Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 20 June 2012 in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr David Anderson General Council Member, Ms Susan Ashworth Employee Representative, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Mr Peter Daniels Co-opted Member, Ms Susan Dunsmore General Council Member, Dr Robin Easton Co-opted Member, Professor Eleanor Gordon Senate Member, Ms Amy Johnson SRC Vice President Student Support, Mr Kenneth Law SRC Member on Court, Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Member, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Representative, Professor William Martin Senate Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Dr Alan Owen Senate Member, Professor Miles Padgett Senate Member, Mr Alex Ross Employee Representative, Mr David Ross General Council Member (Convener of Court), Professor Michael Scott-Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Adrienne Scullion Senate Member, Dr Donald Spaeth Senate Member, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Member

In attendance:

Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Steve Beaumont (Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise), Professor Graham Caie (Clerk of Senate and Vice-Principal), Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Mr James Harrison (SRC President elect), Professor Neal Juster (Vice-Principal Strategy & Resources), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Andrea Nolan (Senior Vice-Principal), Professor Murray Pittock (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal), Ms Susan Stewart (Director of Corporate Communications)

Apologies:

Members: Dr Marie Freel Senate Member, Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP Rector
Attenders: Mr Ian Black (Director of Human Resources), Professor John Chapman (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal)

CRT/2011/45. Announcements

Court welcomed Ann Allen, Director of Estates & Buildings, to her first meeting of Court.

Eleanor Gordon, Amy Johnson, Alex Ross, Susan Dunsmore and Graham Caie were attending their final meeting of Court. Court thanked them for their contributions to Court and wished them well in the future.

CRT/2011/46. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 18 April 2012

The minutes were approved.
CRT/2011/47. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2011/48. Strategic Plan Update/Key Performance Indicators and Budget 2012/13

Professor Neal Juster, Vice Principal Strategy and Resources, provided an update on progress against the University’s Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the 12 months to June 2012. The KPIs were described in the University’s strategic plan: Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision.

A KPI dashboard at University level provided details on latest available data. Many of the targets had not yet been reached, which was not unexpected since the target date was 2014/15. Details on progress in the last 12 months indicated that nearly all KPIs were moving in a positive direction. Performance against the Russell Group had improved since last year. The recently expanded Russell Group of 24 institutions would be used as the benchmark group in the future. The areas covered by the KPIs were Research, Student Experience, Global Reach and Reputation, Staffing, Finance and the Estate, in line with key areas in the strategic plan. Although many of the University’s KPIs did not influence league tables, the general improvement had resulted in a small rise in the University’s position in two recently published UK league tables.

A review of KPIs would take place in the coming year, 2012/13 marking the mid-point of the period covered by the strategic plan. SMG would discuss the appropriateness of current KPIs and targets in the light of progress and the external environment. Any proposals to modify the KPIs would be brought to Court for discussion.

With regard to future years, Court had been advised in 2011 that University Sustainability Metrics would be developed. The UK University funding bodies had commissioned consultants to develop indicators of sustainability. The report had since been published and included a recommendation that each HEI governing body make a formal annual assessment to assure itself about the sustainability of the institution in the expected environment and with the academic and other strategies being pursued. The SFC had not yet indicated if it would adopt the recommendations. Court would be kept updated.

Court noted the requirement for Outcome Agreements, about which more background was provided in the Principal’s Report. Court would be updated when further information became available.

Court noted the KPIs and related details.

Court received a briefing on the 2012/13 University Budget and financial forecasts. These featured a broad-based strategic investment plan, mainly focused on the academic units, with substantial investments across the 4 Colleges. The main investments in services focused on the estate, international recruitment, IT infrastructure, website enhancement and college-focused alumni engagement and fundraising.

The draft budget for 2012/13 set a management accounting surplus of £5.5m. The budgetary forecast to 2015/16 predicted surpluses of £13.6m, £20.4m and £25.8m in years 2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16. The increased surpluses in the outer years were mainly driven by increased fee income, return on investment from new appointments and an increase in commercial income. With respect to income projections for student fees, Court noted that these were under regular discussion and review with Colleges and with the Recruitment & International Office, down to programme level.

The forecasts contained a number of uncertainties (e.g. levels of research contribution, wage inflation, FRS 17 pension charges, overseas growth) which had been included in a sensitivity analysis producing a range of likely outcomes with ‘baseline budget’ and ‘most likely scenario’ potentially dipping in 2012/13 below the 2% surplus target, but rising thereafter on successive
years to 2015/16. Some potential risks existed that had not been included within the budget either because it had not been possible to arrive at a realistic quantification or where the risk was considered to exist outwith the planning period. The main areas were the potential impact of any decision by the Pension Regulator to require accelerated action to deal with the growing pension fund deficit; and the potential removal in 2016 or possibly earlier of the National Insurance Contribution rate reduction for defined benefit pension schemes. An evidence-based approach was used with respect to identifying and quantifying risks, which were under continuous review.

Court received the annual update of the capital plan 2012-2022, 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. Future projects showed indicative costs based upon the best available information at this time. Prior to any significant costs being incurred, 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 a working document which could be altered in-year, with significant changes discussed by SMG and reported to Estates Committee for approval.

Court approved the 2012/13 Budget and four year financial forecasts, and the updated capital plan 2012-2022. Court thanked Professor Juster and his colleagues for the information in the briefing.

**CRT/2011/49. Report from the Principal**

**CRT/2011/49.1 Funding Environment**

Court had received details of the University budget and financial forecasts, from Professor Juster.

**CRT/2011/49.2 Outcome Agreements**

The Scottish Government had indicated that it expected the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) to ensure that improved outcomes were delivered by universities across a number of areas including: retention; access; international competitiveness in research; University/industry collaboration and the exploitation of research; pattern and spread of provision; efficiency; and the entrepreneurial and employability skills of graduates.

In seeking to deliver the government agenda, SFC had advised that it would establish an outcome agreement (OA) with each university that would contain targets, to allow the SFC and the sector to quantify improvements across the areas identified. The OA would incorporate and take precedence over the conditions of grant. The institutional OA must be in place by the start of Academic Year 2012/13. SFC had indicated that progress with developing OAs would be iterative, such that OAs would continue to evolve and be refined and redefined through engagement on an individual basis with institutions, supported by discussion at a national level. The key issue of the future relationship with funding remained to be clarified by the SFC. Due to the short timescale for delivering OAs for the year 2012/13, the SFC had advised that the focus would be on: Widening Access; Knowledge Exchange; and pattern of provision.

