by the recently appointed Director of Planning and Business Intelligence.

**AUDIT/2011/40. Risk Management**

The register for 2013, which included details of the senior staff who would take individual matters forward, and progress on these matters, was noted.

Mr Fraser highlighted a new entry relating to pensions, to the effect that growing pensions deficits could place serious pressure on cash reserves and surpluses, and/or affect industrial relations. The background was that a fall in the gilt yield, arising from the UK government’s Quantitative Easing programme, would involve liabilities being discounted at a lower rate, and therefore would increase the size of the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme (UGPS) deficit. The increased deficit was expected to have a material impact on the University's balance sheet for 2011/12 and on its Income and Expenditure statement for 2012/13 and potentially for subsequent years. All Universities with their own pension schemes were in the same position and that if, as
was expected, the gilt yield rose in due course, the deficit was likely to fall accordingly, but that it was still necessary to reflect the current position at this time. In addition, the Pensions Regulator was looking at Universities’ approach in general to funding pension fund deficits. Mr Fraser would keep the Committee updated at future meetings.

With regard to the Student Lifecycle Project (SLP), Mr Newall explained that the Lessons Learned review had taken place, and that measures had been taken to ensure that improved services and support were in place in time for the new academic year. Communication was taking place with Colleges to ensure awareness of issues and to ensure that training was provided. It was agreed that Ms Connell would liaise with Mr Newall and Mr Fraser to agree an appropriate timescale for audit of the SLP, which would be as part of a more general audit of project management.

**ACTION GC/DN/RF**

The Committee agreed that the Risk Register indicated that risk was being managed in and effective and transparent manner. The item should continue to be on the Committee agenda on a regular basis.


The Committee noted the report and agreed that benefits had clearly emerged from the work undertaken. It agreed that the report no longer required to be a regular agenda item, but could be brought to the Committee’s attention in future should University management consider it necessary.

**AUDIT/2011/42. Audit Planning Report**

External Audit’s approach for the year to 31 July 2012 would be to review the accounts of the University, Subsidiaries and Trust and to give a true and fair view on whether funds had been used for the purposes for which they were intended. The approach was based on knowledge of the University and the sector, and discussions with management.

The key areas of emphasis would include: student accounts receivable and bad debt, pensions obligations, fixed assets, accounting for severance costs, and treatment of subsidiary companies, where it was noted that the trading developments of the overseas subsidiary UGlasgow Singapore Ltd were not material in relation to the University’s consolidated accounts, but the subsidiary’s local statutory accounts were being audited by Ernst & Young Singapore and their findings would be considered as part of the audit of the University, as would the financial governance arrangements in place for the company.

With regard to VAT, no changes were expected but the auditors would keep the area under review.

The Committee approved the External Auditor’s proposed approach to the audit of the University's accounts, as set out in their report.

**AUDIT/2011/43. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**AUDIT/2011/44. Date of Next Meeting**

Dates for 2012/13 to be advised. Pre-meetings for the committee will be held in September and November.

*Prepared by: Deborah Maddern, Clerk to Committee, deborah.maddern@glasgow.ac.uk*
Court – Wednesday 20 June 2012

Report from the Meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Tuesday 29 May 2012

Cover Sheet

Brief Description of the Paper

HR Committee Minute – 29 May 2012

Summary of and key messages from the 2012 Staff Survey (Annex 1)

Dignity at work and study policy and procedure – has been approved by Human Resources Committee, SRC and Student Support and Development Committee (Annex 2)

Action Requested

Court is asked to note the HR Committee Minute 29 May 2012 and the Staff Survey details

Court is asked to approve the Dignity at work and study policy and procedure

Ann Hastings
HR Operations Manager & Clerk to HR Committee
6 June 2012
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Human Resources Committee

Minute of Meeting held in the Turnbull Room on 29 May 2012

Present: Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), Mr A Macfarlane (AM), Professor A Anderson (AA), Mr D Newall (DN), Mr I Black (IHB), Mrs H Durndell (HD), Dr A Owen (AO), Mr G Scott (GS), Professor E Cameron (EC), Dr D Spaeth (DS), Mr S McCafferty (SMcC)

In attendance: Mrs A Hastings (AH) (Clerk), Mrs S Woolcott (SW) for item HR/11/36, Professor S Beaumont (SD) for item HR/11/37, Mrs M Taylor (MT) for item HR/11/42

Apologies: Professor A Muscatelli (AM), Professor E Gordon (EG), Mrs A Allen (AAL)

DA welcomed Stephen McCafferty to his first meeting. As noted at the last meeting Stephen is a new Lay Member of the committee. DA also advised the committee that this would have been Eleanor Gordon’s last meeting. Unfortunately she was unable to attend but had sent her apologies. He thanked her very much for her contributions to the committee and wished her well for the future.

HR/11/36 Staff Attitude Survey

IHB presented an early draft paper in relation to the initial findings of the staff attitude survey. He advised that the paper has been discussed in outline initially at the Principal’s Advisory Group and was due to be discussed again in detail at SMG in June. He advised that it would also be reviewed by the Health and Safety Committee in September, Equality and Diversity Committee, CMGs/USMGs and the Joint Union Consultative Committee. There was a discussion about the response rate for the survey, (33%) and it was agreed that there should be a plan to try to increase the return rate for the next survey. Different ways of assessing the differing College populations were also discussed, together with the intention to obtain normative data from the HSE if possible. The committee agreed that the high level messages would go to Court in June and, following further analysis and input from different groups a detailed action plan to address the issues would be submitted to HR Committee in September and Court in October

ACTION: IHB

HR/11/37 Update on Research Development Committee – Professor Steve Beaumont

Professor Beaumont attended to give an update on the progress of the Research Development Committee. The key activity included the implementation of the “Concordat” for developing of researchers’ careers and future options. The University had already obtained the EC excellence in research award and to further the support for this had developed a code of practice for the management of research staff. In addition, development opportunities for researcher had been expanded including the research staff conference 2012, research networks and wider Scottish researcher collaborations. The programme had been developed in close liaison with Staff Development to ensure a wide range of appropriate training was available, delivered through a number of channels. SB was asked how the impact of all the initiatives would be measured. Although he believed it would mean better researchers at the end, he agreed that an evaluation framework was needed. DA asked if similar provisions were in place for the rest of the staff, in particular, other Academics. IHB and SB explained some aspects of Managing Academic careers etc (MAPCD) and it was
agreed this would be discussed at a future meeting. DA thanked SB for his excellent presentation and asked if he would return for an update next year.

**ACTION: IHB/AH**

**HR/11/38  Minute of Last Meeting**

**38.1** The minute of the meeting on 28 March 2012 was approved.

**HR/11/39  Matters arising**

**39.1  P & DR update**
IHB advised the committee that the UCU dispute was not yet resolved, but hoped for a positive outcome soon. UCU had asked for all ratings to be removed, and failing that, any ratings’ moderation to be discarded. IHB reported that the SMG had agreed that ratings will continue but moderation for 2011/12 will be at grade 10 only. There will be statistical analysis for grades 9 and below to assess the effectiveness of the system, but no moderation.

DA advised that, following a decision at Court there had been discussions with the Lay Members of Court and Andrea Nolan and IHB about the changes to the rating system. These discussions had lead to a clearer understanding of the rationale for the change in the ratings and it had been agreed that appropriate success criteria would now be developed for evaluating the forthcoming P&DR round, including the rating system. There was some discussion about what would constitute success criteria and the Committee was content that proposals would be developed for discussion at the September meeting and Court in October.

**ACTION: IHB**

**HR/11/40  HR Director’s Report**

**40.1 National Pay situation**
IHB updated the committee that the final offer tabled by UCEA is 1%. Most Unions will be consulting their members but EIS has already rejected the offer. More information when available

**40.2 Performance and Development Review 2011/12**
IHB advised that P & DR for 2011-12 has been formally launched and academic forms will be pre-populated with research, teaching and income data from other University systems. More intensive training has been initiated with Staff Development for reviewers.

**40.3 Professorial Zoning**
IHB reported that professorial zoning was entering the appeals period and there are currently 11 Professorial staff who have appealed.

**40.4 Research Excellence Framework (REF)**
IHB advised that preparations for REF continue and Court has approved the selection policy and outline of the Quality Standard required for REF selection. Training for managers is ongoing.

**40.5 Pensions**
IHB updated that there was a pension shortfall in USS pensions. USS was in discussion with UUK and the Employers Pension Forum to try to address this. Similar challenges face the support staff pension funds and discussions are underway to try to address this. IHB advised that auto enrolment is likely to be a challenge over the next year, particularly for staff on zero hour contracts. A working party has been set up by Universities Scotland to look at the issues.
40.6 **UHR Conference**

IHB updated that he had attended the UHR conference pension costs, managing age discrimination and the general absence of an employer’s justified retirement age along with raising performance levels across Universities had been key topics. EC asked about the practicalities of the removal of a retirement age in view of Oxford’s and Cambridge’s decision to implement an Employer’s Justified Retirement Age under the new legislation. The committee accepted that (as yet untested) case law will be crucial in determining if this is course of action can be sustained.

**HR/11/41 Policy Update – Gordon Scott**

GS updated that there had been discussions with the Trade Unions, PAG and Senate Assessors in relation to the Management of Organisational Change policy. There were specific concerns about level 2 in the tiered approach. He and IHB believed that it would not be appropriate to rely only on numbers potentially at risk for decisions in this tier. Recommendations will be made to the October Court but DA/ AMcF/IHB/GS will brief the Lay Members in advance the June Court, other groups having already been consulted and briefed, to try to ensure a thorough understanding of the revised policy. AA asked that sensitivity to the wording of the paper would be considered to ensure it was not detrimental to any group of staff. The Committee asked for clarity on the role of Senate and that the paper be updated to reflect the discussion from the meeting.

**ACTION: GS**

**HR/11/42 Dignity at work and study policy and procedure (Mhairi Taylor attended)**

MT attended to brief the committee on the background to and reasons for the Dignity at Work and Study Policy paper sought the approval of the committee for all staff related sections. She advised that the SRC and Student Support Committee had approved the student sections. The committee approved the paper and it will go to June Court for final approval.

**ACTION: AH**

**HR/11/43 Review of HR Committee**

DA asked if anyone had any views about the effectiveness of the committee: AMcF advised that he thought the committee was extremely effective especially with the interaction with Lay Members and University members of staff. He thought the committee would benefit from more regular informal communications and he thought the presentations from the HR Managers describing roles within the Colleges was very informative. Visits to College Managers may be useful for Lay Members. EC asked if the KPIs were still relevant and useful. DA said that the list had been tested with Court in December and no changes had been proposed. It was felt, therefore, that in the meantime, they should continue but be reviewed at next year’s meetings. DA and IHB had agreed that they should increase their contact between meetings and this should help with communications. DA asked if IHB would present the current integration and devolved powers of the new structure and how well these were working for the whole HR function at the November meeting: this was agreed. There was also a request for an overview of the research excellence framework at the November meeting. It was agreed that in view of the input provided DA and IHB would develop a programme of items for inclusion in next session’s agendas.

**ACTION: IHB/AH**

**HR/11/44 Any other Competent Business**

DA thanked members of the committee for their contribution over the past year and look forward to a productive year ahead.

Ann Hastings
30 May 2012
Purpose of GU 2012 Staff Survey

☐ 1. To measure:
   • Staff Involvement
   • Staff Commitment
   • Staff Wellbeing

☐ 2. To determine:
   • Actions for building on favourable findings
   • Actions for addressing weaknesses

☐ 3. Where possible, to compare with 2009 survey findings
   • To look for continuous improvement

☐ Restructure has limited 2009 ↔ 2012 comparison
GU 1012 Staff Survey Summary

- Survey held April 2012
  - Slightly shortened version of 2009 survey
  - 2012 response 1780 out of 5441 staff (33%)
  - 2009 response 1814 out of 5524 (33%)

- Findings
  - 2012 GU 10 KPI average = 79% (81% in 2009)
  - Improvement in team communications = 90% (78% in 2009)
  - Fall in workplace enjoyment = 78% (89% in 2009)
  - HSE benchmark indicators show some lower scores

- Areas for Improvement requested by staff
  - Management and administration support
  - Communication
  - Understanding of vision or strategy
Key Messages

☐ Good Points

- Response rate good at 33%; management and staff in general can have confidence in the findings
- Staff have high understanding of team aims and performance expectations
- Large improvement in work team communications since 2009 (78% → 90%) 
- Where comparable, improvement since 2009 in intra-School/RI/Service communications (67% → 71%)

☐ Areas for improvement

- Improved discussion with managers about working practice and performance feedback, and staff generally do not feel praised for a job well done
- Low level of awareness of what rest of University does
- Work enjoyment and loyalty levels both down from 2009
- HSE results down from 2009; requires further detailed investigation
- Some variances between School/RI/Service which require more detailed investigation
## Response Rates by College/US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Resp. Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Arts</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. MVLS</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Science &amp; Eng</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. Social Sciences</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. University Services</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Not Disclosed</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Total</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>5441</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Human Resources Committee

29 May 2012

Human Resources Committee

Dignity at Work and Study Policy and Procedure

Brief Description of the Paper
This paper has combined the Staff Harassment Policy and Student Harassment Statement into one unified Dignity at Work and Study Policy and Procedure. This revised policy aligns both previous procedures with the Equality Act 2010, together with the developments of Hate Crime legislation, and dovetails with the new Grievance Procedure. The Policy has been approved by the Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee and the Trade Unions.

For information, the student procedure has been approved by the SRC and Student Support and Development Committee on the 4 May 2012.

Action Requested
The HR Committee are requested to approve this policy and procedure, and recommend it to Court.

Recommended Person/s responsible for taking the action(s) forward
The Equality and Diversity Unit.

Resource Implications
Training resource

Timescale for Implementation
On approval by Court and Senate the policy will be promoted to staff and managers from Summer 2012.

Equality Implications
The development of this policy displays the University’s commitment to a campus free of discrimination or harassment, whilst recognising if this does occur there are procedures and support mechanism for staff and students.

Originator of the paper
Mhairi Taylor, Head of Equality and Diversity Unit
23/5/12
Dignity at Work and Study Policy and Procedure

1. Introduction and statement of intent

The University of Glasgow vision is to enhance its position as one of the world’s great, broad based, research-intensive universities. The University recognises that productive employees and students are vital to achieve this. Underpinning this vision are four values – integrity, credibility, openness and success.

Our inclusiveness embraces diversity by valuing and respecting the perspectives and contributions of all our colleagues and students.¹

This is supplemented by emphasising that all colleagues and students should be treated with dignity and respect within their working and learning environment and that harassment or bullying in any form will not be tolerated by the University.