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

The University group progressing the OA had met with SFC staff in May. In preparation for the meeting, the group had considered how the University’s strategy and its associated KPIs
mapped on to the SFC priorities. There were areas where work was required to clarify the
approach to delivering outcomes for SFC and the government in the medium term.

The University was articulating its objectives and developing its preferred targets with respect
to Widening Access and Knowledge Exchange, highlighting priorities, ambitions and required
investments in these areas. Given the short timescale for agreement this year, it was proposed
that a draft paper being prepared for SMG also be circulated to Court at the same time, and that
authority to sign off the OA be delegated to the Convenor of Court and the Principal. It was not
envisaged that the 2012/13 OA would involve any deviation from the strategic KPIs or
budgeting decisions, given the approach being taken by SFC. Future OAs were likely to impact
more directly on University strategic goals and the discussion and negotiation of these
agreements for 2013/14 onwards would require much greater discussion by Court.

Court approved the suggested approach.

CRT/2011/49.3 REF Selection Criteria – Quality Thresholds

Selection for the REF would be informed by the mini-REF and assessment of more recent
outputs. The SMG had considered the matter in more detail and had approved a minimum
institutional quality threshold, together with raised thresholds for a number of individual Units
of Assessment. Court ratified the decisions.

CRT/2011/49.4 UK Border Agency Audit

The University’s Highly Trusted Sponsor Status had been approved by UKBA in May. UKBA
were expected to visit the University later in 2012 to carry out a compliance audit focusing on
the way on which the University exercises its sponsor duties with respect to Tier 4 visas. This
would include interviews with students. The University would be required to be able to
produce evidence of compliance and have fully documented procedures and processes that
clearly delineated individual responsibilities for exercising sponsor duties across University
Services and Colleges. Senior Management Group had tasked a project group to oversee
preparations for the audit.

CRT/2011/49.5 International Students and migration

UUK had arranged for a letter to be sent to the Prime Minister on behalf of 67 Chancellors and
Chairs of Council from universities across the UK, including Glasgow, asking the Prime
Minister to support the proposal to take international students out of the definition of net
migration.

CRT/2011/49.6 Stevenson Building Extension/GUU Social Facility

Court had received the minutes of the Estates and Finance Committees, both of which had
recently discussed the proposed investment in the Stevenson Building Extension and the
Glasgow University Union (GUU) social facility. Both Committees had approved the relevant
capital projects, and in discussion both had recorded a concern that, in approving substantial
investment in a facility that would not meet the University’s normal return on investment
thresholds and that would be leased to GUU for nil consideration, the University ought to
stipulate certain conditions that should be attached to the lease. SMG had taken a similar view
when it had discussed the proposal, asking that arrangements be put in place to ensure the
University community as a whole secured good value from the investment.

Court was being asked to approve a proposal that the Student Finance Committee continuously
monitor GUU’s financial performance and its management of the new social facility, and
conduct an annual dialogue with GUU's officials, and report annually to Court. Court would reserve the right, should GUU fail to meet the terms of the lease, to terminate the lease, giving one year's notice. The proposed terms of the lease were:

1. that GUU submit quarterly management accounts within 4 weeks of each quarter-end;
2. that there be effective financial management and budgetary control;
3. that GUU budget for and deliver an annual operating surplus;
4. that GUU make 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 maintain the accommodation in good condition; and
6. that GUU cooperate 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 was 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 takes 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.

Court was invited to approve the above approach.

Peter Daniels requested clarification on a point of order, namely at which stage in the meeting would the decision be taken to approve or not approve both projects, given that the Minutes of the Estates and Finance Committees had not yet been approved. The agenda item concerned only the conditions relating to the lease and to GUU financial performance and management. David Ross agreed that as the projects had already been approved by both Committees and the conditions about which Court was being asked had been left as a matter outstanding by the Finance Committee, and had been presented for Court’s consideration via the Principal’s Report, following discussion at the SMG, all decisions should be taken at this point in the meeting.

Discussion then took place. Mr Daniels stressed that the combined investments in the important capital projects, and the benefits to the student experience, should be the focus for the University, and that the suggested approach to the outstanding issues should be referred to the Student Finance Committee and the GUU, particularly the proposal to reduce the GUU grant by £75k. Court noted from Ken Brown that the GUU were aware and understood that the organisation should anticipate a cut in its grant, given the level of investment agreed. Mr Daniels commented that he had concerns about the amount of the proposed reduction to the GUU grant. Amy Johnson expressed concerns that the GUU had not been involved in the discussions to date. The Principal explained that SMG had collectively supported the investments through the capital projects, but had been concerned to ensure the University derived good value from the £4m investment in the social facility.

Court recognised that the Finance and Estates Committees had approved the capital projects, and agreed with the SMG that it was appropriate to attach suitable terms to the lease. Court’s view was that the lease terms proposed by SMG numbered 1, 2, 5 and 6 were appropriate unless the Student Finance Committee advised Court otherwise. Court concluded that the Student Finance Committee should be asked to reconsider the proposed terms numbered 3 and 4, and to determine appropriate wording for these terms after discussion with GUU, noting the need to ensure that these two terms should reflect a realistic assessment of what could be achieved by GUU in reducing its financial reliance on the University and by when. Court also agreed to remit any other outstanding matters relating to the lease and GUU financial performance and management to the Student Finance Committee. Finally, it was agreed that
the Senate Assessors should identify one of their number to join the Student Finance Committee.

CRT/2011/49.7 Tax Relief on Charitable Donations

The UK government’s proposals to cap tax relief on charitable donations would not be going ahead.

CRT/2011/49.8 Key Activities

Court noted a summary of some of the main activities in which the Principal had been involved since the last meeting of Court, covering internal and external activities beyond daily operational management and strategy meetings. The activities were under the broad headings of: Academic Development and Strategy, where Court noted in particular that Glasgow had been chosen to host the Universitas 21 Presidents Symposium in 2014; International Activities, which included details of a visit by 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; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; and Internal activities and Communications.

CRT/2011/49.9 Clerk of Senate

The Principal informed Court that Professor John Briggs had been appointed as Clerk of Senate, for a period of 4 years from 1 August 2012, in succession to Professor Graham Caie. Court approved a recommendation from the Principal that Professor Briggs also be appointed as Vice-Principal, given in particular the strategic role that he would be undertaking.

CRT/2011/50. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2011/50.1 Management of Organisational Change: Accounts Receivable function

At its last meeting, Court had 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 would help to ensure a better integrated approach to debt collection and accounting. The transfer would mean that three posts, currently based in the Registry, would no longer be required. Court had approved 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 had asked that information be provided on how the University would ensure that there was no detriment to the quality of front-line support service to students.