2. Scope

The behaviours in this Policy cover all members of the University community, including:

- All members of staff holding a contract of employment, and staff from other institutions on placement at, or visiting the University
- All students, including visiting and placement students
- Visitors, including external persons using the University’s premises
- Contractors working at the University
- Individuals working or acting on the University’s behalf, including suppliers of goods and services
- Employees working within the Student Representative Council and student unions.

The procedures² relating to this Policy cover;

- All members of staff holding a contract of employment, and staff from other institutions on placement at, or visiting the University
- All students, including visiting and placement students
- Contractors working at the University (appendix D only)

3. Policy

The University of Glasgow is committed to fostering a working, learning and research environment where mutual respect and dignity is experienced by and between employees and students.

¹ http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_180610_en.pdf
² All other University community members not covered below should follow existing complaints procedures should they wish to make a complaint about a University employee or student.
The University aims to promote a culture where differences are welcomed, harassment and bullying are known to be unacceptable and where allegations are dealt with in fair and timely fashion, and without fear of victimisation.

The University recognises harassment is unlawful as outlined in the Equality Act.

Harassment and bullying can have a serious detrimental effect on the health, confidence, morale and performance of those affected by it, and on the working, learning and living environment.

3.1 University responsibility

The University will ensure that:

- Staff, students, visitors and external contractors/suppliers are treated fairly irrespective of any protected characteristics as outlined in the Equality Act 2010 (see appendix A).

- Incidents of harassment or bullying are taken seriously and dealt with promptly.

- University employees or students who report harassment or bullying are not victimised.

- It will act promptly when allegations of third party harassment are reported by employees (see appendix D).

- Employees and students are made aware of this equality policy through the University’s web pages, publications and general training, where appropriate.

- Malicious, vexatious or spurious allegations will be dealt with in the appropriate manner.\(^3\)

3.2 Individual responsibility

University employees, students, contractors and visitors will ensure that they:

- Treat others with dignity and respect.

- Participate in training to support the implementation of the Policy where appropriate.

- Challenge harassing or bullying behaviour as and when appropriate.

4. Definition of harassment and bullying

Bullying and harassment are defined by the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) as the following:

\(^{3}\) This would be through the Student Code of Conduct or staff Disciplinary Procedure.
• Bullying is offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means that undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient.

• Harassment is unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, which has the purpose or effect of violating an individual’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that individual.

For practical purposes those making a complaint usually define what they mean by bullying or harassment – something has happened to them that is unwelcome, unwarranted and causes a detrimental effect. However, behaviour that is considered bullying by one person may be considered firm management by another. Therefore the test of reasonableness must also be applied, i.e. a reasonable person in possession of the same information would regard it as harassment.

Examples of what may constitute harassment and bullying are provided in Appendix B. This is not exhaustive list, but it provides examples of what is considered to be harassing or bullying behaviour.

5. Procedures

The University encourages individuals to solve issues informally as this is often the quickest and most effective method of dealing with harassment or bullying: the University has in place support measures to reflect this. The informal procedure for students and employee are very similar and are outlined below.

If you are a student and your allegation relates to an employee of the University, follow the student procedure. If you are an employee and your complaint relates to a University student, follow the student procedure.

5.1 Informal procedure for Students

If a student thinks they are being subjected to harassment or bullying in any form, they may wish to consider the following course of action:

If possible the student should tell the alleged harasser that they perceive their behaviour as harassment, and that they would like them to alter this behaviour. This can be done in person, or by letter/email. It is helpful if the student has specific examples, or evidence of the unwanted behaviour, and can say why this has made them feel uncomfortable. A record of the discussion, and copies of any correspondence, should be kept by both parties in the event that follow-up action becomes necessary.

If the student finds this too difficult they may ask for support in writing to, or accompanying them to a meeting with, the alleged harasser. This support may be from the Harassment Volunteer Network (see Appendix C), their Advisor of Studies, the SRC Advice Centre, Head of Subject or School.

If the outcome of this initial informal action fails to produce a resolution, then the student should proceed to the Formal Procedure (see 5.2)

5.2 Formal procedure for Students

A formal complaint should be made where a matter remains unresolved through the informal approach, if the problem continues after an agreed resolution or if the matter is of a more serious nature that would not be appropriate to be dealt with by informal means. Formal procedures are in place to allow incidents of bullying or harassment to be investigated fairly and transparently.

For students the following procedures are available:

a) University Student Complaints Procedure: a student can refer a matter of harassment or bullying as either an informal or formal complaint under this procedure. An outcome of a complaint investigation may involve a referral under b) or c) below. The Complaints Procedure states that a formal complaint must be made within 12 months\(^5\) from the date of the most recent incident, but clearly it is desirable to address matters promptly.

b) Code of Student Conduct: a report can be made to the Senior Senate Assessor for Student Conduct under this Code if a student has been harassed by another student of this University.\(^6\)

c) Staff Disciplinary Procedures: a report can be made to Human Resources if the University Student Complaints Procedure has been completed and the complaint of harassment by a member of staff of this University towards a student is upheld.

5.3 Informal procedure for Employees

The University encourages individuals to solve issues informally as this is often the quickest and most effective method of dealing with harassment or bullying. If an employee thinks they are being subjected to harassment or bullying in any form, they may wish to consider the following course of action:

If possible, the employee should make it clear to the alleged harasser that they perceive their behaviour as harassment, and they would like them to alter this behaviour. This can be done in person, or by letter/email. It is helpful if the employee has specific examples, or evidence of the unwanted behaviour, and can say why this has made them feel uncomfortable. A record of the discussion, and copies of any correspondence, should be kept by both parties in the event that follow-up action becomes necessary.

\(^5\) 6 months in the case of a former student/former employee.

\(^6\) Students can refer cases under the Code of Student Conduct directly if they are of serious nature, and require early attention/intervention by the Senior Senate Assessor for Student Conduct.
If the employee finds this too difficult they may ask for support in writing to, or accompanying them to a meeting with, the alleged harasser. This support may be from the Harassment Volunteer Network (see Appendix C), their line manager/supervisor, a colleague, trade union representative.

5.4 Formal procedure for Employees

If the outcome of this initial informal action fails to produce a resolution, then the employee may proceed to the Formal Procedure, which is the Grievance Procedure. Where a grievance has already been considered informally (as outlined in the Dignity at Work and Study Policy, section 5.3), and the employee believes it has not been resolved, a formal grievance should be raised within 10 working days of the outcome on the informal stage.

Where a serious case of harassment or bullying is established at the informal stage this may proceed directly to the Disciplinary Procedure for appropriate investigation.

6. Confidentiality

It is important that any claims of bullying and harassment are treated seriously and confidentially.

Appropriate confidentiality will be observed for both complainant and alleged harasser. Confidentiality in this context relates to the details of the case and investigation. Only those who are required to know details of the case will have access to information including the complainant and the alleged harasser.

There may however be circumstances where there is a legal obligation to share information with another party. For example, where a line manager or Harassment Volunteer learns about something that could seriously affect the wellbeing of an individual or group; they have a duty of care to advise a HR Manager/Adviser of Studies or Head of School/RI/Service even though it may be against the wishes of the student/employee. Except in these exceptional circumstances confidentiality will be maintained where at all possible.

7. Monitoring of this policy

The Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee (EDSC) will monitor the implementation and revision of this Policy.

The University will collect anonymised statistical information on complaints made by student and employees including:

- Informal monitoring of the policy by the Harassment Volunteer Network.

- Formal monitoring of student complaints by the Senate Office and of employees’ grievances by Human Resources.
8. Relevance to other Policies

8.1 Student Policies

- Student Complaints Procedure
- Student Code of Conduct
- Code of Practice on Unacceptable Behaviour

8.2 Employee Policies/Procedures

- Grievance Procedure
- Social Media Policy
- Stress, Health and Wellbeing Policy

9. Useful contacts

Harassment Volunteer Network
www.gla.ac.uk/services/equalitydiversity/harassment/

Equality and Diversity Unit
Level 2, South Front
Gilbert Scott Building
Glasgow G12 8QQ
Tel: 0141 330 1887
Email: equality@gla.ac.uk
www.gla.ac.uk/services/equalitydiversity/

9.1 For Students

The Students’ Representative Council - Advice Centre
John McIntyre Building
University Avenue
Glasgow G12 8QQ
Tel: 0141 339 8541
Email: advice@src.gla.ac.uk
www.glasgowstudent.net/advice

Counselling and Psychological Services
65 Southpark Avenue
Glasgow G12 8LP
Tel: 0141 330 4528
Email: studentcounselling@glasgow.ac.uk
www.gla.ac.uk/services/counselling/

Senate Office
Level 6, South Front
Gilbert Scott Building
Glasgow G12 8QQ  
Tel: 0141 330 6063  
www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/

### 9.2 For Employees

**Human Resources Department**  
Level 2, South Front  
Gilbert Scott Building  
Glasgow G12 8QQ  
Tel: 0141 330 3898  
Email: humanresources@glasgow.ac.uk  
www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/

**Positive People Company**  
Staff counselling service - external and independent service. For more information -  
www.gla.ac.uk/services/health/staffcounselling/  
Tel: 0800 282 193  
www.ppconline.info

**Occupational Health Unit**  
63 Oakfield Avenue,  
Glasgow G12 8LP  
Tel: 0141 330 7171  
Email: ohu@admin.gla.ac.uk  
www.gla.ac.uk/services/occupationalhealthunit/

**University and College Union – Glasgow**  
UCUG Office  
68 Oakfield Avenue  
University of Glasgow  
Glasgow, G12 8QQ  
Tel & Fax: +44 (0)141 330 5375  
Email: ucug@glag.ac.uk  
www.gla.ac.uk/services/organisations/ucug
8. Appendices

Appendix A: The Equality Act 2010

The Act introduced protected characteristics for which discrimination is unlawful. The protected characteristics under the Act are:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- marriage and civil partnership
- pregnancy and maternity
- race
- religion or belief (including lack of belief)
- sex
- sexual orientation

The legislation applies to both staff and students, before, during and after the relationship with the higher education institution (HEI).

The legislation covers employment, education, the provision of goods, facilities and services, the management of premises and the exercise of public functions.

The Act places general and specific duties on public authorities.

Under the general duty\(^7\), public authorities are required to:

- promote equality of opportunity
- foster good relations between diverse groups
- eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation

The specific duties for Scotland are still to be confirmed.

\(^7\) Applies to all protected characteristics other than marriage/ civil partnership.
Appendix B: Definitions of bullying and harassment

Bullying and harassment are defined by ACAS as the following:

- Bullying is offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means that undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient.

- Harassment is unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, which has the purpose or effect of violating an individual’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that individual.

Examples of harassing or bullying behaviour could include:

- spreading malicious rumours, or insulting someone (particularly on the grounds of age, race, sex, disability, gender identity, sexual orientation and religion or belief)
- copying information which is critical about someone to others who do not need to know
- racist jokes and ridiculing relating to cultural differences
- ridiculing or demeaning someone - picking on them or setting them up to fail
- abuse or harassment relating to an individuals disability, sexual orientation (e.g. homophobia/biphobia) or relating to gender reassignment/identity (e.g. transphobia), which under recent legislation changes are now considered hate crimes.
- email, text or online abuse
- exclusion or victimisation
- inciting others to harass
- overbearing supervision or other misuse of power or position
- unwelcome sexual advances – touching, standing too close, display of offensive materials, asking for sexual favours
- making threats or comments about job security without foundation
- deliberately undermining a competent employee/student by overloading and constant criticism
- preventing individuals progressing by intentionally blocking promotion/progression or training opportunities
- violence
- shouting and sarcasm
- constant destructive criticism
- ignoring, patronising and ostracising
- setting a person up for failure with impossible workloads and deadlines.

Bullying or harassment do not need to take place face to face, but can happen within written correspondence, on the telephone and through visual images.

Types of discrimination

Since the implementation of the Equality Act 2010, the types of discrimination have been extended from direct, indirect, harassment and victimisation to also include associative and perceived discrimination. Definitions are supplied below:
• Associative discrimination – This is direct discrimination and happens where someone is treated less favourably because they associate with another person who possesses a protected characteristic.

• Perceived discrimination – This is direct discrimination and happens where someone is treated less favourably because they are perceived to have a particular protected characteristic. So it still applies even if that person does not have the protected characteristic.
Appendix C - Harassment Volunteer Network

The University has a network of voluntary employees who support staff and students who think they may be experiencing bullying or harassment.

The contact details for the HVN is available here - http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/equalitydiversity/harassment/staff/harassmentadvisers/

The University has a duty of care for students, staff and visitors and is committed to maintaining a professional working, learning and social environment that is free from any form of bullying & harassment. Volunteer Harassment Advisers play a vital role in promoting this environment by being a useful support contact person for staff and students who have an issue with bullying or harassment.

Volunteer Harassment Advisers are provided with training which covers the law in relation to discrimination, harassment and bullying, the University’s Dignity at Work and Study Policy and their role.

The University recognises and appreciates the value of the contribution of this role and reasonable time off normal duties to fulfil this function will be given.

The role is voluntary and there is no remuneration for these duties, however it is expected the role will be recognized within the advisers Performance and Development Review.

**Purpose of the role is**

- To raise awareness of the University’s Dignity at Work and Study Policy.
- To provide a confidential, as appropriate, listening service for staff and students who think they may be being bullied or harassed.
- To facilitate informal resolution in cases of harassment in line with the University’s Dignity at Work and Study Policy.
- To advise on the role of Volunteer Harassment Adviser and provide guidance, assistance and advice on the courses of action available.
- To identify, and refer, serious allegations to the appropriate University authority.

**Purpose of the role is NOT**

- To undertake any investigations.
- To represent or accompany individuals at the formal stage of the process.
- To decide whether the behaviour / conduct of an individual(s) constitutes harassment.
Appendix D

Procedure for Complaints relating to external providers

1. Introduction

1.1 This procedure is intended to outline the process dealing with harassment or bullying complaints concerning contractors and suppliers.

1.2 The University is committed to eliminating all forms of direct, indirect, associated or perceived forms of harassments, discrimination, and victimisation of employees and students, as outlined in the Equality Act 2010.

1.3 The University as part of its daily business conducts campus infra-structure development and maintains regular contact with contractors and suppliers. Many have tendered for work and through this process are advised of information on the University Policies and Regulations, including those related equality and diversity.

1.4 The University has developed a specific Dignity at Work and Study policy for students and employees. A network of voluntary Harassment Advisers operates on the campus to support students and employees alleging bullying and harassment.

1.5 The University expects that contractors and suppliers will behave with dignity and respect towards students and staff. However, where complaints of bullying, harassment or discriminatory remarks are alleged, the University has a duty to investigate the allegation.