The Redundancy Committee had met on 12 June. It had noted that the potential redundancy in relation to one of the three posts had been fully mitigated, with the postholder having been redeployed into a Financial Aid role in Student Services. The postholder was therefore no longer at risk of potential redundancy and the matter would not form part of further deliberations by the Redundancy Committee. Court noted this.

With regard to the two other posts, the members of staff had both taken up secondments in Colleges. The Structural Change Committee would engage in discussions in the coming weeks to establish the viability for potential longer-term roles for the staff within the relevant Colleges. If redeployment discussions failed to achieve a successful outcome for the longer term, and if no further mitigation measures became available, the Redundancy Committee would be required to meet again. A further update would be provided to Court at its next meeting.
With regard to Court’s concern regarding possible detriment to the quality of front-line support to students, Court was advised 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 were being committed to enhance the front-line team for the start of session 2012/13.

**CRT/2011/50.2 Review of Court’s Effectiveness**

At the last meeting, Court had noted that a review of Court’s effectiveness would be undertaken. Since the meeting, a small group of Court members had been convened to oversee the effectiveness review and its intention was to engage the services of someone with extensive experience of higher education governance to conduct the review. Subject to agreeing satisfactory terms and conditions, Court approved the engagement of the external consultant. A schedule for the consultant’s work would be drawn up, which would include attendance at Court and committee meetings, and interviews with members of Court.

**CRT/2011/50.3 Western Infirmary Site**

The University was 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 remained in the ownership of the Health Board, following the University's acquisition of the larger part of the site in March 2011.

Court had asked a sub-group of its members and University officers to oversee this transaction. The group had met and given University officers authority to take forward final negotiations with the Health Board with a view to acquiring Site B.

**CRT/2011/50.4 Student Lifecycle Project /MyCampus**

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

Court had asked at its last meeting that thought be given as to how the Project Board would measure the success or otherwise of the steps it was taking to improve the Registration and Enrolment process this summer. The Board had discussed this and had agreed to monitor a range of indicators, where comparisons could meaningfully be made to the position in 2011. Professor Miles Padgett requested that consideration also be given as to what would be an acceptable outcome when these indicators were examined, rather than a simple comparison between 2011 and 2012 data. He also requested that indicators be developed in relation to student debt and financial aid matters, which had been subject to problems within the MyCampus system. Mr Newall agreed to take these matters forward. Dr Donald Spaeth requested that given some remaining uncertainties about how the system had changed processes relating to academic and funding matters, the Project Board should consider identifying key milestones within each year, to provide for clarity for staff and students. David Anderson asked if data were available on training provided on the system. Mr Newall advised that registration for and uptake of training was being monitored and that the relevant data were therefore available.

**CRT/2011/50.5 University of Glasgow Pension Scheme**

In March 2012, the Pension Regulator had written to the Chair of the Trustees of the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme, intimating the Regulator's concerns regarding the proposed
Recovery Plan, by which it was intended that the University would address the deficit in the Pension Scheme; and suggesting that the Pension Trustees should undertake an independent assessment of the strength of the University's financial covenant. The Trustees had engaged an independent party to conduct an assessment of the University's financial covenant, and would consider the advice received, in August 2012. They would then enter into discussion with the Pension Regulator regarding the terms of the pension scheme recovery plan. A further update would be provided to Court in October.

In view of the 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 was asked to approve the appointment of the Vice-Principal (Strategy & Resources) to serve as an employer-nominated member of the Pension Trustees. Court approved the appointment.

**CRT/2011/50.6 University of Glasgow Trust**

Court agreed that it would recommend to the University of Glasgow Trust that Professor Frank Coton, Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching), replace the Clerk of Senate, Professor Graham Caie, on the board following Professor Caie’s retirement in the summer.

**CRT/2011/50.7 Employee Representative**

Alex Ross’s term on Court would end 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 had nominated a member of staff to succeed him, and in accordance with established procedure, further nominations were being sought from among other eligible staff members in the University. An election would be held if required, for a two-year term starting on 1 August.

**CRT/2011/50.8 General Council Assessors on Court**

The General Council had approved the re-appointment 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 had approved the nomination of Mr Brian McBride to the vacancy created by the retirement from Court of Susan Dunsmore. Mr McBride would serve for four years from 1 August 2012.

**CRT/2011/50.9 Senate Assessor on Court**

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

**CRT/2011/50.10 Media Report**

Court noted the latest media report.

**CRT/2011/50.11 Resolutions**

The following draft Resolution had been approved and was 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 had been approved. They related to academic matters including degree regulations, and had been 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)

The following Resolution had been approved

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

CRT/2011/51. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2011/51.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2011/51.1.1 Budget 2012/13 and four year forecast

Court had approved the 2012/13 Budget and four year financial forecasts, under item CRT/2011/48. Strategic Plan Update/Key Performance Indicators and Budget 2012/13.

CRT/2011/51.1.2 Centre for Virus Research Transfer

Court had received a paper on the proposed development of a Centre for Virus Research within the College of MVLS, through the transfer of the Medical Research Council (MRC) Virology Unit to the University. Risks identified in the original CapEx application related to estates and administrative costs and a ‘section 75’ pension fund cessation charge. These risks had largely been mitigated by the financial terms proposed.

Court approved a recommendation from the Finance Committee that formal negotiation proceed on the terms and conditions of the transfer.

CRT/2011/51.1.3 Stevenson Building extension and GUU Social Facility extension

The Finance Committee had 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 GUU, relating to its social facility. Finance Committee had approved the CapEx applications with reservations from the Director of Finance and Convener noted with regard to the social facility application. The Committee had also noted that the Principal would discuss the GUU proposal further with the SMG. The discussions had been reported to Court and discussed under item CRT/2011/49. Report from the Principal at the present meeting.

CRT/2011/51.1.4 Library Level 5 Annex Development

Court noted that the Finance Committee had approved a CapEx application to create a postgraduate centre in Level 5 of the Library and to scope potential future developments to levels 2 and 3 of the Library.

CRT/2011/51.1.5 Credit Ratings and Banking Limits

Finance Committee had received a paper noting the considerations when managing the risk in banking the University’s cash deposits. The Committee had noted that the Finance Office employed a risk management approach reviewing concentration and credit risk.
CRT/2011/51.1.6 Treasury Management Policy Update
Court noted that the Finance Committee had approved an amendment to the University Financial Regulations on Treasury Management, reflecting issues discussed in relation to management of credit and concentration of risk.