2. Responsibility

Students, employees, contractors and suppliers should demonstrate respect for all parties in their dealings.

Students, employees, contractors and suppliers should take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

3. Lodging complaint

Complaints should be lodged with the School/RI/Service who manages the contractor or supplier, and they will appoint an appropriate investigator. It is therefore important that the complainant seeks to note the time and place of the alleged incident, and if possible note the name of the contractor. Please note for the purposes of this procedure the Student Representative Council and student unions are not considered contractors.

4. Dealing with complaint(s)

4.1 The University will inform the appropriate contractor and/ or supplier about the complaint received.
4.2 The University will conduct an investigation (see section 5).

4.3 The complainant and the alleged harasser will receive a decision in writing from the University as soon as the investigation is complete.

4.4 Where a serious incident takes place (for example physical assault) then the matter may be referred to the police after seeking advice from the University Security Service. The University may invoke its right to suspend work until the contractor and/or supplier can provide evidence that possible precautionary actions have taken place to prevent harm and violation to the University community (staff and students).

5. Procedure

5.1 The University will take action which may:

- require an investigation
- resolve the matter without the need for investigation
- require urgent action being taken before any investigation is conducted
- fall within the scope of specific procedures which will then be dealt with under those procedures.

5.2 The individual should be prepared to provide the following information:

- a description of what happened
- the date and place of the occurrence
- the people involved
- relevant documents (notes, signs, letters) or names of witnesses.

5.3 Possible outcomes include the decision to:

- take no further action, because the complaint is not founded, or there is insufficient evidence
- uphold the complaint and inform the contractor and/or supplier about the outcome
- work with the contractor and/or supplier to remove the offending worker(s)
- ensure that the contractor and/or supplier provides evidence of appropriate training and policy put in place as a result to prevent repeat of such behaviour
- invoke the University’s formal disciplinary procedure against the complainant if the complaint is found to be vexatious or malicious
- terminate the contract where gross misconduct/negligence is proven.
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Estates Committee

Minute of the meeting held in the Turnbull Room on
Monday 21 May 2012

Present:

Mrs A Allen, Mr P Daniels (Convener), Mr R Fraser, Mr J Harrison, Ms A Johnson, Professor N Juster, Professor W Martin, Ms M Morton, Mr M Murray, Professor A Muscatelli (Principal), Mr D Newall, Mr D Spaeth

In Attendance:

Mrs L Duncan, Mr R Kilpatrick, Ms J Ommer, Mr S Sutton

Estates Committee extended a warm welcome to the University’s new Director of Estates, Mrs Ann Allen, and to the SRC President Elect, Mr James Harrison. It also offered a belated welcome to Mr Don Spaeth, Senate Assessor who had joined the Committee.

Apologies:

There were no apologies

EC/2011/33 Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19 March 2012

The minutes were approved.

EC/2011/34 Matters Arising

EC/2011/34.1 Gilmorehill Halls (EC/2011/27.3 refers)

At its meeting on 19 March 2012 the Committee had requested that Estates and Buildings examine the full details of the major refurbishment which had been undertaken in 1996/1997, the purpose of which was conversion of the original church building into a Centre for Theatre, Film and Television Studies. The Committee was keen to determine whether there was any opportunity to claim against warranties given by original design team and/or main contractor.

The Committee was advised that significant volumes of project files were retrieved from University Archives. These were fully examined and had established that works commenced on 15 January 1996 and the Certificate of Practical Completion was issued on 25 June 1997 (6 months late). The contract sum was £2,963,515 (ex VAT) and final account recorded as £3,677,419.28 (ex VAT). In terms of the Design Team and Contractors the information obtained was: Architect and Lead Consultant (SBT Keppie); Quantity Surveyor (Davis Langdon & Everest); Structural Engineer (Rennick Partnership); Mechanical & Electrical Engineer (MKL); Theatre Consultant (Carr & Angier); Main Contractor (Alexander Arthur & Sons Ltd); Structural Steel Subcontractor - Domestic Subcontractor (McCulloch & Pairman); Piling Works Subcontractor - Domestic Subcontractor (Roger Bullivant Ltd)

Further investigation of the parties involved had established that the Main Contractor (Alexander Arthur & Sons Ltd) ceased trading January 2006 and the Structural Engineer (Rennick Partnership) was no longer trading. The Structural Steelwork Contractor ceased trading June 2007.

The Committee heard that in addition to the exploratory investigations undertaken on its own documentation, Dundas & Wilson had been consulted. Consequently their advice in relation to timing and the period of time which could elapse before a claim for latent defect was submitted for any recourse was five years from the date a problem was discovery. The Committee also noted that there is also a twenty-year long-stop date from practical completion on any claim.
The Committee concluded, having considered all of the information provided to it, and the likelihood that any claim under the Prescription and Limitation of Actions (Latent Defect) is time bound, that there were no opportunities to pursue the matter further.

EC/2011/34.2 Western Infirmary Site Update (EC/2011/30.2.6 refers)

The Committee was advised that a tender had been issued to engage the services of a Master Planning Consultant for the Gilmorehill Campus Masterplan. In relation to Western Infirmary Site B, Heads of Terms had been returned by the Health Board in recent days, and it was hoped that the transfer of the site could be concluded by the end of June 2012.

EC/2011/35 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2011/36 Carbon Management Committee (CMC) 3 May 2012

EC/2011/36.1 Oce Pilot Study

The study, which had taken place in the College of Arts, had continued to receive positive feedback and academic staff in particular had been happy with its implementation. The estimated savings on carbon and cost, as calculated by Oce, were significant but had yet to be finalised.

EC/2011/36.2 Carbon Management Plan (CMP)

The University had reached the end of phase 2 of the CMP. The Carbon Trust would now refresh the plan and focus on key actions needed to deliver carbon savings and achieve targets in the future.

EC/2011/36.3 GUEST Final Report

The CMC had been impressed by what had been achieved by the GUEST student initiative in its first phase and had agreed to fund phase 2 of the initiative. The report outlined funding details which amounted to £15,896 as the total investment of twelve GUEST positions for 20/22 weeks over phase 2. It was proposed that this work would start during the first week of the new academic term.

EC/2011/37 Expenditure

EC/2011/37.1 Capital Plan Update

The Committee welcomed the annual update of the Capital Plan which recognised the completion of projects over the last 12 months; the shift in timing of projects caused by the design and construction process; and the projected availability of cash over the period of the Plan (2012 – 2022). It also gives sight of cash flow forecasts which are then included within the annual budget presented to Court.

The Committee noted that the majority of projects show indicative costs based upon the best available information at a point in time although it noted that prior to any significant costs being incurred on any project, a business case would be required to be progressed through the agreed approval process, and would be subject to the normal University procedures for conducting capital projects.

The Plan was recognised as a working document which could be altered in-year to allow for ad-hoc and significant changes which arose through discussion at SMG. CAPEX Group and Estates Committee would be guided by the Plan in all of its deliberations relating to the approval or rejection of any project.

The revised Plan was based on a number of assumptions: the University retains surpluses in line with budget forecasts presented to Court in June 2011; SFC will provide £6m per year of Capital funding for the period of the Plan; 70% of the SFC capital funding will be used for capital projects and 30% credited to the Income and Expenditure account for revenue expenditure on maintenance and refurbishment; VAT remains at 20%; The Development and Alumni Office, together with major trusts reach agreed fundraising targets for large capital projects (Beatson TRC, Virology and CRF); there would be no sale
of assets over the period of the Plan; and that revenue spend on refurbishment and maintenance projects will be £17.3m in 2012/13 and average £14m a year thereafter.

Estates Committee noted the content of the spreadsheet appended to the Plan which detailed the capital and revenue costs of building, refurbishing and maintaining the University Estate over the ten year period of the Plan. It noted that where the term “ERR” appeared in the affordability table this indicated a project where capital funding requirements exceed available cash in any year or where annual revenue spend exceeded a defined limit. The defined limit on revenue spend has for a number of years been fixed at £14m per annum and was reflected in the budget forecasts. For 2012/2013 SMG had agreed that the defined limit would be increased to £17.3m to reflect an additional £1.3m for Gilmorehill Halls and to accelerate maintenance projects by £2m.

The Committee noted the major changes from the 2011-2021 Plan:

**Completed projects removed from the Plan:**

- Refurbishment of 13 University Gardens; and Housing for MAGTEM, Kelvin Building.

**New projects added to the Plan:**

- Priority (Approved):
  - Gilmorehill Halls - Fabric and Structural Repairs (£1.85m);
  - WILT - Provision of two 80 seat seminar rooms (£1.2m);
  - Clinical Research Facility at the SGH (£4.75m);
  - Refurbishment of Library Level 5 Annex (£1.7m);

- Priority 1:
  - Purchase of Western Infirmary “Site B” (£4m);
  - Development of Office Space for Business School (£1m);
  - Development of new laboratory space for Chemistry Professor (£1.5m).

- Priority 3:
  - Consolidation of the School of Social and Political Sciences in the Gilbert Scott Building (£4.6m);
  - Installation of Mezzanine in James Watt South (£2.5m)

- Priority 5: Relocation of School of Culture and Creative Arts (uncosted).

**Projects whose timing, priority and/or costs have significantly altered:**

Stevenson Building Extension (£13m) – escalated from Priority 2 to Priority 1 and budget cost increased from £9m to £13m; and Construction of new academic building at SGH (£10m) - Costs increased from £6m to £10m as design workshops helped to elicit building specification with NHS during 2011-12.

The Committee noted a summary of all of the projects now contained within the updated Plan

**Approved Projects:**

- Gilmorehill Halls – Fabric and Structural Repairs (£1.85m);
- WILT – Provision of two 80 seat seminar rooms (£1.2m);
- Clinical Research Facility at the SGH (£4.75m);
- Development of SCENE II (£4.2m);
- Library Cladding Replacement (£5m);
- Beatson TRC (£38.9m);
- Virology Building (£20m);
- Development of Garscube Learning and Social Space (GLaSS) (£6m);
- Development of QEB at GRI (£6.9m);
- Build of new academic building at SGH (£10m estimate);
- Upgrade of Lifts (£3m);
- Redevelopment of Thompson Building (£3m).

**Priority 1:**

- Seminar Room and Lecture Theatre Programme (£750k/year);
- Teaching Laboratory Programme (£1m/year);
- Purchase of Western Infirmary “Site B” (£4m);
- Development of Office Space for Business School (£1m);
- Development of new laboratory space for Chemistry Professor (£1.5m);
- Development of PG Building (£13m);
- Development of Western Infirmary Site: (£90m estimate);
- Hunterian move to Kelvin Hall (£6m);
- Carbon Reduction (£1.5m);
- Equipment (£3m/year);
- Maintenance (Total £7m/Year); Revenue spend to ensure legislative compliance, fabric repairs and annual maintenance programmes. Increased to £7.7m in 2012/13.
Priority 2:

West Medical Building (£4.3m); General refurbishment (£1.5m/year); Upgrade of Hunterian Art Gallery (£10m estimate); Space Rationalisation (£500k/year); Small projects (£2m/year); Stevenson Building Extension (£13m).

Priority 3:

Consolidation of the School of Social and Political Sciences in the Gilbert Scott Building (£4.6m); and Installation of Mezzanine in James Watt South (£2.5m).

Priority 4:

Redevelopment of Library (£5.75m); CP08/157 Development of Stair Building (£18m); Refurbishment of Level 5 Stevenson (£380k); Strategic Appraisals (£200k/year); Demolition of Pontecorvo and Virology (£500k); and Development of McIntyre Building (£4m).

Priority 5:

Redevelopment of Thompson Building (£20m); Redevelopment of Alexander Stone Building (£10.6m); Development of additional student accommodation (£21m); Development of Level 5 Kelvin (£3m); Pedestrian Crossing, University Avenue (£1m); and Relocation of School of Culture and Creative Arts (uncosted).

EC/2011/37.2 Approved Projects Status (RAG)

The Committee noted the current status of approved projects. It was advised of a time delay in respect of CP11/422: Cardiovascular Building Laboratory Refurbishment Level 3 which was currently 95% complete. The delay was related to the installation of additional equipment, funded by the School.

EC/2011/37.3 CapEx Applications

EC/2011/37.3.1 Library Level 5 Annexe

The Committee noted that the project had arisen to respond to the significant increase in the Post Graduate community over the last two years and to assist with forecast growth in future years. Following detailed discussions with the Director of Library Services Level 5 Annex was identified as a suitable area within which to create a dedicated Post Graduate space. This would necessitate removal of existing reference materials to storage and development of study space for 200 students.

The refurbished area will provide formal and informal study and social space with supporting printing and vending facilities and will be styled and designed to complement the successful refurbishment recently undertaken at Level 4 Annex. The Committee noted that it was anticipated that the refurbished space would be completed during summer of 2012, with the aim of accommodating PG students in September/October 2012.

The Committee noted that investment funding is available in 2012/2013 due to delay in NHS approval of the Queen Elizabeth Building GRI and a delay in scoping of refurbishment proposals within the West Medical Building. It therefore approved the project in the sum of £1.705m, together with £50k for an additional scoping study of Levels 2 and 3.

EC/2011/37.3.2 Stevenson Extension/GUU Hive

In September 2011 Estates Committee Approved in Principle the proposed Stevenson Building Extension. This development was proposed due to the imminent loss of indoor sports facilities at the Kelvin Hall, provided by Glasgow Life. The approval was subject to satisfactory plans being developed to address Glasgow University Union's needs for a suitable social facility to replace The “Hive”. At that point the net investment required was £9.2m with a projected positive return on investment within 10 years. This position was reported to Court in October 2011.
Finance Committee noted the proposal at its meeting in November 2011 and agreed that it would not take any decision until satisfactory plans for development replacement GUU facilities had been agreed although it did review the financial assumptions contained in the proposal, and raised a concern that the financial model might rely too much on income from associate members, who were not staff or students, and that the proposed increase in student membership fees (from £40 to £95 per annum) would have the impact of reducing student membership. The Committee requested that these matters should be considered within revised proposals. Consequently the preferred income profile was reviewed.

In the original business case three income profiles (A, B and C) were proposed, all based on differential balances of internal and external membership projections. At the time Profile B was selected as the preferred option at that time as it secured a good financial return balanced alongside University use. However, the model required a 20% reduction in student numbers to provide the capacity for increased external memberships and associated increased external member fees. Upon further consideration and in view of the desire to maintain current student membership levels numbers Profile A was reviewed and adopted.