CRT/2011/51.1.7 Overview of Performance at Period 9 2011/12
Court noted the Period 9 2011/12 Overview of Performance.

CRT/2011/51.1.8 Debtors Reports at Period 9 2011/12
Finance Committee had received an overview of debtors and analysis of student and sponsor debt.

CRT/2011/51.2 Audit Committee
The report was noted. It was noted that audits routinely involved discussions with individuals, rather than simply a paper exercise, and that this would be the case for the forthcoming audit of the Student Lifecycle Project.

CRT/2011/51.3 Human Resources Committee
CRT/2011/51.3.1 Performance and Development Review
Court noted that following the previous Court meeting, there had been discussions with the lay members of Court, Professor Andrea Nolan and Ian Black about the changes to the rating system for Performance and Development Review. These discussions had led 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.

CRT/2011/51.3.2 Staff Survey 2012
Court noted a summary of and key messages from the 2012 Staff Survey, details of which had already been sent to all staff in the University. Further details would be available later in the year, and a series of presentations to Colleges would take place. Court would be kept updated at future meetings.

CRT/2011/51.3.3 Dignity at Work and Study policy
Court approved the Dignity at Work and Study policy and procedure.

CRT/2011/51.4 Estates Committee
CRT/2011/51.4.1 Capital Plan 2012-2022

CRT/2011/51.4.2 CapEx Applications
Court endorsed Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications in respect of: CP11/447 Library Level 5 Annexe in the sum of £1.705m and the associated scoping study of Levels 2 and 3 in the sum of £50k; and the Stevenson Extension/GUU Social Facility (Hive) combined project proposal in the overall sum of £13.348m.

**CRT/2011/51.4.3 Estates Key Performance Indicators**

Court noted the University’s performance against agreed Estates KPIs.

**CRT/2011/51.5 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee**

The report was noted.

**CRT/2011/52. Report from the Rector**

In the absence of the Rector there was no report.

**CRT/2011/53. Communications from meeting of Senate 7 June 2012**

Communications from the meeting of Senate held on 7 June were noted by Court. Senate had received briefings on: the University budget, outcome agreements, MyCampus and the UK Border Agency audit. The Ordinance relating to the composition of Senate had also been discussed, and would be revisited in the next session. Senate had approved a draft guide to Governance at the University, which has been compiled as part of the ongoing work of the Senate Communications Working Group. 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 worked together to ensure effective communication and mutual understanding in taking forward the work of the University. The Guide included reference to the setting up of a group of Senate and Court members, in the event that an issue could not be readily resolved by agreement between the two bodies and required further consideration, providing a mechanism that could be employed in circumstances such as those surrounding the Academic Shape issues of 2011 and particularly those concerning Slavonic Studies. Court members had been provided with a copy of the document, which would be discussed at the next meeting.

The Clerk of Senate, Professor Graham Caie, who was retiring from the University, thanked Court for its commitment and support.

**CRT/2011/54. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**CRT/2011/55. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 10 October 2012 in the Senate Room
Court - Wednesday 10 October 2012

Principal's Report

Items A: For Discussion

1. Glasgow International College

At its June 2011 meeting, Court was advised that the agreement between the University and Kaplan Corporation, relating to Glasgow International College (GIC), had been extended to 2027, and its terms refreshed.

2. UK Border Agency (UKBA)

As Court heard in June, the University’s Highly Trusted Sponsor Status, applicable to student sponsorship, was approved by UKBA on 11 May and was initially valid until 23 September 2012. Work has been undertaken over the summer, via a working group, to ensure the renewal was granted, which has occurred. This has included a communications strategy intended to raise staff awareness of their responsibilities under UKBA regulatory requirements. The working group has also focused on: increased standardisation of arrangements, including international admissions, and attendance monitoring; improved data, including attendance data and details of recruitment agents; and improved reporting to UKBA.

A Tier 4 Compliance Officer has joined the University for Tier 4 activities (admission of international students). UKBA is expected to visit the University to carry out a compliance audit focusing on the way on which the University exercises its sponsor duties. Our key commitment is to the well-being of all our students, and within that to the education and welfare of our 3,500 international students who have chosen the University of Glasgow as their place of study. In order to maintain our HTS Tier 4 status we must meet stringent UKBA requirements. The University is very mindful of its obligations particularly in light of the recent problems at London Metropolitan University where the UKBA revoked its Highly Trusted Sponsor status. Staff were recently contacted with details on the review of the ways in which we collate information across all academic units, and advising them on changes to how and when attendance is monitored for Tier 4 students, as well as the timescales for reporting absences. The University Registry will have three central checkpoints during the academic year and there will be ten contact points for students to demonstrate engagement in their studies. Each School and Research Institute is required to ensure that Tier 4 students are engaging in their studies and must report to Registry if attendance at scheduled contact points is missed.

In addition to maintaining our Highly Trusted Sponsor status, we also have to renew or licenses from the UKBA in November which is undertaken on a four year cycle. Finally, an audit is due to take place and although no date has yet been fixed we expect this to be carried out before Christmas.

3. Consultation Outcomes – Nursing and Health Care

Following the review of Nursing and Health Care which took place as part of the consultations in the spring of 2011, and pending the outcome of the Chief Nursing Officer’s review of nursing and midwifery education in Scotland, the University’s programmes in this area have continued as normal, including admissions for the 2012/13 year.
Based on the recommendation of SMG, Court agreed to hold completion of the consultation and review on Nursing and Healthcare until the Chief Nursing Officer’s (CNO) review was published - this was planned for Spring 2012. The chair of the review panel had also given assurance to the staff that in the event that the report was delayed, the panel would return to complete the report by making recommendations to Court for a decision.

Over the last year, the external environment has changed significantly.

i. There is currently an oversupply of nursing graduates in Scotland, and the Cabinet Secretary for Education and the CEO of the SFC have indicated that there are too many nursing providers. All providers (those with commissioned and non-commissioned nursing places) were asked to cut their intake for 2012/13 by 10% on the basis of over-provision, and they agreed to do this collectively.

ii. Discussion took place amongst all providers of nursing to identify how they would collectively address the numbers issue, and collaborate in a manner that would enhance the capacity, capability and impact of nursing research in the sector. No agreement was reached and thereafter, the SFC directed nursing providers to consider collaboration on a regional basis, a request that was formalised in outcome agreements (see below).

iii. Outcome agreements were introduced by the SFC; three priorities were addressed for 2012/13, one of which was ensuring ‘coherence of provision’ across the sector. As part of the discussion, University of Glasgow was asked to consider collaboration in nursing with Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU), and similarly GCU was asked to consider collaboration with the University of Glasgow. The University of Glasgow’s Outcome Agreement 2012-13 contains the following statement ‘We are keen to contribute to the national consideration of the coherence of nursing provision, and to this end have initiated discussion with Glasgow Caledonian University colleagues to consider options for greater collaboration and integration’.

iv. The Court Nursing review group met in September and agreed that given the change in the external environment, no knowledge of when the CNO report would be produced, and the direction from the SFC, it was appropriate to establish a joint working group (JWG) between The University of Glasgow and GCU to progress the commitment in the outcome agreement. The JWG remit has been agreed as follows:

The group has been asked to report to the Head of College of MVLS and the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences by 7th December.