During the last six months University and GUU officers reviewed options to combine the University's needs for suitable sports facilities and GUU's needs for a replacement social facility for the Hive. Options included:

Option 1 - New Extension for GUU - Involved relocation of the Hive to a new extension at the rear of the main GUU building, together with redevelopment of the snooker hall in the main building and the creation of a new fire escape from the snooker hall area. While this would provide in full for the loss of the Hive facility, the creation of a new extension would add between £7m and £8m to the cost of the project;

Option 2 - Re-use of Existing Space within GUU to accommodate replacement social facilities - The most suitable area for redevelopment was the ground floor, allowing ease of access and egress. It would however compromise the current ground floor, alcohol-free environment. It had also proved problematic to confidently estimate re-development costs, given the significant constraints that may be imposed by Historic Scotland, the possible substantial costs of asbestos removal, and the unquantifiable statutory infrastructure and fabric renovation that would certainly emerge as a result of substantial refurbishment of a listed building. This was therefore an unattractive option; and

Option 3 - Re-design of the Stevenson Extension - Preferred by GUU and University officers. A modified Stevenson extension would combine facilities for GUU and Sport with new GUU facilities provided at ground floor level of the extension building and linking into the re-designed basement of the main GUU building. An important advantage of this option would be the provision of a street-level entrance from Kelvin Way animating the building street frontage and providing improved commercial opportunities. While not a necessary part of the new extension works, the proposal included costings for an improved fire escape from the main building. Initial high-level discussions with City Planning officers have been positive to the proposal and Planning Services were supportive of the active frontage at street level which supports the local streetscape.

Estates Committee noted the estimated Summary of Costs to combine the original Stevenson Extension Proposal in the sum of £9.2m with the addition of Option 3 and its additional associated costs of £4.148m (new floor added to extension - £1.645m, adaptations to main GUU building - £1.068m, new fire escape for main GUU building - £0.951m and GUU lost income - £0.484m), resulting in a total projected outlay of £13.348m.

Estates Committee noted that since the Stevenson Extension was first proposed, GUU had highlighted its concern over lost revenue during construction works. A figure of £484k was estimated by GUU officers although this would require to be examined fully by the Student Finance Sub-Committee, using GUU's actual financial performance as a measure.
In addition to analysing the impact of the capital works on revenue during the construction period, GUU was asked to consider the impact of the new facility on future revenues. The Union stated that it was committed to reducing its dependency on the University's annual block grant (currently £225k) and hoped that the redevelopment would enable it to make significant financial gains. Estates Committee considered some major concerns expressed about GUU’s ability to achieve independent financial stability. It agreed however, that addressing its concern to identify the most suitable replacement option for the loss of student social facilities, Option 3, when combined with the previously approved Stevenson Extension project, was the best option currently available. It therefore approved the additional expenditure of £4.148m and recommended that the University should proceed with the proposed combined project in the sum of £13.348m.

The Committee also recommended that Student Finance Sub-Committee be charged, in discussion with GUU’s officers, with determining the level of financial support for the GUU through the construction period and that it should also make a recommendation to Court on the level of continuing financial support required following completion of the works. Estates Committee noted that the University would lease the ground floor accommodation to GUU and that GUU would require to comply with agreed conditions of lease in order to retain occupancy of the premises.

EC/2011/38 Policies

EC/2011/38.1 Key Performance Indicators

Estates Committee noted that the annual UK-wide EMS report, now managed by HESA, for 2010/11 had been issued. It noted the University’s latest comparison with peer groups in the KPIs agreed by Court:

Total Property Costs to Income - The University continues approximately in line with previous years, generally just slightly higher than Russell Group (RG) and in line with Scottish Institutions.

Total Income per SqM (NIA) – The University shows continued strength on this ratio, with a significantly higher ratio than either Scottish HEIs or RG.

Teaching Space Utilisation – Previously the University has tended to be at least in line with its peer groups (both Scottish HEIs and RG) and with a slight upward trend, though the most recent year has reflected a slight decrease. This indicator can be subject to a level of ‘error’ due to inconsistencies as to how the data is collected across all institutions, and can also reflect the level of flexibility of curriculum and subject options offered across institutions.

Non-Residential Space in Category A or B - The University continues to appear significantly lower than both other Scottish HEIs and RG, though is now above 50%. Reported data now reflects the updated 2011 (Drake & Kannemeyer) Condition Appraisal report.

Investment to IRV - This indicator can be somewhat volatile due to the inconsistent nature of capital development spend, however there has generally been a downward trend in recent years with both the University and RG reflecting lower investment levels.

Backlog Maintenance to IRV - Data reflects the updated (2011) Condition Appraisal report. Although similar to the previous (Cat A/B %) indicator, this KPI provides some further information on the relative complexity of upgrading an existing estate. The GU indicator remains higher than RG, though in line with Scottish Institutions. The year on year trend is also generally in the right direction although real spending required remains fairly flat (2004/05 £95m, 2005/6 £97m, 2006/07 £98m, 2007/08 £94m, 2008/09 £86m, 2009/10 £78m, 2010/11 £88m).

Energy Consumption and Carbon Emissions - The University has invested significant sums in its capital programme over recent years. This investment has been mainly research intensive having significant energy demands together with a requirement for higher standards of environmental conditions. Developments such as BHF GCRC, GBRC Sir Graeme Davis Building, CRUK, Sir Alwyn Williams, Photonics, Maclay Residences, Scene 1 and Small Animal Hospital etc have been responsible for a significant increase (some 20%) in our primary energy requirements.
Accordingly, notwithstanding a significant investment of over £2.5m to reduce carbon emissions over the past decade significant, energy consumption on a floor area basis is showing an upward trend for our institution. The figures are not weather compensated and therefore will work in favour of institutions south of the border.

The University's energy consumption/notional energy emissions per student and per building show a rising trend corresponding with the increase in building energy intensity. These ratios do however compare favourably against the other Russell Group members. The University has set a 20% reduction target for its carbon footprint in its strategic plan with the objective of cutting emissions by nearly 9,000 tonnes per annum.

EC/2011/39 Any Other Business

There was no other business.

EC/2011/40 Schedule of Meetings for 2012/2013

Estates Committee noted the planned Schedule of Meetings for session 2012/2013: Tuesday 4 September 2012; Tuesday 6 November 2012; Monday 7 January 2013; Monday 18 March 2013; and Monday 20 May 2013.

It was agreed that the date for the September 2012 meeting would be reviewed due to a number of early apologies.
Estates Committee KPIs

Key Performance Indicators
Appendix 1 and 2 shows the indicators, which were approved by Court to be used as Key Estates Performance Indicators. The annual UK-wide EMS report (now managed by HESA) for 2010/11 has now been issued, and the University’s latest comparison with peer groups is therefore now reflected in the charts. Trend lines are also shown for the University’s results as well as for the Russell Group figure for each indicator. Some further explanations for each indicator appear below.

Total Property Costs to Income
In the first indicator 'total property costs' are (as defined for HE Estates Management Statistics) all Estates related revenue costs, and income is total institutional income. This KPI therefore indicates the proportion of overall income being spent on property, and the indicator therefore provides some measure of inherently how efficient an estate is to run. The Glasgow University (GU) indicator continues approximately in line with previous years, generally just slightly higher than Russell Group (RG) and in line with Scottish Institutions.

Total Income per SqM (NIA)
This indicator provides some measure of the efficiency of the estate, by comparing the total institutional income with the size of the estate. There would tend to be an upward trend on this ratio due to inflation, however the GU indicator does show continued strength on this ratio, with a significantly higher ratio than either Scottish HEIs or RG.

Teaching Space Utilisation
The next KPI indicates how well institutions are managing the use of teaching space. GU has tended to be at least in line with its peer groups (both Scottish HEIs and RG) and with a slight upward trend, though the most recent year has reflected a slight decrease. This indicator can be subject to a level of 'error’ due to inconsistencies as to how the data is collected across all institutions, and can also reflect the level of flexibility of curriculum and subject options offered across institutions.

Non-Residential Space in Category A or B
The fourth KPI (space in category A/B) provides an indication of the general condition of the estate. The GU indicator continues to appear significantly lower than both other Scottish HEIs and RG, though is now above 50%. Our reported data now reflects the updated 2011 (Drake & Kannemeyer) Condition Appraisal report.

Investment to IRV
'Investment' is defined as the total of property maintenance costs plus land and buildings capital expenditure, and which broadly reflects the amount each institution is devoting to further enhancing its estate. This indicator can be somewhat ‘volatile’ due to the ‘lumpy’ nature of capital development spend, though there has generally been a downward trend in recent years with both GU and RG reflecting overall lower investment levels.

Backlog Maintenance to IRV
The last general KPI indicates broadly the level of spend required (compared to overall insurance replacement estate value) to bring an estate up to good condition. Again, the latest data reflects the updated (2011) Condition Appraisal report. Although similar to the previous (Cat A/B %) indicator, this KPI provides some further information on the relative complexity of upgrading an existing estate. The GU indicator remains higher than RG, though in line with Scottish Institutions. The year on year trend is also generally in the right direction although real spending required remains fairly flat (2004/05 £95m, 2005/6 £97m, 2006/07 £98m, 2007/08 £94m, 2008/09 £86m, 2009/10 £78m, 2010/11 £88m).

Energy Consumption and Carbon Emissions
The University has invested significant sums in its capital programme over recent years. This investment has been mainly research intensive having significant energy demands together with a requirement for higher standards of environmental conditions. Developments such as BHF GCRC, GBRC Sir Graeme Davis Building, CRUK, Sir Alwyn Williams, Photonics, Maclay Residences, Scene 1 and Small Animal Hospital etc have been responsible for a significant increase (some 20%) in our primary energy requirements. Accordingly, notwithstanding a significant investment of over £2.5m to reduce carbon emissions over the past decade significant, energy consumption on a floor area basis is showing an upward trend for our institution. The figures are not weather compensated and therefore will work in favour of institutions south of the border.

The University's energy consumption/notional energy emissions per student and per building show a rising trend corresponding with the increase in building energy intensity. These ratios do however compare favourably against the other Russell Group members. The University has set a 20% reduction target for its carbon footprint in its strategic plan with the objective of cutting emissions by nearly 9,000 tonnes per annum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Costs to Income (ALL)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.1032</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.1097</td>
<td>0.1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Costs to Income</td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment to IRV (ALL)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.0465</td>
<td>0.0466</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Space A/B Condition</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Costs to Income</td>
<td>Scottish HE Sector</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Costs to Income</td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation rate - teaching space (N/R)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption per sqM (kWh) (ALL)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption per sqM (kWh)</td>
<td>Scottish HE Sector</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption per sqM (kWh)</td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Costs to Income</td>
<td>Scottish HE Sector</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Costs to Income</td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Space A/B Condition</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Space A/B Condition</td>
<td>Scottish HE Sector</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Space A/B Condition</td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment to IRV (ALL)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.0465</td>
<td>0.0466</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment to IRV (ALL)</td>
<td>Scottish HE Sector</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment to IRV (ALL)</td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy consumption per student (FTE)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>6671</td>
<td>6793</td>
<td>6570</td>
<td>6787</td>
<td>6717</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>6,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy consumption per student (FTE)</td>
<td>Scottish HE Sector</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>6467</td>
<td>5617</td>
<td>6001</td>
<td>6388</td>
<td>6268</td>
<td>6,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy consumption per student (FTE)</td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>6008</td>
<td>7976</td>
<td>7705</td>
<td>8137</td>
<td>7736</td>
<td>7730</td>
<td>7,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per SqM (GIA) (ALL)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per SqM (GIA)</td>
<td>Scottish HE Sector</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per SqM (GIA)</td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per Building (Tonne</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>2,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per Student (FTE)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per Building (Tonne</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>2359</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>2615</td>
<td>2608</td>
<td>2,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per Building (Tonne</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per Building (Tonne</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notional Energy Emissions per Building (Tonne</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Convenors business:
The Convenor welcomed Mrs Ann Allen (the new Director of Estates & Buildings) to the Committee. He informed the Committee that this would be the last Committee meeting for Mr Alex Ross and thanked Mr Ross for his role in the HS&W Committee. His performance in his role as a Trade Union H&S representative had been exemplary and the Committee was grateful for all of his input over the years.

HSWC/2011/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 13 March 2012
The Minute of the meeting of the 13th March 2012 was approved.

HSWC/2011/2 Matters arising

HSWC/2011/2.1 Progress with programme of audits (verbal update Ms S Woolcott)
Ms Selina Woolcott informed the Committee that she had received 10 audit reports so far with a further 9 to follow from Marsh Ltd by 8 June 2012. Issues highlighted so far included:

- Review of safety documents, especially in areas that had been involved in the recent restructure
- Risk assessments development, review and communication
- Accident reporting procedures to be formalised
- H&S training, formal local inductions required, management training and training needs analysis for wider H&S subjects
- Science & Engineering to formalise inspection maintenance in labs
- Geographical & Earth Sciences to have fixed installation testing and a review of security and CCTV usage

Ms Woolcott congratulated Biological Services on their audit. The auditor was looking to provide a top 10 of issues for each audit, but could only find 4 in this area. Ms Woolcott agreed to report back to the Committee in September with a final report.

HSWC/2011/2.2 Evacuation chairs - practice and policy (verbal update Mr D Newall)
Mr David Newall informed the Committee that this was an ongoing matter. He had met with various staff that were relevant to this issue and would set up another meeting with Mr David
MacLean (and others) to take this matter forward. Mr Newall agreed to feed back to the Committee at the September meeting.

**HSWC/2011/2.3 Student safety, Kelvin Way (verbal update Mr D Newall)**

Mr David Newall informed the Committee that he had met with the Head of Security & Central Services to discuss this matter. However, the issue had been overshadowed by the recent serious assault of a University student in Lilybank Gardens. Following this event, a review of safety on campus had been undertaken on 29 May, involving staff, students, Police officers and a local councillor. Areas of concern arising from that exercise included the secluded nature of various pathways in the vicinity of University Gardens and poor lighting in Kelvin Way. On the first matter, the SRC would encourage students not to use the pathways out of hours and consideration would be given to the possibility of installing gates at the lane ends which could be locked at night. The Committee agreed that any such matters must not conflict with existing fire escape requirements in the area. On the second matter, there had been a walkthrough of Kelvin Way, lead by Councillor Martha Wardrop, involving the Head of Security & Central Services, representatives from the SRC and Hillhead Community Council (with 2 community police officers). Members of the group reported that 8 of the lights were currently not working. The Committee agreed that whilst Kelvin Way was not the responsibility of the University, reporting broken lights should be. The SRC agreed to provide a link to the council's webpage for reporting broken lights. Mr Newall agreed to discuss the issue of gates, improved lighting and CCTV with relevant colleagues and would report progress at the next HSWC meeting in September.