4. Student Admissions

Our admissions for 2011-12 are generally on track, with international recruitment growth on target. Scottish/EU undergraduate admissions slightly ahead of target (3,371 against a target of 3,039) and Rest-of-UK undergraduate admissions behind target (440 against a target of 552). In terms of international recruitment, we have admitted 1,095 (new and continuing) students at undergraduate level, and are projecting 1,847 students at PGT level. International PGT recruitment is ahead of target in Social Sciences, broadly on target in Arts and Science and Engineering and behind target in MVLS.

In terms of RUK undergraduate recruitment, Court will recall that we experienced an increase in applications this year. But two significant events have skewed the admissions outcomes this year. Firstly, according to preliminary figures issued by UCAS last month, there are over 30,000 fewer RUK applicants in the system. Secondly, the overall performance of students sitting A-levels this year fell for the first time in a long number of years. When setting the student number controls, HEFCE assumed a growth of around 5000 additional students achieving AAB or above. On the contrary, it appears that there has actually been a drop of around 5000 achieving these grades.
It looks like Scotland as a whole is substantially down in terms of RUK students. We are awaiting final confirmation of this.

The situation in England, however, sheds more light on what has happened and why RUK applications to Scottish universities may have been adversely affected.

To put the following figures in perspective, it is first necessary to understand how admissions quotas are determined in institutions south of the border. Until this year, the system operated in England was very similar to that in Scotland with each university being allocated a student number control limit. This year, however, the student number control limit was reduced by removing the predicted number of students likely to be recruited at AAB or above in A-level in a particular institution. As compensation for this, there was no cap placed on the number of students, achieving AAB or above, that institutions could recruit. This potentially provided a mechanism for some institutions to grow at the expense of others if they could attract well-qualified applicants. For some institutions, the reduction in the student number control limit was very dramatic. Taking Sheffield, a mid-ranking Russell Group university, as an example, according to the HEFCE grant letter this year the student number control limit in 2011-12 was 4419 whereas this year it is 1377. The assumption was that the difference between the two figures would be made up by recruitment of students achieving AAB or above.

The cumulative effect of these changes is significant. Preliminary estimates released at a recent Universities UK meeting suggest that around 30 English universities have undershot their targets by 500 students or more. Of these, eight have undershot by more than 1000 and four by more than 2000. Within the Russell Group, Southampton are 600 below target, Nottingham are 200 below target, Manchester are 400 below target and Sheffield are over 700 below target. Others like Liverpool are also known to be hundreds below. A major factor contributing to this has been that there has simply not been enough students with AAB or above to make up the numbers outside of the control limits.

One further consequence of the problems south of the border this year has been that institutions have not been able to control the shape of the intake. This means that numbers in some subject areas/departments/schools have been decimated and others have seen extreme levels of growth. This will create significant issues in terms of the delivery and sustainability of teaching in some universities. A general trend towards high-cost subjects has also been witnessed which suggests that the perceived income benefits to institutions in England may be partially negated.

We are looking at a range of strategies to improve RUK recruitment that cover the way in which we apply UCAS tariffs within the admissions process (in some cases A-level students are currently admitted at higher UCAS tariffs than Scottish students and we are looking at the potential to equalise these), more pro-active marketing of our direct and advanced entry options, more proactive engagement with prospective students during the adjustment process (possibly through advertising) and further benchmarking to ensure our financial assistance packages are configured to be attractive to applicants.

Scottish/EU recruitment: The big pressure is from EU applications given the introduction of higher fees in England. We are revising our EU admissions strategy to align more closely with that used for Scottish students so requiring EU students to achieve specific performance levels in key subjects. This will reduce the pressure on these places from EU students.

5. Outcome Agreements

At the June meeting, Court received details about the University’s proposed approach to Outcome Agreements, which have arisen from the Scottish Government’s expectation that the Scottish Funding Council will ensure improved outcomes from universities across a range of areas. Court heard that because of the short timescale for delivering the agreements for the year 2012/13, the focus would be on Widening access; Knowledge exchange; and Pattern of provision. Court agreed that a draft paper that was going to SMG, should also be circulated to Court, and that authority to sign off the agreement be delegated to the Convener of Court and the Principal. The agreement was submitted to the Funding Council in mid July.
Court may want to discuss how it wishes to be updated on this area in the future, including the possibility of receiving summaries of other institution’s agreements, given that all Universities may be required to publish these.

**Items B: For Information**

**6. University Rankings/National Student Survey**

The University of Glasgow has risen five places from 59th to 54th in the latest QS World Rankings, which were released in early September. Glasgow is one of only three Scottish institutions in the top 100. While we are cautious about league tables, this is the best ever showing, and the rankings are significant given that they confirm the reputation of Glasgow as a world leading research intensive university. I will update Court verbally on the THE World University Rankings which will be released on 4th Oct after the papers are circulated. The THE tables have generally been less stable since they were introduced 2 years ago.

As Court heard at the recent strategy day, although many of the University’s KPIs do not influence the league tables, the general improvement in KPIs has enhanced the University’s position in UK league tables: Guardian – up 7 places to 14th; Times – up 7 places to 15th; and Complete University Guide – up 4 places to 17th and finally, just announced at the weekend, we are up 1 place to 19th in the Sunday Times University Guide.

In the National Student Survey 2012, the University scored very highly for student satisfaction and in delivering an excellent student experience. Our overall satisfaction rating of 89% (Question 22) was 4% higher than the average for the HEI sector, though slightly lower than the 90% we achieved in 2010 and 2011. Within Questions 1-21 of the NSS there was also some improvement, on average. There was success within the finer detail of the NSS, across our Schools and Colleges. The University was first, or joint first, in the UK University sector in the following seven subjects: Classics; Dentistry; Drama; German; and Scandinavian Studies; Microbiology; Physical Geography and Environmental Sciences; Genetics (aggregated responses from 2011 and 2012). Additionally, 36 subjects achieved, or exceeded, the Key Performance Indicator of 90% in terms of overall satisfaction. That is more than the University has achieved before. We have similarly improved our standing in respect of a number of other questions in the survey.