**HSWC/2011/2.4 SEQOHS accreditation (verbal update Ms A Stewart)**

Ms Aileen Stewart informed the Committee that the self assessment section had been completed and supporting documentation uploaded to SEQOHS. Once SEQOHS were happy with the submission, they would arrange an audit to take place in the next 6-12 weeks. If OH received SEQOHS accreditation, the University of Glasgow would be the first University in Scotland to receive this accreditation. Ms Stewart agreed to update the Committee at the next HSWC meeting in September.

**HSWC/2011/3 OH Report (Paper 1)**

The Committee noted the paper that was circulated. Ms Aileen Stewart informed the Committee that vaccinations had increased significantly since the previous report. This was due to BCG vaccinations being added to the screening process and a recent 3rd Hep B clinic. Research passports had been added to the stats as these were becoming more numerous and were time consuming for all OH staff involved. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that self referrals had increased in both MVLS and Arts. Referrals for work related mental health problems were especially high in Arts and HR had been alerted to this. The Committee discussed breaking down self referral stats to School level but noted that this must not be allowed to compromise staff confidentiality. The Committee agreed however that College Management needed to be kept informed of management referrals. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that health surveillance had risen significantly from April to June. Small groups of staff had been identified, working in hospitals, who had not previously been included in surveillance. The Committee thanked Ms Stewart and agreed that the Executive Committee would explore any trends developing from this and previous OH reports at their next meeting in order to report back to the Committee.

**HSWC/2011/4 Managing staff back to work after long term sickness absence (verbal report Dr J O'Dowd)**
Dr John O'Dowd informed the Committee that having implemented the Stress Management Policy himself, he found this to be a first class working document which provided a map to navigate the process. He also commended OH on the work that they did with staff referred for stress (both management and self referrals). He did, however, feel that there should be more training as well as guidance for managers on how to deal with staff suffering from work related stress. As this matter would be partly covered in item 10 the Committee agreed to discuss this further under item 10. An online document for managers entitled "rehabilitation and phased return to work guidance" was available on the HR website.

**HSCW/2011/5 Health & Safety E-Induction completion rates (Paper 2)**

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Selina Woolcott informed the Committee that this document had been produced to give an indication of how many new staff had completed the mandatory induction between September and December 2011. Completion had initially been slow but this was steadily improving over time. In some instances line managers had to be involved when staff ignored requests to complete the e-induction quiz. The Committee agreed that any staff that had not completed, even with line manager intervention, would be referred higher up the chain of command. Committee members were encouraged to complete the quiz for themselves.

**HSCW/2011/6 Employee Counselling update (Paper 3)**

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Selina Woolcott informed the Committee that the employee assistance programme service (EAPS) was now provided by PPC. The Paper showed that initially high figures were inflated by employees accessing online information. Usage had now dropped to a level similar to that of the previous service provider (ECS). Personal counselling averaged 10 per month with 57% receiving telephone counselling and 43% attending face to face counselling. Of the 23 employees using the counselling service 5 had been assessed as work related and 18 non work related. Of all the 249 online information sourcing activities 44% related to work/life balance, 27% to coping with change at work and 24% to working with relationship difficulties. The remainder were managers visiting the management advice section. The Committee discussed the confusing service utilisation percentage figures supplied by PPC and Ms Woolcott agreed to raise this with PPC and provide more helpful figures in future. The Committee agreed that there was a need to continuously publicise this service.

**HSCW/2011/7 Accident Statistics (Paper 4)**

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr David McLean informed the Committee that there were no unusual anomalies in the stats with the exception of an increase in minor injuries from 50 to 73 when comparing the previous quarter to the same period last year. The Committee requested further analysis of the data at its next meeting to identify any developing trends.

**HSCW/2011/8 HSE involvement (verbal report Mr D McLean)**

Mr David Maclean informed the Committee that there had been 2 separate visits from Health & Safety Executive (HSE). The first was in regard to a scalding on campus which produced feedback but no follow-up at this time. The second had taken place at SUERC in East Kilbride and, whilst the inspector was apparently satisfied with his inspection, he had decided to return with a specialist electrical inspector at a later date to review an activity involving specialist equipment that utilised high voltage electricity.
HSWC/2011/9 Staff survey, stress management, results (verbal report Ms S Woolcott)

Ms Selina Woolcott informed the Committee that analysis of the survey results was in a preliminary stage. Her intention was to collate data from sickness absence stats, OH data, EAP reports and the staff survey to produce a more detailed assessment of workplace stress. This would take place over the next 3 months and would incorporate looking at the HS&W Policy, with a view to reporting back to the Committee at the next HSWC meeting in September. The Committee members were informed that 33% of staff had taken part in the survey with 200 paper returns from staff without easy access to a pc. The Committee thanked Mr Ian Black and Mr Bob Marshall for their work on this project.

HSWC/2011/10 Stress management training (verbal report Ms S Woolcott)

Ms Selina Woolcott informed the Committee that the University had delivered resilience training to 51 senior managers in session 2010/11 with 25 completing follow up leadership training. In session 2011/12, 13 Heads of Administration in the Colleges of Arts and Science & Engineering had received resilience training, leadership training and promoting positive management behaviour training as part of a joint management development initiative. Ms Woolcott and SDS were now comparing feedback on the RT/LT with promoting positive management behaviour training to see which was found most useful by both attendees and management. The Committee discussed how this tied in with item 4 on the Agenda and agreed that although there was no specific section regarding managing staff back to work, this training was useful as it showed managers how their behaviour affected other people in the workplace. Ms Aileen Stewart informed the Committee that OH had contributed to the delivery of absence management training in the past with colleagues from HR and SDS and found this valuable in influencing management behaviour. Mr Ian Black informed the Committee that delivering this training to the high numbers of staff involved was currently not resourceable and that perhaps the focus on the management development courses already discussed was a more practical approach. Ms Selina Woolcott informed the Committee that the delivery of management training on this scale would also pose significant resource challenges. The Committee agreed that this should be discussed further at the next Executive Group meeting who would report to the next HSWC meeting in September.

HSWC/2011/11 Asbestos management update (verbal report Dr N Elliott)

Dr Nick Elliott (asbestos manager) informed the Committee that the first round of management surveys were complete with a follow-up taking place which included both the annual re-inspection and also a risk based priority assessment. This programme was now in week 7 and was on schedule. By the end of the current week 101 out of 219 buildings would have been completed. Once completed, draft reports would be circulated to the relevant staff. Dr Elliott thanked the Committee for their help in recruiting department liaisons. The Committee thanked Dr Elliott for his work on the project thus far and asked that he update the Committee at the next HSWC meeting in September.

HSWC/2011/12 Any Other Business

The Committee were introduced to the new Biological Safety Adviser, Dr Phil Walsh. The Committee welcomed his appointment and wished him success in his role.

HSWC/2011/13 Date of Next Meeting
Dates for session 2012/13 TBC

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales
1. Budget Update

The Principal reported that the University Budget was almost finalised. The position was very satisfactory. Key factors were: the Voluntary Service/Early Retirement scheme, which had saved more than had been expected; the favourable outcome for the sector in the Government Spending Review; and the increase in international student recruitment. As a consequence, attention was closely focused on the identification of areas for investment. There would be some support for infrastructural work, but the main concern was investment in the academic base, where the forthcoming Research Excellence Framework was being fully taken into consideration.

Senate received a presentation from Vice-Principal for Strategy & Resources, Professor Neal Juster, on the University budget and financial forecasts 2011/12 – 2015/16.

Professor Juster explained that the process of constructing the budget had involved extensive discussions, with a special meeting of Heads of School and Directors of Research Institutes with the Senior Management Group (SMG) being convened, a Court Strategy Day and SMG Strategy Day.

Progress was illustrated in a slide of the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) ‘dashboard’. Many of the indicators showed good progress. Regarding staff satisfaction, some aspects were positive, although the overall satisfaction level had dropped from 2009. Much work remained to do to reduce the size of the University’s carbon footprint.

An operating surplus of £8.8M was expected for 2011/12 - the same as at the end of 2010/11. The surplus was forecast to drop in 2012/13 to c. £5.5M, but thereafter steadily increase to £25.8M in 2015/16. Increased International and Rest of UK student fees and the additional £10M Teaching Grant had contributed significantly to the 2011/12 outturn. Much was being invested in new staff. Investment in this regard was even across the four Colleges, in proportion to College sizes. Research Council pressure on overheads had impacted negatively on research figures. Increasing International Student fees would make a very significant contribution to the large surplus in 2015/16, and the return on investments was expected to increase year-on-year. A downside factor was the disappointing research contribution, which was not yet growing as had been hoped. Also, the University pension fund was in deficit and changes to the USS pension scheme could be introduced. Pay increases had been allowed for, but the actual size of the rise could not be predicted with certainty.

In discussion, it was confirmed that sensitivity analyses were carried out on the key budget elements. It was noted that a loophole was permitting students from Northern Ireland to avoid the standard Northern Irish student fee. For the purposes of forecasting, it had been assumed
that all entrants from Northern Ireland would make use of the loophole. The Scottish Government was taking steps to prevent this occurring in future years.

2. Outcome Agreements

The Principal reported that the recent Letter of Guidance from the Funding Council had confirmed the relatively favourable funding settlement for the University and Higher Education sector. However, the prescriptions also within the letter were unprecedented in recent years. One requirement was for the development of individual ‘Outcome Agreements’ for each university. The initial foci of the Agreements would be: part-time provision, knowledge exchange and widening participation. Targets would be set for each university for each of the three.

The advent of Outcome Agreements constituted a very significant development for the sector. While similar agreements were also being introduced for Local Government, the effect there would be to provide local authorities with greater latitude. In HE, the effect would be to increase individual institutional accountability. The Principal characterised the change as one that made the SFC less of a funding body and more a commissioning body. Government was not funding institutional need, but national need. While the new approach would bring opportunities, there were potential dangers also: for example, there could be detailed requirements concerning the shape of academic provision. Indeed, providers of programmes in Nursing, such as the University, who were not holders of contracts to offer pre-registration provision in Nursing, had recently been requested to reduce student numbers. Such developments could become more common. There might also be greater requirement for responsiveness to student and employer requests. With respect to Knowledge Exchange, the University’s Easy Access IP system had been praised by Government, but it was possible there would be further requests to direct activity towards enhance social benefit in specific areas. The sector was already being pressed to maximise the outcomes stemming from research pooling.

With regard to Widening Participation, the University already performed well, with 10% of its intake from ‘MD20’ areas - the quintile of greatest multiple deprivation. Consideration was being given to how performance might be further improved, and it was important that the number of entrants increased overall and that the University was not simply recruiting students who would have gone to sister institutions.

The new environment being introduced would be highly dynamic. It would be necessary to respond rapidly to change. The Principal noted that this would pose questions for the role and operations of Senate and the Senate Business Committee.

Professor Nolan, the Senior Vice-Principal, was leading discussion with the SFC on the University’s initial Outcome Agreement. She reported that one high-level preliminary meeting had been held. Since then, matters had moved very quickly, and the University had received a fifteen-page guidance document containing 30 questions around which the Agreement was to be framed. The approach of the SFC was described as interventionist. Funding of the University was conditional on the Agreement being finalised by 31 July; this timing precluded Senate and Court engagement with the process. It was intended that the Agreements would be highly dynamic: ten visits by the SFC were expected annually.

The Principal further reported that it was possible that the traditional Main Grant Letter issued by the Funding Council and covering the whole sector would be replaced by individual funding
agreements. There were consequent concerns that the new arrangements were potentially invidious. There would be great need to ensure that the Teaching Unit of Resource was not reduced and that the effects of short-term Government special initiatives that could undermine continuity and autonomy were avoided or minimised.

In discussion, there was agreement that there could be helpful opportunities for universities also where there was a good fit between initiatives and institutional mission. However, there was also strong agreement that the individuation of universities increased their vulnerability and the risk of them being damaged, to the detriment of the overall sector. The Principal reported that Universities Scotland was very actively involved in engaging with Government on this matter and in articulating collective views. It was expected that the Outcome Agreements of 2013 would be further-reaching than those presently being developed, but there was time to position the sector in anticipation. With respect to the potential for governmental micro-management and short-termism, the sector would continue to argue strongly that it served societal needs very well, not least through its contribution to employability. The wider social and cultural benefits of the sector would be asserted to help counter the potentially damaging effects of abrupt short-term change. Historically, a micro-managerial approach had been less successful than the results produced in conditions of institutional autonomy.

There was agreement that the University valued and took very seriously its mission and traditions with respect to widening participation. There was a shared desire to enhance further performance in this regard, albeit with University rather than externally imposed targets. Work that involved primary as well as secondary schools in relevant areas was being considered.

It was reported that discussions were taking place with the University's partners at the Dumfries Campus to develop a joint approach. Government expected that resources there would continue to deliver successfully, although viewed positively achievements to date.

The Head of Nursing and Health Care drew attention to the Universities Scotland opposition to inter-institutional competition in the context of the Principal's comments regarding selected institutions being requested to reduce student numbers. The Principal explained that the developments in Nursing were not directly connected to the forthcoming Outcome Agreements. The SFC did want to see greater collaboration between neighbouring universities in the interest of greater efficiency in pre-registration Nursing education. Professor Nolan and Professor Dominiczak, Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Medicine, Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences, would report the outcomes of forthcoming national discussions to staff in Nursing.

It was queried whether the stress Government was placing on flexibility and articulation between institutions and levels of study would affect the traditional four-year degree. Professor Coton, Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching, responded that the sector consistently emphasised the value of the four-year degree and its breadth. In practice, there were few students who entered directly into Year 2 from school. For those who did, the experience could be daunting. The University would monitor developments, but the four-year Honours degree would remain the core undergraduate offering.

Discussion also addressed whether it would be desirable to reduce the University's dependence on SFC funding. The Principal reported that the University’s dependence on central funding was decreasing, at the same pace as that of Edinburgh University and the Russell Group overall. With twice as many international fee-paying students, Glasgow had now moved markedly ahead of the University of Strathclyde in this regard. However, while diversification
was important, much funding would still come ultimately from Government sources and the University remained completely committed to continuing to serve the domestic population.

It was also noted that the University performed very well comparatively in attracting alumni funding. Excepting Oxford and Cambridge, it was among the top five UK universities in this respect. However, alumni income represented only 1% of the University’s total funding. There was also the potential for central funding to be reduced to offset increased earnings from such sources. In response to a question, the Principal reported that, with exceptions such as Medicine, the primary affiliation of graduates was to the University rather than the subject in which they had specialised. This had led to the identification of themes that it was hoped would appeal to graduates, such as the creative arts, museums and Robert Burns around which scholarships could be developed.

3. Guide to University Governance

Senate received for consideration and approval a guide to Governance at the University. The document set out the responsibilities and modus operandi of the University's key decision-making bodies: the Court, the Senate and the Senior Management Group. It also stated how these bodies work together to ensure effective communication and mutual understanding in taking forward the work of the University.

The Guide had been endorsed by the Communications Working Group. It had been drafted by a group comprising the Secretary of Court, Professor Munck (member of the Communications Working Group), the Director of the Senate Office, the Clerk to Court and Head of the Principal's Office. The Convener of Court had also contributed to the development of the Guide. The Clerk of Senate, who convened the Senate Communications Working Group, commended the document to Senate.

In discussion, Professor Munck wished to stress the critical importance of the document in reducing the likelihood of disagreement between Senate and Court. He advised that an alternative version of the section of the document concerning cooperation between Senate and Court had been considered. This had differed from the version before Senate in that the recommendations made by the ad hoc joint Senate-Court committee to be established when required would be binding on both bodies. A meeting to discuss the earlier version had been held which Mr Ross, the Convener of Court, had attended. Mr Ross had not been able to agree to the earlier proposals, on the basis that Court could not delegate its responsibilities to another body. While the current proposals represented a compromise, they represented significant progress, in that a mechanism would exist that could be employed in circumstances such as those surrounding the Academic Shape issues of 2011 and particularly those concerning Slavonic Studies.

The Secretary of Court expressed his thanks to Professor Munck for his positive contribution to the development of the Guide to Governance. He agreed that it was highly desirable to avoid conflict between Senate and Court and also hoped that the early establishment of a joint committee would provide an effective means of dealing with sensitive issues of common concern.

The Clerk of Senate was optimistic that occasions where there was the potential for conflict would be very rare in practice and that the proposed arrangements would be effective in achieving agreement.
It was agreed that Senate would take steps in the autumn to identify a group of members who would form a pool from which its representatives on the joint committee would be drawn in the event it was required. This was to help ensure that it would be possible to establish the joint committee and allow it to commence its work quickly.

With respect to other aspects of the document, the Principal explained that the function of the Principal’s Advisory Group (PAG) was less formal than that of the Senior Management Group (SMG). PAG had been established prior to University restructuring, when SMG had been a larger body, in order to facilitate more rapid progress with SMG activities. It was confirmed that binding matters agreed by both bodies were minuted. The Principal would consider whether to change the title of PAG in order to further underline its largely informal purpose.

Senate also noted that its work undertaken to amend its membership through a draft Ordinance had been stalled on the advice of the Privy Council Office as it had coincided with the Scottish Government’s review of Higher Education governance. It was unknown when or how the Scottish Government would take forward the recommendations stemming from the review. There was a further issue, in that, without primary legislation that amended the University’s constitutional position, the Senate quorum remained at a level which was not likely to be often reached. While other Scottish ancients had dealt with the problem through the establishment of smaller Colleges of Senate with delegated authority, there was no consensus at Glasgow in support of that arrangement. As a consequence of these factors, the proposed Guide to Governance had been intentionally drafted to reflect the status quo. It was agreed that Senate would return to the matter early in the new session.

The draft Guide to Governance at the University was approved by Senate, subject only to it being stated in paragraph 1 of the section concerning Senate that Senate bears responsibility for academic activity at the University.

* * *

A copy of the Guide is appended to these Communications.

4. Senate Assessors on Court

Senate had approved several measures concerning the work of the Senate Assessors on Court. The Clerk of Senate reported on the outcome of resulting discussions with the Senate Assessors on these matters and recommended that Senate accepted the ways forward outlined below.

Taking the recommendations in turn:

“At each Senate meeting the Senate Assessors should be invited to provide their own commentary on the formal communications Senate receives from Court which are presented by the Secretary of Court.”

The Assessors do not wish to make a formal presentation or attempt a collective commentary, but the Assessors present at each Senate meeting should be asked if they wish to make any individual points after the Clerk of Court has delivered his report.

“That consideration is given to the Senate Assessors on Court holding surgeries.”
The Assessors are happy to try this as an experiment. They take the view that such surgeries should be open to all staff and not just members of Senate. They plan to deal with the surgeries on a rota basis ahead of Court meetings. Staff members wishing to see the Assessors will be invited to provide advance notice of what they wish to talk about. The intention would be to have a list of timed ‘appointments’ within the surgery time so colleagues do not have to spend time waiting their turn.

It is planned to hold the surgeries on the Mondays preceding the Wednesday when Court meetings take place. Accordingly, the first surgery will be held on Monday, 18 June. Details of the location and timings will be issued by the Senate Office shortly.

The Assessors wish to stress that such surgeries should not be seen as precluding people coming to see then as individual Assessors.

It would be borne in mind that the Assessors are not delegates of Senate on Court.

It was recommended that success of the surgeries is reviewed after a number have taken place.

“That the Senate Assessors on Court play a leading part in participating in the Senate discussion forum”

The Assessors are of the view that they should contribute as normal members of Senate.

Senate approved the recommendations of the Clerk of Senate.

5. MyCampus Update

Senate received an update on progress with MyCampus.

The Secretary of Court, who convened the MyCampus Project Board, recalled that the implementation of the first components of the new system had provided a poor level of service to students and had led to severe workloads being imposed on numbers of staff. As a result, the ‘Lessons Learned’ group had been established and had reported its findings in January. This had governed much subsequent work of the Student Lifecycle Support and Development team. Mr Newall advised that the programme plan rule checking had gone well. There had been significant work done on software to improve screen layouts and navigation. Fewer student enquiries were expected this year than last, but a bigger frontline team would help advise students. There was a good level of confidence that the handling of examination results and information necessary for graduations would be successful and that Registration would be more successful in the coming year.

6. Application Statistics

The Principal reported very positive application statistics. The upward trend in applications to the University had continued, with a 6% increase over 2011. Applications from within Scotland had increased by 4%. Those from the other UK nations had increased strongly overall, albeit with a fall in the Northern Irish figure. There had also been a welcome increase of 26% in applications from European Union countries. The 8% increase in non-EU international
applications included a significant rise in applications from the US as well as China. The fall in applications from India was mirrored across the UK sector.

7. UK Border Agency Audit of the University

Senate was notified that the UK Border Agency (UKBA) was conducting audits at all UK universities in 2012. The audits were focused on institutions’ compliance with their duties as student sponsors. Failure in the audit could lead to suspension of an institution’s sponsor licence which entitled it to recruit international students.

The date of the audit of the University was not yet known. The UKBA had indicated that the audit was likely to include interviews with c. 10% of the University’s international student population: over 300 students. To assist University preparations, a Project Team had been formed, convened by the Deputy Secretary and with representatives from each College, Human Resources, the Recruitment and International Office, Registry, Senate Office and Student Lifecycle Support and Development. The Project Team was presently focusing on the following areas:

- Admissions
- Record-keeping and Reporting Duties (including attendance monitoring)
- Partners and Agents
- Place of study
- Writing-up postgraduates and termination of sponsorship

The Principal asked members to note that preparation for the audit might involve checking of information with academic units around the University.

8. University Restructuring Action Plan

In January 2012, Senate had received a report on the Year 1 review of the University restructuring. An action plan has been developed to reflect the commitments set out in that report with measurable objectives and timescales. The plan had been approved by Court at its meeting on 18 April 2012.

Senate was also reminded of a prior commitment to review the operation of College Councils as well as the operation of learning & teaching and research related committees after two years. These would be addressed in the coming months as part of the agreed action (no. 2.5), to ‘Foster an inclusive, structured and transparent approach to decision making through the adoption of a range of formal and informal mechanisms, maximising the opportunity for staff to engage in decision making wherever possible’. Additionally, the Senate Communications Working Group had recommended that the establishment of a reporting link between the College Councils and Senate should be considered, as should the establishment in the schools of bodies similar to the College Councils. These matters would also be considered as part to the review of the operation of College Councils.

In discussion, issues concerning decision-making authority were raised, particularly within the Colleges and Schools. It was argued that matters should be devolved to the most appropriate level and location. The view that College Councils should have authority and not merely act as fora for the purposes of communication was repeated. The need for comparable plenary
meetings of Schools for the same purposes was also argued for. It was reported that staff, particularly at more junior and middle levels, did not feel involved in decisions. This was not appropriate when issues such as curriculum change were under consideration; such matters required buy-in by all staff and all staff should therefore be involved in related discussions. The need for a balance between executive and collective decision-making was recognised. It was also pointed out that there were significant practical issues affecting decision-making responsibility, given the large numbers of staff in Colleges - c. 1700 in the College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences. It was suggested that the document ‘Roles and Responsibilities of Colleges, Schools, etc’ might be helpfully elaborated to spell out further how decisions should be taken and who should be involved, in particular, whether decisions should be collectively or individually made. In response to a question, it was confirmed that the action plan had been informed by the staff attitude survey conducted in 2011. In the event that they ran counter to the outcomes of the more recent staff attitude survey, aspects of the action plan would be reconsidered. The points made at Senate would be fully considered in taking the action plan forward. It was intended that developments would be reported to Senate at its December 2012 meeting.

9. Retirement of Professor Graham Caie, Clerk of Senate and Vice-Principal

The Principal noted that Professor Caie, Clerk of Senate and Vice-Principal, is due to demit office on 31 July 2012. Senate joined with Professor Cogdell in offering warm thanks to Professor Caie for his services to Senate and the University. Professor Caie’s dedication to the academic life of the University, his support for colleagues and students and the resilient positivity with which he had dealt with the challenges of the role set a very high benchmark for his successor to emulate. Senate would mark its appreciation with a reception at the conclusion of Professor Caie’s last Senate meeting and there would be a further event to mark his full retirement from the University in the early autumn.

10. Appointment of Clerk of Senate

Senate received an update from the Director of the Senate Office on progress with the appointment of the Clerk of Senate.

The Finding Committee had held interviews for the post and wished to recommend that the following were endorsed as candidates for election to the position:

Professor Paul Bishop (Geographical & Earth Sciences)
Professor John Briggs (Geographical & Earth Sciences)
Professor David Fearn (Mathematics & Statistics)

Senate endorsed the three nominations.

An election would consequently be arranged and would commence at 12.00 on 8 June. The election would be by secret ballot and held electronically, using the single transferable vote system. It would close at 1200 on Thursday, 19 June.

A short written statement by each candidate would be issued to Senate together with instructions on the voting process. The statements would set out the candidates’ visions of the role and the priorities they would pursue if elected.
The result would be ratified at a special formal meeting of Senate at 3.00 pm on 19 June.

Professor Cogdell and Professor Monaghan, the two elected members of the Finding Committee, reported that the selection process had been very fair and robust. They urged members to participate in the election. It was important that the result reflected the views of Senate as fully as possible.

11. Retirements

The Principal thanked all members who were due to retire from the University over the summer for their valuable contributions over the years to the work of Senate. Good wishes were also expressed to Students' Representative Council representatives who were demitting office and to Mr James Harrison, who would become SRC President on 1 July.

Particular thanks were expressed to Professor David Watt, who was retiring in September. Professor Watt had convened the Academic Standards Committee since 2004, and throughout his convenership had ensured that the Committee oversaw its substantial volume of activity with care and diligence. Senate also expressed its gratitude to Professor Robert Rennie, who was stepping down after having served as Senior Senate Assessor for Student Complaints since 2001. The advice and guidance Professor Rennie had provided in dealing with difficult and sensitive matters had been of great benefit to the University.
This document sets out the responsibilities and modus operandi of the University's key decision-making bodies; the Court, the Senate and the Senior Management Group. It also states how these bodies work together to ensure effective communication and mutual understanding in taking forward the work of the University. The document is in four Sections:
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II  Senate

III  The Senior Management Group

IV  Effective Communication and Cooperation
Section I: Court

1. What is the University Court?

The Court is the University’s governing body and is the legal persona of the University. The University Courts at the ancient Scottish Universities, including Glasgow, were created by the Universities (Scotland) Act 1858. Under the Universities (Scotland) Act 1889, the University Court became a body corporate, with perpetual succession and a common seal.

2. Who is on the University Court?

The Court’s composition has changed a number of times since 1858. It currently consists of the Rector, the Principal, the Chancellor's Assessor, a representative of Glasgow City Council, five assessors elected by the General Council, seven Senate Assessors elected by Senate, two employee representatives, the President of the Students' Representative Council, one assessor elected by the Students' Representative Council, and five co-opted members. A quorum is seven.

Court members who are not members of the University staff or student body are referred to as “lay members”. The current composition reflects the University's wish to have the appropriate level of expertise needed to govern a modern Higher Education institution. More details on the current membership of Court are at

http://www.gla.ac.uk/about/facts/whoswho/universitycourt/

The role of key officers on Court is:

Rector: The Rector is elected by the students of the University for a period of three years and is also, ex-officio, the President of the University Court. The Rector chair such parts of the Court meetings as the Court may from time to time decide; this is normally the opening and closing of Court meetings, Minutes of the last meeting, Matters arising and the reports from the Principal and Secretary of Court.

Convener of Court: The lay Court members elect a senior lay member ('the Convener') from among their number. The Convener chairs those parts of the Court meetings not chaired by the Rector, including reports from Court committees, and undertakes all other responsibilities expected of a chairman, e.g. performance review of the Principal, attendance at the national Committee of University Chairs of governing bodies.

Secretary of Court: the office holder, who is also the Director of Administration, is responsible for the issuing of the Court agenda and papers and for advice to the Convener of Court ahead of and during Court meetings.

3. What does Court do?

The present powers of the Court are defined in the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966. These include the administration and management of the whole revenue and property of the University, the amendment of the composition, powers and functions of bodies in the
University, the creation of new bodies, review of decisions of Senate, and, on the recommendation of Senate, the regulation of degrees and admission and discipline of students.

The Court is involved in the development of, and ultimately approves, the University' strategic plan. It approves any major financial decisions, such as whether or not to borrow money; it also approves the University's proposed budget. It authorises the acquisition or disposal of University property (all the property belonging to the University at the passing of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1889 was vested in the Court). Court is responsible for the appointment of professors, lecturers and examiners (1889 Act), and administrators (1966 Act). It also regulates their salaries and pension arrangements (1966). Court is also responsible for setting fee levels for students (1966) and is responsible to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) for certain financial matters, as detailed in the Financial Memorandum with the SFC. Court's responsibilities are set out in its statement of Primary Responsibilities (Annex 1). In addressing these, Court members are required to comply with Court’s Code of Conduct (Annex 2).

A number of the Court’s functions are delegated to committees which report to Court and which seek Court’s approval for major decisions. The seven main committees of Court are:

- Audit Committee
- Estates Committee
- Finance Committee
- Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee
- Human Resources Committee
- Nominations Committee
- Remuneration Committee

Further details of these committees, including their remits, are at

http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_216403_en.pdf

The Court has agreed to delegate authority to act on its behalf in urgent matters between meetings of Court to the Principal, Convener of Court and the Secretary of Court, acting together. Any action taken under delegated authority has to be reported to the next meeting of Court. Court has also given authority to the Secretary of Court to act on its behalf between meetings on matters of routine business. The Secretary of Court is answerable to Court for any action which he/she takes on its behalf and a written report is made to the next meeting of Court detailing any such action taken for endorsement by Court.