Over the coming weeks we will look to share best practice, of which much was highlighted, from the NSS results. We will also review our performance and consider ways in which we can improve on our already strong showing. It is important that Schools continue to work with our student representatives to identify ways in which we can further improve our standing in future years.

**7. Key activities**

Below is a summary of some of the main activities I have been involved in since the last meeting of Court (20 June), divided 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 attended and spoke at the Half Yearly meeting of the General Council (23 June). I took the opportunity to update Council on the University’s progress towards fulfilling our strategic goals, with particular reference to our KPIs, budgets and financial forecasts and the strategic investment plans already underway in the Colleges and University services.

One aspect of our investment plans is our continuing commitment, reported in previous Court reports to pursue a recruitment strategy that draws key people to Glasgow to enhance our academic strengths for the future and as we move closer to the REF. To this end I have taken part in interviews for Chairs in Psychology (19 June) Economics (9 July, 5 September, 1 October); Chair in Complex systems & Software Engineering (9 July); Chair in Environmental Studies (11 July); Richmond Chair in Fine Art and Chair in
Logic and Rhetoric (7 August); Chair in Biodiversity, Animal Health & Comparative Medicine (13 August); Professorships in Accounting and Finance on 21 August and 13 September and Parasitology 27 September.

Court will know that the Adam Smith Business School has enjoyed tremendous success over recent times and the School’s Strategic Advisory Board, a tremendous asset to the ambition and vision of the school as it seeks to build on this success, is scheduled to meet on 8 October.

Moving outwards to the sector as a whole, as I am now a member of the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) Board, my diary over recent months has begun to reflect my greater involvement in SFC activities, which I am sure will prove to be a fascinating opportunity to help shape future policy direction. Consequently I attended the SFC Business meeting on 29 June, the SFC Strategy Meeting on 24 August and the Board Meeting on 28 September.

In June 2012, the Council for Industry and Higher Education announced plans to launch a National Centre for Universities and Business to strengthen links between the two sectors with the aim of driving economic growth. The aim of the centre is to provide support and advice on university and business relations, helping institutions to establish international links and exploring issues that affect them. The setting-up of such a centre was recommended in the Wilson Review of Business-University Collaboration published in February and has been backed by the UK Government. I was delighted to be appointed with Sir Richard Lambert to co-chair a steering group to develop a business plan for the new Centre which is to be launched later in the year. I have attended two meetings of the Steering group thus far (2nd July and 30th August) and again am pleased that I have the opportunity to participate in this critical area for Universities and Business.

On 16 July I attended a UUK roundtable on student funding and the Universities Scotland Away Day on 28 August.

7.2 International Activities

The University has enjoyed a long association with Spain and has had the good fortune to progress some close ties with Spanish Universities over recent times. These extend to links in arts and languages with Universidad de Málaga, with Universidad de Oviedo and with the Universidad de Alcalá which I had the privilege of visiting in September last year. We in turn were delighted to welcome the University’s President, Professor Fernando Galvan to Glasgow to receive an honorary degree at our Commemoration Day celebrations in June. And so it was good to meet and welcome to the University the Vice President of Malaga University (9 July) and attend a Round Table discussion and dinner in Edinburgh for Catalan University Rectors.

I welcomed a senior delegation from Ekiti State University, Nigeria (3 September) who were essentially on a fact finding mission and on the 4 September met the President of the University of Mainz, Johannes Gutenberg.

On 5 September, I hosted a Lodging dinner for some medical colleagues from Columbia University who were visiting for a cardiovascular symposium. Cabinet Secretary Mike Russell also attended the dinner. Court will recall that the University is consolidating its links with Columbia through exchange visits, joint projects, joint seminars and symposia and is capitalising on the strength of a bottom-up, academic/science driven, rather than management driven, initiative. As a next step we aim to develop doctoral exchange programmes.

On 10 September, I hosted a dinner in the Lodging for a delegation from Sun Yat-Sen University. The University, originally known as Guangdong University, was founded in 1924 and is located in Guangdong Province, an area neighbouring Hong Kong and Macao. It is one of the leading universities in the People’s Republic of China, covering a broad range of disciplines. We share areas of common interest and expertise, including infectious diseases, cancer, cardiology (especially stroke, and cardiovascular disease) and neuroscience and as a China Scholarship Council (CSC) partner we welcome PhD students. We have been pursuing the possibility of establishing a joint graduate school (on the SYS campus or in Guangzhou Knowledge City) in addition to cementing closer links across medicine.
I had the pleasure of meeting Carly Aulicky, a Fulbright scholar who has just arrived to study at Glasgow. We’ve hosted groups of Fulbright scholars to the University as part of their general induction programme, and so it is good to welcome one as a student. Fulbright Scholars are top students who often go on to take up international leadership roles and so have the potential to be tremendous ambassadors for the Universities they attend in the UK.

Finally plans are now well in hand to visit USA over the period 13 October to 21 October for various Alumni events and other activities and visits, and a fuller report on that trip will follow in the next Court report.

7.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

University Events

Professor Doug Kell, the Chief Executive of the Biotechnology & Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC), visited the University to meet with me and the Head of College, MVLS for a working lunch before he had the opportunity to share the BBSRC’s vision for the future, and then hear of some of the key areas of Research currently undertaken at the College. As one of the key research councils which over the last 5 years has funded research within MVLS to the tune of just under £30M, it is always important to make the most of such visits and my colleagues in MVLS did a tremendous job to get the message across that we are doing important and significant work in biomedicine.

On 5 September, I attended the launch of People of Medieval Scotland 1093 -1314 database officially opened by Cabinet Secretary Mike Russell. The launch stands as a significant achievement, one that will be of lasting value to scholars, pupils and the ‘interested’, for years to come. It was made possible through funding from the Arts & Humanities Research Council and was the outcome of two collaborative projects The Paradox of Medieval Scotland (2007-2010) and The Breaking of Britain: Cross-border Society and Scottish Independence 1216-1314 (2010-2013) both led by History at the University of Glasgow and Professor Dauvit Broun as the Principal Investigator, in collaboration with King’s College London, the University of Edinburgh and Lancaster University. It’s a fascinating resource and all involved are to be congratulated.