Exercise of Court powers is, in certain prescribed circumstances in the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1966, by Ordinance, which requires consultation with the General Council and the Senate and then Privy Council approval; in other circumstances by Resolution, which requires consultation with the General Council and the Senate; or by simple decision without the need for formal consultation. Examples of matters regulated under Ordinances are the foundation of the earlier Chairs/Professorships, provisions for the execution of deeds, and amendments to the composition of the main University bodies (Court, Senate). Examples of matters regulated by Resolution are Degree regulations and amendments and the foundation of more recent Chairs/Professorships.
4. How does Court do its work?

Meetings of the Court are normally held five times a year. A typical Court agenda will contain the following items:

- Minutes of the last meeting
- Matters Arising
- Report from the Principal; this will include a summary of items arising from SMG business and key strategic matters which may require the approval of Court
- Report from the Secretary of Court
- Report on key area of University business, e.g. strategy, budget, Key Performance Indicators
- Reports from Court Committees
- Report from the Rector
- Communications from Senate meeting

Other regular items appear in the schedule of Court business summarised below (Annex 3). The agenda for a Court meeting will identify issues that it recommends Court should discuss (starred ‘A’ items). A number of the reports to Court also contain ‘B’ items that are routine for formal approval (but are not expected to be discussed) or for information.

Standing Orders for the conduct of Court’s business are available at [http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_216402_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_216402_en.pdf)

The main committees of Court meet on a similar number of occasions per year as Court, several weeks before each Court meeting. A report from each of the committees, including its minutes, papers on major issues and details of any items for decision by Court, is provided to the Court meeting.

Papers are posted to Court members a week before the meeting. The Court agenda is put on the Court Office website at the same time. Draft Court minutes are put on the website once a draft is complete, and a final version is put on the website following formal approval of the minutes at the next meeting. From 2012, Court papers will be put on the Court Office website after each Court meeting.
Section II: Senate

1. What is Senate?

Senate is the senior academic body of the University of Glasgow, responsible for the University's academic activity, including the maintenance of the University's academic standards. Its role is defined in legislation as 'to regulate and superintend the teaching and discipline of the University' and 'to promote research'.

2. Who is on Senate?

There are two main categories of Senate members: ex officio and elected. The ex officio category comprises:

- The Principal (see below)
- The Clerk of Senate (see below)
- The Vice-Principals
- Professors of the University

The elected members are drawn from the (non-professorial) academic staff of the University. These members are elected for three-year periods on a rolling basis from the Colleges and they total one-third of the number of ex officio members.

There is no distinction in formal status between ex officio and elected members.

Note: The Senate quorum
There are approximately 500 members of Senate. One third of the total membership of Senate constitutes a quorum. Typically, c. 100 members attend meetings. It has been rare in recent years that meetings have been quorate. The approach that has been taken has been to assume that, as the agenda is circulated in advance of meetings, matters which are controversial and not unanimously supported will attract sufficient members to ensure a quorum and that the range of views held is expressed and that, if sufficiently opposed, proposals are not approved. Measures are currently under consideration to address the issue of inquorate meetings, through the strong promotion of the engagement of the broad membership in Senate activities, including attendance at meetings to ensure decisions are constitutionally competent.

The Principal
The Principal and Vice-Chancellor is Head and formally Chief Accounting Officer of the University. The Principal is formally the President of the Senate and convenes meetings.

---

1 As provided for in the Universities (Scotland) Act 1858.
The Clerk of Senate

The position of the Clerk of Senate has existed at the University of Glasgow since the eighteenth century. It is traditionally held by a senior academic member of the University. The post-holder has Vice-Principal status and is a member of the University’s Senior Management Group. The Clerk is appointed by and from the Senate for a four-year period. The Clerk is formally responsible for the management of Senate business. Correspondingly, the Clerk has formal responsibility for the regulation of academic policy and practice. The Clerk also has important responsibilities for the on-going relationship between the University and its students and with respect to the assurance and enhancement of the quality of the University’s teaching provision – notably, for University degrees that are provided by our validated institutions. The Clerk also has extensive responsibilities for ceremonial events at the University.

The present Clerk of Senate is Professor Graham Caie, Professor of English Language. Email: Graham.Caie@glasgow.ac.uk

In addition to the staff of the Senate Office (see below), the Clerk of Senate works closely with the Principal and Vice-Principal, Chief Advisers of Studies and the Directors of support services.

Senate Assessors on Court

The composition of the University Court at present includes seven members (of a total of 25) appointed by and from the Senate. The seven ‘Assessors’ are drawn from across the University. The group of Assessors comprises four professorial members and three elected members. Assessors serve for a period of four years. They are extensively engaged in the work of the Court, notably as members of Court and other central committees and associated working groups. Senate Assessors also participate as panel members in the major six-yearly review of Schools’ teaching, learning and assessment organised by the Senate Office (‘PSR’ or Periodic Subject Reviews – see below) and are often appointed to working groups established to deal with particular initiatives. Senate Assessors are full members of Court. As such, they are individually and collectively responsible to Court in the same way as all other Court members. Senate Assessors are not formal delegates of Senate and, accordingly, are not charged with presenting Senate’s views to Court. Part of their task, however, is to help inform Court of the University’s academic activities. Stemming from that, and to inform themselves, they consult with academic and other colleagues across the University. As part of that exercise, they may participate in the discussions on the Senate Discussion Forum and they may also hold surgeries to provide further means of gathering University members’ views and facilitating communications between the academic community and Court.

For further information concerning the role of the Senate Assessors on Court, see –

http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/senateandcommittees/senate/senateassessorsoncourt/#d.en.87749

---

2 That is, institutions which do not have the power to grant degrees themselves and which offer programmes of study approved by and formally owned by the University.

3 A draft Ordinance concerning the composition of Court is presently under consideration by the Privy Council (which is required to approve University constitutional matters governed by Ordinance). This provides for five Senate appointments to Court (with the new title ‘Senate member’).

4 The Forum may be accessed by logging onto MyGlasgow.
**Senate Assessors for Academic Appeals, Student Complaints and Conduct**

Student appeals, complaints and some conduct issues are dealt with initially by College officers and committees. Unresolved and more serious cases are referred to Senate level. Accordingly, Senate appoints Assessors to act on its behalf in these three areas, and appoints in each area a Senior Senate Assessor to oversee cases. Appointment periods are of three or four years’ duration. The Senior Assessor for Appeals is also the convener of the Senate Appeals Committee. The Student Conduct Committee is convened by the Principal or by a Vice-Principal. The membership of the associated committees is drawn from across the Colleges.

The various University Codes covering Appeals, Complaints and Conduct are contained in the University *Calendar*. See –

http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/calendar/calendar2011-12/

**The Senate Office**

The Senate Office provides a range of academic services to staff and students across the University and to a number of external stakeholders.

The Senate Office’s remit takes its cue largely from the role of Senate itself. Thus, it plays a coordinating role in academic governance for the University, provides support for and helps to develop, communicate and implement aspects of the University’s policies and practices in respect of Learning & Teaching. In this, it supports Senate and its members and Senate’s main committees (excepting RPSC -this is supported by staff of the office of the Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise§). It also manages production of the University *Calendar* (compendium of regulations). Office staff provide advice on regulatory matters, in conjunction with the Clerk of Senate. The Office works closely with the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) as well as the Clerk of Senate, and with staff and students across the University.

Consistent with the constitutional role of Senate itself, the Office manages the University’s centralised systems for the enhancement and assurance of the standards and quality of its degree programmes and associated policy. This includes the University’s external examiner system as well as the PSRs noted above. It also manages the University’s relationship with the external agency that assesses the quality of its teaching – the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education – and associated aspects of the University’s dealings with the Scottish Funding Council.

The Office also provides a number of student-related services. In this, it manages the systems employed by Senate in respect of academic appeals, student complaints and student conduct. Accordingly, it works closely with the Assessors appointed by Senate in these areas of activity.

The Office also manages aspects of the University’s collaborative arrangements with other academic institutions.

---

§ See: [http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/researchandenterprise/aboutre/organisationalstructure/vpteam/](http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/researchandenterprise/aboutre/organisationalstructure/vpteam/)
Members of the Senate Office work with the Clerk of Senate on the organisation of many of the University's main ceremonial events.

More information on Senate Office and its staff is available at the Office web site - http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/ - and members should not hesitate to contact the Office with any queries concerning Senate operations or any other aspect of the Office's work. The Director of the Senate Office is Dr Jack Aitken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate website:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the Senate Office:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Office (general enquiries):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What does Senate do?

Following from its legal responsibilities, one of the chief areas of Senate activity is the awarding of the University's degrees. Senate thus considers proposed new programmes of study and recommends to Court that they be approved. In practice, technical consideration of proposed programmes is devolved to the Colleges and other Senate committees. Senate also approves nominations for Honorary Degrees from the Honorary Degrees Committee.

In discharging its responsibilities for teaching and research, Senate delegates related detailed issues to key specialist committees: Education Policy & Strategy (or EdPSC) and the Academic Standards (or ASC), both of which deal with learning and teaching matters, and Research Planning & Strategy (or RPSC). These committees provide Senate with regular reports, and Senate considers (not exclusively) the strategic dimensions and implications of any proposals. As a matter of course, Senate identifies for discussion the reports from EdPSC and RPSC. In practice, most major University policy developments come before Senate via one of these committees.

---

6 This includes major revisions to existing programmes – see: http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateofice/qea/progdesignapproval/progapproval/#d.en.87515 Senate is also responsible for new/revised courses. (Approval of these is delegated to the Colleges.)

7 For details of the range of Senate Committees and their remits, see.

8 College Deans for Learning & Teaching, Graduate Studies and Research chair key College committees, including Learning & Teaching Committees, and occupy positions on EdPSC and RSPC, thereby maintaining the strong link between the Colleges and Senate. College Learning & Teaching Committee conveners ensure there is appropriate coordination between the College’s constituent Schools. To facilitate, papers for the University Learning & Teaching Committee are copied to all School Heads of Learning & Teaching.
committees. Proposals are also received from the Colleges where they have institutional level implications.

Proposals may also be brought to Senate by the Principal and in reports from the Senior Management Group.

Senate also receives regular reports from the Student Support & Development Committee (SSDC). SSDC serves as a forum for the University and the Students' Representative Council to work in partnership to identify, address and monitor, at a strategic level, matters affecting student support and development with the aim of enhancing the quality of the student experience.

Committees and others developing proposals are requested to provide an indication at the earliest feasible stage of initiatives likely to be submitted for Senate’s consideration. This is to allow members time to inform themselves of the issues concerned and to discuss these informally with colleagues. The Senate Discussion Forum may be used to facilitate such discussion.

As the responsible body, Senate also receives reports arising from the activities of officers and committees delegated to deal with student-related matters – academic appeals, complaints and student conduct issues. (See above on the Senate Assessors.)

Senate’s agenda also always includes ‘communications’, some of which are of a purely formal nature, from the University Court. Senate also sends its communications to meetings of Court. These will include any matter which Senate has considered and which requires the endorsement of the Court. The Clerk of Senate presents the Communications from Senate to Court. The Secretary of Court does the same for communications from Court at Senate meetings. In addition, the Senate Assessors on Court provide further commentary on Court communications at Senate.

Other formal matters Senate deals with include the appointment of representatives to a number of external bodies – School governing bodies, etc.

At the start of the session, Senate receives a note from the Conveners of the main committees advising of business the committees expect to deal with in the coming session. As indicated above, initiatives under development are reported to Senate at the earliest appropriate stage. Every other year, the conveners of the main committees explain committee remits.

4. How does Senate do its work?

Meetings

There are five scheduled meetings of Senate in each year. The timing reflects the pattern of the academic year. Dates of forthcoming meetings are always provided with the Senate papers and

---

9 The re-constitution of the College Councils formally as committees of Senate is presently under consideration.
10 See below on how interaction between Senate, Court and the SMG takes place.
are also available on the Senate web pages. **Meetings are normally held at 3.00 pm on Thursday afternoons, and customarily take place in the Senate Room in the Gilbert Scott Building.** Tea and coffee are available for members from 2.45 pm in the area outside the Senate Room. It is very difficult to predict the duration of meetings. The normal maximum length of meetings is two hours. Members who require to leave meetings may do so, normally at an appropriate point between agenda items.

Meetings are convened by the Principal. On the rare occasion where the Principal is not present, the Senior Vice-Principal or one of the Vice-Principals convenes. The convener is supported by the Clerk of Senate and Director of the Senate Office. The latter acts as clerk to meetings and drafts the Senate minutes.

Meetings customarily begin with the formal induction of new professors. Inductions are followed by any intimations. In the event that the death of a member or former member has been reported, Senate stands in silence to mark its respect.

**Agenda & discussion**

There are typically c. 15 items on Senate’s agenda, although not all are discussed. The agenda is discussed beforehand by the Senate Business Committee. This committee comprises the Principal (as convener), Clerk of Senate, Vice-Principals and a nominee from the Students’ Representative Council, together with one professorial and one non-professorial member of Senate from each College, elected by the members in the corresponding group. It provides an annotated agenda which identifies issues that it recommends Senate should discuss (i.e., ‘starred’ items), may offer comment on topical matters, and checks to ensure that actions previously agreed by Senate have been progressed appropriately.

- Starred items form Part A of the Senate agenda.
- Part B lists items that require formal approval, but are not expected to be discussed.
- Part C provides items for information.

Members have the opportunity at the beginning of meetings to ask that further items are starred. Members are, however, encouraged to notify the Senate Office (see above) in advance of the meeting of issues they would like starred for discussion. This allows the Office to contact relevant officers to ensure they are prepared and thus helps to resolve any concerns at the meeting, rather than necessitate or prolong further consideration of the issue under discussion.

Near the start of the meeting, the agenda includes **Convener’s Business**, where the Principal provides a report on important matters currently affecting the University.

The agenda also includes ‘**Principal’s Q&A**’ as a standing item. Here, the Principal reports to Senate on questions and issues that have been submitted (in advance of meetings) by members. Members may submit proposals for questions to the Principal for response and discussion at Senate. Proposed questions should be submitted in writing to the Senate Office two weeks before Senate meets for consideration by the Principal. Members whose questions have been accepted will be notified and their questions will be included in the papers.