On 13 September we enjoyed the re-launch of the Hunterian Art Gallery through the opening of Rembrandt and the Passion Exhibition which was then followed on 19th September with the Lord Provost’s reception for the Exhibition. The re-launch and opening of the special exhibition marked the completion of the Hunterian exhibition gallery renewal programme. The first stage saw the opening of the Antonine Wall: Rome’s Final Frontier gallery in September 2011 to widespread critical acclaim. This, the second stage, has culminated in the mounting of one of the most significant exhibitions in the Hunterian’s 200 year history. At the heart of the development programme has been our drive to make what we have, open and available, to as wide an audience as possible and in ways that interest, entice, intrigue! It’s an opportunity, a platform, to engage with new audiences including those within our own academic and student bodies. The re-launch has been the catalyst for other developments and initiatives. The refurbished space now has the capacity to support a major increase in the numbers of works on show by 50%, incorporating a new contemporary art space and a space to showcase more recent acquisitions. It has also spawned new publications, including the Antonine Wall (part of the Hunterian Treasures series); a SCALA Director’s Choice edition dedicated to the Hunterian and of course the exhibition handbook Rembrandt and the Passion itself. It has triggered the creation of a new website, new in design, new in content and the Hunterian has just commissioned a state of the art collections management system to create improved virtual access to its extensive collections of human, natural, scientific and medical history. Add to this, a new and vigorous engagement with students at UG and PG levels, matched by new course development and you sense the scope and wide ranging impact this tremendous resource is capable of achieving. We concluded events on the 13 September with a special dinner involving Glasgow Life and people from the Museum and Gallery worlds in Scotland. This was an important marker that we are working with Glasgow Life and the City to explore ways in which we can develop ambitions plans to create joint museum space to make more of what we hold available to more people. The Museum opened again to the public on 15 September.

On 14 September, I had the privilege of launching Glasgow Polyomics and an associated academic symposium. Glasgow Polyomics, based within MVLS, is built around the concept of our Research Institutes which aim to harness and thrive on inter/multi disciplinary work. In establishing the resource we are aiming
to expand the provision available in all of the Omics strands in Glasgow. Genomics, proteomics and metabolomics underpin all of the medical and life sciences. But Glasgow Polyomics also offers the ability to enhance research outputs not just across the College, but also with other Colleges within the University: important collaborations are already in place with Electronic Engineers, Computer scientists, statisticians and chemists, all of whom can benefit from Polyomics. It is about supporting multi strands of research but it can only do this effectively if it possesses and can harness 3 important strands – state of the art technologies, skilled technologists and talented bio-informaticians. And Glasgow Polyomics can lay claim to all three. We are uniquely placed to open up tremendous capabilities and talents to the talents of our scientists and researchers. This is a versatile resource, ready to respond to a rapidly changing world of data, on the cusp of discovery, with as yet unknown potential. If ever the cliché ‘cutting edge’ deserved its place, it’s surely alongside Glasgow Polyomics. The symposium attracted well over 200 delegates and top line presenters, a measure of the importance of this new initiative.

**Personal engagements**

I was asked to speak at Hutcheson’s Grammar School Prize giving on 28 June which I was delighted to accept and had an inspiring time with the young people from junior through to secondary school as they celebrated a range of achievements.

On 4 July, I attended a Santander Universities Reception for Vice Chancellors in Covent Garden London. The University has built up a good and fruitful relationship with Santander Universities. Through the Glasgow partnership, which was signed in 2010, Santander Universities has contributed upwards of £270,000 towards scholarships – undergraduate, postgraduate and mobility – to facilitate international exchanges of students and staff, help build collaborative links between institutions, and provide students with a meaningful international experience. We have also become engaged in Santander’s Breakthrough initiative to support business growth in the UK. This programme is designed to target SMEs, and the Head of College (Social Sciences) is a member of the regional board. Links between the Breakthrough programme and our Careers Service and alumni volunteer programme are currently being explored, with a view to contributing to the strategic objective of developing graduate attributes. Finally Santander has supported our Stirling Maxwell research project and provided major sponsorship for the ‘Rembrandt and the Passion’ exhibition at the Hunterian.

On 3 October, I will be attending an Alumni Event in London, chaired by Andrew Neil and sponsored by Santander. It’s an interesting format which will include a panel discussion on The Future of Printed Media.

I had the privilege of representing the University at the Queen’s Jubilee celebration service in St Giles on 5 July.

On 18 September I attended a British – Egyptian Education Conference which was being held jointly in London and Cairo and participated in a panel discussion as one of the co presenters on the topic *How can teaching skills at Universities be improved?* In the evening I attended a reception in the Egyptian Embassy hosted by Ambassador H E Hatem Seif El Nasr.

I attended an informal dinner with the other Scottish Principals at the Royal Society of Edinburgh 21 August.

Looking ahead, I will be meeting with Mary McAleese (2 October) former President of the Republic of Ireland, and our School of Veterinary Medicine will be celebrating through a series of events and dinners 150 years of Excellence over the weekend of 5-7 of October.

**Interaction with Scottish/UK Ministers and Governments**

I and members of SMG met with Tracey Slaven, the new Head of Higher Education (Scotland) on 16 August; Dave Ramsden Chief Economic Adviser to the Treasury along with Professor Charles Nolan of SIRE, and on the 10 July I and the Head of College MVLS, met with the Deputy First Minister, Nicola Sturgeon, Director General for Health, Derek Feeley and Robert Calderwood, Chief Executive of NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde to discuss among other things the future plans for the Southern General.

We also hosted a press conference for Mike Russell Cabinet Secretary for Education and Life Long Learning where he announced new student support funding measures. This was linked with a workshop on the
REACH programme which has been established to encourage potential students from non-traditional backgrounds to think about applying to a course in one of the four professions (Medicine, Dentistry, Law and Vet Medicine). The University has been committed to playing a leading role in taking the REACH Programme forward throughout Scotland, along with our partners Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh and St Andrews. Our particular responsibility has been the West of Scotland, and in just over two years we have put in place an annual REACH programme covering 92 schools, around 1,500 pupils, across the age span of S4 to S6. There’s evidence that the scheme is already bearing fruit and this is a tribute to the magnificent support and partnership enjoyed across our widening participation team, the 4 professions, all the local authorities involved and the 92 participating secondary schools.

On 10 September, I attended a Universities Scotland lunchtime meeting involving Mike Russell, and Mark Batho, Chief Executive, Scottish Funding Council. The main focus of this important meeting was Outcome Agreements, Post – 16 policy and legislative developments with an update on current Widening Access initiatives which I was asked to lead on.

We will also be delighted to welcome the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Life Long learning to the Chapel Service on Sunday 7 October where he has agreed to preach the sermon. It’s a special service for another reason – it is a Baptismal service, where I understand 10 babies are to be baptized.