Members are also invited to propose items for inclusion on the Senate agenda. Proposals should be submitted in writing (preferably by email) to the Senate Office not less than two weeks before Senate meets. The proposal should include any necessary contextualising
information. Proposed items will be considered by the Senate Business Committee at its pre-
Senate meeting, and members whose suggestions have been accepted will be notified in
advance.

Normally, the Principal will invite the senior officer responsible to introduce items starred for
discussion. Others who have been involved in preparing proposals or for whom proposals have
significant implications may also be invited to comment before open discussion commences.
The SRC will also be asked as a matter of course to express a view on issues under discussion.

The size and breadth of Senate means that there will often be a range of viewpoints on any issue
under consideration. On occasion, a decision will be taken on the basis of a show of hands, or,
for closely balanced and/or contentious matters, a counted vote may be taken. These have
traditionally been very rare. On such occasions, the Principal has both a deliberative and a
casting vote.

**Papers**

Papers for meetings are normally posted on the Senate web site on the Friday of the week
preceding the meeting. The Senate Office sends an email to all members notifying them when
the papers have been uploaded. New members are provided with information on downloading
papers. Members of Senate who experience any difficulties in this regard should contact the
Senate Office. Papers are available on the Senate web site wherever it is not considered
necessary to keep them confidential.

Not all agenda items have accompanying papers. As noted above, committees provide reports
that focus on key matters – formal minutes of committee meetings are not submitted. The
Committees will sometimes append full copies of documents associated with issues they have
been considering. Reports from committees note where there has been a range of views on an
issue and, where appropriate, in making recommendations, list options for Senate to consider,
together with their rationales. Recommendations which are not discussed are considered to
have been approved at the meeting concerned. This includes recommendations contained
within the papers received for formal approval that are not discussed.

**Other practical matters concerning meetings**

Typically, c.100 members attend Senate meetings\(^{11}\), together with some non-members, such as
representatives of the Students’ Representative Council and Directors of University Service units
who have an interest in business under consideration.

A small number of seats are customarily reserved. The Principal, Clerk of Senate, and Vice-
Principals sit at a table facing the assembly, together with the Director of the Senate Office (who
is in attendance at all meetings). The Heads of College normally occupy seats on the front row
in order to participate in the induction of new professors. No other seats are reserved.

**Outwith meetings**

Senate extends authority to the Principal and Clerk of Senate to decide matters on its behalf
during the summer months between Senate meetings – ‘summer powers’. Senate extends to

---

\(^{11}\) See above re the Senate quorum.
the Clerk of Senate authority to decide matters of routine business between meetings. All such decisions are reported to Senate at its next meeting for formal endorsement.

An **online forum** has been established to permit members of Senate to exchange views on forthcoming business. The forum may be accessed by logging onto MyCampus.

**Reports** are issued on the Senate Office web site after every Senate meeting, summarising matters discussed and decisions taken.

Information concerning established policy, regulations, codes, etc., including the University Calendar, is available on the Senate Office web site – See:

[http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/](http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/)

The Senate Office notifies groups of staff and students affected of recent policy decisions and their implications. The Senate Office also maintains a list of Senate-related initiatives that are under development on its ‘work in progress’ web pages. See: [http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/workinprogress/#d.en.87249](http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/workinprogress/#d.en.87249)

Members of Senate with queries concerning any aspect of Senate activity should contact the Senate Office for advice (see above for contact details).

**5. Standing Orders of Senate**

Standing Orders of Senate are available on the Senate web site at: [http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/committees/senate/standingorders/](http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/committees/senate/standingorders/)
Section III: The Senior Management Group

1. What is the Senior Management Group?

The Senior Management Group (SMG) is convened by the Principal and comprises the senior executive officers of the University. These officers are appointed by the University Court to provide leadership, within the context of the University’s Strategic Plan and to manage the University’s human, physical and financial resources, within the context of the policies approved by the Court.

2. Who is on SMG?

Its membership, which is determined by the Principal currently includes:

- The Principal
- 9 Vice Principals, being:
  - 4 Heads of College
  - The Senior Vice-Principal
  - The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching)
  - The Vice-Principal (Research & Enterprise)
  - The Vice-Principal (Strategy & Resources)
  - The Clerk of Senate
- The Secretary of Court
- The Director of Corporate Communications
- The Director of Finance
- The Director of Human Resources

The meeting is clerked by the Head of the Principal’s office.

3. What does SMG do?

The SMG has responsibility for ensuring that the University policies are effectively implemented and that this is done in a coordinated way across the Colleges and University Services. It has a role in developing corporate initiatives and policies, for consideration by Senate and Court. SMG maintains a watching brief on the University strategy and in particular on progress against the strategic KPIs and it takes action as required to ensure that the University is positioned to meet them. SMG also has an ongoing responsibility to monitor, assess and address risk, and in liaison with Court, update the strategic risk list annually.

4. How does SMG do its work?

Frequency of meetings
The SMG meets once a month every month throughout the year. Meetings are usually scheduled for 9.00am to 2.00pm.

**Agendas**

Agendas are generated by members and cover a broad range of issues relating to the University strategy, finance/budgets, human resources, research management and performance, learning and teaching, internationalisation. SMG receives regular reports on strategic risks, major IT initiatives, biannual reports on media activity and fundraising activity, a yearly report on Health & Safety and the Glasgow International College. It has the following standing items: Convener’s business, admissions and recruitment, monthly university management accounts, audit reports, action log.

**Communications**

The Principal and the other SMG members attend meetings of Senate and Court, and they have an important role in ensuring that there are effective communications between all three bodies (Senate, Court and SMG) and that, when important matters of University business are being considered, Senate and Court are well informed.

The Principal reports to Court and Senate on SMG business.

Minutes of SMG meetings are circulated to Heads of School and Research Institutes and verbal update reports are given at University Services Management Group.

It is intended that summary reports will in future be issued following each SMG meeting.

**Principal’s Advisory Group**

In addition to SMG the Principal convenes the Principal’s Advisory Group (PAG) which meets every week except the week of an SMG. The membership of PAG is the same as SMG.

The purpose of PAG is to deal with ongoing operational matters, continuing SMG business when necessary, and to provide a forum and opportunity for members to update colleagues and raise issues relating to their specific areas of responsibility.
Section IV : Effective Communication and Cooperation

Communications are exchanged between Senate and Court after each of their meetings and the Clerk of Senate presents communications from Senate to Court at Court meetings. In the same way, the Secretary of Court presents communications from Court to Senate and the Senate Assessors on Court provide further commentary on the communications from Court at Senate.

The Principal is a member of Court as well as the President of Senate.

The President of the Students’ Representative Council is also a member of Court and attends Senate.

To assist mutual awareness, Senate and Court publish the agenda for forthcoming meetings on their web pages. Subject to the need to reserve some matters of business, Senate and Court papers are available to all in the University on the respective web sites.

At the outset of the academic year, the Principal and Convener of Court advise the University community of business expected to feature on the Senate and Court agendas during the coming session. Reports are issued to the University by email following meetings advising on the main matters considered and decisions made. As Senate deals with a substantial number of policy developments, the Senate Office maintains a web page listing recent such developments and those who may be affected by them. See: http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/academic/recentpolicyagreements/#d.en.87248

Informal arrangements are also maintained - such as the Senate Guest Night dinners - to provide occasions for members of Senate and Court to meet.

Significant matters of policy which have a primarily academic bearing, the province of Senate, may also have resource implications, and will therefore require the approval of Court. Similarly, policy matters which primarily concern resources may also have consequences for academic activity, and in such situations policy decisions will be taken by Court only after a clear process of consultation with Senate, aimed at achieving an outcome that is supported by both bodies.

Consultation may simply involve seeking a direct response from the next appropriate meeting of the body concerned, conveyed by means of Court-Senate communications. Sometimes the matter may be more complex and/or far-reaching, and it will be important to ensure that communications between Senate and Court are clear and that both bodies are well briefed. In such situations, SMG has an important role to play in promoting mutual understanding of Senate and Court viewpoints and in seeking consensus between the two bodies.

The recently agreed improvements in communications between Court, Senate and SMG should obviate disagreements amongst these bodies. However, occasionally the Principal - either on his/her own initiative, or having received advice from Senate or Court - may decide that an issue is of sufficient importance to the academic work of the University that a formal Joint Senate/Court Working Group should be established. The Group would have a remit to consider the matter and to formulate recommendations to Senate and Court, and its establishment would require the approval of both bodies.
A Joint Senate/Court Working Group would have an equal number of Court and Senate members (six each is suggested). Court and Senate would select representatives to the Group on the basis that no member of the Joint Working Group would have a direct interest in the matter under discussion.

The Joint Working Group would have the power to call any member of the University to provide information, clarification or other evidence, either in writing or verbally. All members of the Group would observe strict rules of confidentiality: it would therefore be able to discuss all relevant issues and consider data of a confidential nature.

Meetings of the Joint Working Group would be called as quickly as possible, discussions taken forward without delay, and the Group would be required to complete its work within a timescale agreed between Court and Senate, or, failing such agreement, within 28 days of the establishment of the group. The aim of the Group would be to formulate recommendations for consideration by Senate and Court which, if not unanimously agreed by the Group, would be acceptable to at least two-thirds of its members.
STATEMENT OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

The primary responsibilities of the University Court, as the governing body of the University, are:

**General**
To be satisfied that appropriate mechanisms are in place:

1. to administer and manage all of the revenue and property of the University and to exercise general control over its affairs, purposes and functions, taking all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern to the institution;
2. to safeguard the good name and values of the University and to ensure that the institution is responsive to the interests of its stakeholders, including students, staff, graduates, the local community and funding bodies;
3. to make provision, in consultation with the Senate, for the general welfare of students;
4. to ensure the solvency of the University and to safeguard its assets;
5. to ensure compliance with the University's Statutes, Ordinances, Resolutions and other rules and regulations of the University, as well as national and international law where applicable;
6. to appoint the Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University, including the terms and conditions attaching to the appointment, and to put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring his or her performance;
7. to appoint a Secretary of Court and to ensure that with regard to his or her managerial responsibilities in the University, there is an appropriate separation in the lines of accountability;

**Strategic Planning**

8. to approve the mission of the University and its strategic plans, setting out its aims and objectives in teaching and research, and identifying the financial, physical and staffing requirements for their achievement;
9. to approve a financial strategy, long-term business plans and annual budgets;
10. to approve an estates strategy for the management and development of the University's estate and buildings in support of institutional objectives;
11. to approve a human resources strategy and to ensure that reward arrangements for its employees are appropriate to the needs of the University;
12. to monitor the University's performance against approved plans and key performance indicators;

**Exercise of Controls**

13. to make clear and to review regularly the executive authority and other powers delegated to the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, to other senior officers and to other bodies of the University including the Senate and Committees of Court, such authority and powers to be set out in a Schedule of Delegated Authorities;
14. to ensure the proper use of public funds awarded to the University and observance of the terms of the Financial Memorandum between the University and the Scottish Funding Council;
15. to establish and monitor effective systems of internal control and accountability throughout the University;
16. to oversee the University’s arrangements for internal and external audit and to approve the University’s annual financial statements;
17. to ensure that arrangements are in place for the proper management of health and safety in respect of students, staff and other persons affected by University operations;
18. to be the University’s legal authority and, as such, to ensure that systems are in place for meeting all the University’s legal obligations, including those arising from contracts and other legal commitments made in the University’s name.

Effectiveness and Transparency

19. to ensure, through the appointment of co-opted lay persons in accordance with the Statutes, and through liaison with the University’s General Council with regard to its Assessors, a balance of skills and experience amongst the membership of the Court sufficient to meet its primary responsibilities;
20. to ensure that the proceedings of the Court are conducted in accordance with best practice in higher education corporate governance and with the principles of public life drawn up by the Committee on Standards in Public Life;
21. to ensure that procedures are in place in the University for dealing with internal grievances, conflicts of interest and public interest disclosure;
22. to monitor its own performance and that of its Committees, with a formal evaluation of effectiveness undertaken not less than every five years.

Adopted by the University Court: 18 April 2007
CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF COURT

This Code of Conduct applies equally to all members of Court. The Court endorses the seven principles of public life as defined by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (see following page). In practical terms, these principles require that the Court and its members should observe the highest standards of integrity, objectivity and honesty in the transaction of all its business.

Members of Court should:-

- make all reasonable efforts to attend every meeting of Court. In the event of unavoidable absence, a member should inform the Secretary of Court prior to the meeting;

- read the papers to be considered by Court (normally circulated to members on the Tuesday prior to each meeting), consider their contents and seek any additional information or necessary clarification from the Secretary of Court, the convener of the committee concerned or the author of the paper;

- ensure, through the Chairperson, that their views relevant to an item under discussion are heard by Court;

- always bear in mind the best interests of the University;

- declare any personal or business interests which may conflict with their responsibilities to the University; leave the meeting and not participate in the decision-making process if there is a conflict of interest;

- participate in ensuring that discussions are held and decisions taken in an honest, open and objective manner and that taking sectional positions is avoided;

- when a consensus decision cannot be reached, vote objectively and dispassionately. If a member votes against a motion which is carried by the majority of those present, he/she should subsequently support the decision or, exceptionally, ask that his/her dissent is recorded. In extreme circumstances, for example if the matter is felt to be one of conscience or principle, a member may resign from the Court; and

- bring the same qualities of honesty, openness and objectivity to any work they have agreed to undertake on Court Committees or on working parties established by Court.
SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC LIFE

Selflessness

Holders of public office should take decisions solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends.

Integrity

Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might influence them in the performance of their official duties.

Objectivity

In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.

Openness

Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

Honesty

Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.

Leadership

Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

These principles were set out by the Committee on Standards in Public Life
### ANNUAL SCHEDULE OF COURT BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(September/ October)</td>
<td><em>Strategy Discussion Day</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>• Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report on any action taken under delegated summer powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report on Strategy Discussion Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standing Orders, Code of Conduct, Committee remits and dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statement of Primary Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scheme of Delegated Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schedule of Court business for forthcoming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report on previous year's attendance of Court and Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning &amp; Teaching update and KPIs from Vice Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nominations Committee recommendations for forthcoming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review of Teaching Quality (ELIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Honorary Degree nominations (for information from Senate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(November)</td>
<td><em>(Half day briefing on Governance, Funding and HE Policy)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>• Report from Head of University Services (pre-Court briefing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audited Accounts/Financial Statements for previous year (including subsidiaries’ financial statements and GU Trust statements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report on Investments (Finance Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Human Resources Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>• Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SRC annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finance KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>• Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research update and KPIs from Vice Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SFC Main Grant Allocations for forthcoming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May/June)</td>
<td><em>(Half day briefing on University Finances)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>• Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic Plan (annual update) including KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capital Programme (annual update for approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget Overview for forthcoming year/Financial Forecasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report on Investments (Finance Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Estates KPIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>