Attended on 17 September the PrU@10 event at the House of Commons, a networking reception organised by PraxisUnico to highlight the links between UK Universities and business, with David Willetts and Richard Lambert as key speakers.

7.4. Internal activities and Communications
The period immediately following June Court is a time for summer graduations which involves 13 ceremonies, over 3,200 graduating students and some honorary graduates too.

In addition to June staff talks, I have continued to do regular Pod casts – 6 July, 23 August, 7 September with the next planned for the 8 October. These are 4 minute interviews with Corporate communications which focus on current issues of relevance to the university.

8. Senior Management Group business

In addition to standing and regular items (which include SLP, REF, Admissions, Risk List, Management Accounts, Audit) reports the following issues were discussed.

SMG Meeting 18 June 2012
Early Career Academic Development
Outcome Agreements
Key Information Sets (KIS)
Updated Draft Consultancy Policy
Ipsos Mori research on perceptions of the University
Recruitment & Selection Process, Timescales, Issues and Future Suggestions
Staff Attitude Survey
Pensions Auto Enrolment

SMG Meeting 18 July 2012
Procedure for clear out of redundant term active student records
Update on the review of arrangements for the management of organisational change and redundancy
Progress Report on RUK Marketing
Update on Action Plan Arising from Year 1 Review of Implementation of New University Structure
David Livingstone Bicentenary

SMG Meeting 15 August 2012
(majority of items were ongoing issues from previous meetings)
SCIES: Strategy to Create International Experiences for all Students
Océ Pilot Study - interim report
**SMG Meeting 17 September 2012**

Income Allocation

Fundraising KPIs for future SMGs (included Half Yearly Report on Major Gifts)

Centre for Virus Research

Organisational Development

Discussion on RUK tariff

Health, Safety and Wellbeing Update Report

University’s Expenses Policy

EDSC overview and minutes

Queen’s Anniversary Prizes 2012-14 – Proposals
SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Court Strategy Day

Annex 1 is a brief report on the key points arising from the Strategy Day held on 25 September. Officers responsible for taking forward matters discussed at the meeting are:

Key Performance Indicators - Neal Juster, through a report to Court in February 2013;

E-Learning - Frank Coton, through development of E-Learning strategy, by end 2012/13;

Campus Masterplan - Ann Allen & David Newall, through half-yearly progress reports and, in between, regular updates through Estates Committee;


A.2 Management of Organisational Change: Accounts Receivable function

At its last meeting, Court received an update on the activities of the Structural Change and Redundancy Committees established in connection with a proposal to restructure the accounts receivable function within the University, involving the transfer of activity from Registry to Finance Office. At the June meeting, one potential redundancy in relation to a Grade 8 post had been fully mitigated, with the postholder having been redeployed into a financial aid role in Student Services.

Over the summer, further steps in mitigation have taken place. The Grade 6 postholder has now been redeployed to the School of Veterinary Medicine and therefore that potential redundancy has been mitigated. The matter will not form part of further deliberations by the Redundancy Committee. Court is asked to note this.

The secondment to Science & Engineering of the one remaining member of staff (Grade 7), whose post is currently at risk, has been extended until 31st July 2013. The College Secretary intends to review the overall staffing profile of support staff within the College with a view to making a decision on the long-term sustainability of a permanent role by the end of this year. The position will be reviewed in December. Court will be kept updated.
A.3 Review of Court’s Effectiveness

As Court members will know from the last meeting, a consultant has been engaged to undertake a review of Court’s effectiveness. John Lauwerys will be present at the Court meeting on 10 October, as part of his programme of engagement with Court committees and with individual Court members and senior University managers, which will take place over the autumn and early winter.

A.4 Western Infirmary

The University is in continuing negotiations with NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde regarding the acquisition by the University of the 4-acre Western Infirmary ‘Site B’.

A sub-group of governors and University officers has authority on Court's behalf to agree the terms of this transaction, which it is expected will conclude by the end of the calendar year.

A.5 Pensions Liability

As I reported at the last meeting, the Pension Regulator had written earlier in the year to the Chair of the Trustees of the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme, outlining the Regulator's concerns about the proposed recovery plan, by which the University undertakes to address the deficit in the Pension Scheme. The Trustees have since engaged an independent party, KPMG, to conduct an assessment of the University's financial covenant. When this work has been done, they will correspond with the Pension Regulator regarding the future terms of the recovery plan. Meanwhile, the Chair of the Trustees has asked to meet with representatives of the Court to discuss the matter, and a meeting is being arranged involving the Principal, the Convener of Court, the Director of Finance and the Convener of Finance Committee. Court will be updated at its December meeting.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Review of Higher Education Governance

Following publication of the Von Prondzynski Report on 1 February, the Cabinet Secretary for Education made a parliamentary statement on 28 June. The statement focused principally on the College sector, but included a brief reference to the Higher Education Governance Review, which appears as Annex 3. In this statement, the Minister announces that he is asking the Scottish Funding Council to take forward the establishment of an HE Advisory Forum, and that he has asked the Committee of the Scottish Chairs of Higher Education Institutions to lead a group to develop a new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance. Annex 4 provides information on the composition and remit of that governance group.
B.2 Student Lifecycle Project/MyCampus

At its last meeting, Court received a report on the current status of the MyCampus student system implementation, outlining progress in addressing the recommendations contained in the Lessons Learned Group's Report, and in preparing to ensure that the Registration and Enrolment process in 2012 would operate more efficiently than in 2011. The Lessons Learned Group's recommendations were fully implemented in time for Registration and Enrolment and, as the statistics in Annex 5 indicate, the process operated more satisfactorily this year than last. A post-Registration exercise is being conducted in October/November to hear the views of students and staff on their experience of the system this year and to consider areas where further improvements may be desirable.

The start of the Registration exercise was made difficult this year because of problems encountered with system performance when MyCampus was opened for student registration in early August. This was due to the malfunction of an Oracle software tool, Weblogic, whose purpose is to distribute workload among servers. Colleagues in IT Services addressed this issue by reconfiguring the IT architecture to reduce its reliance on Weblogic, and this allowed Registration and Enrolment to proceed. Towards the end of the calendar year, it is intended to introduce a hardware load balancer, which will remove any future reliance on Weblogic.

B.3 Nominations Committee/Lay member of Estates Committee

Following Morris Murray’s departure as a lay member of the Estates Committee, we have advertised for a new lay member, with suitable skills and experience to contribute in particular to the Campus Development Framework. Interviews will be held in late October and Court will be asked to approve any nomination.

B.4 Employee Representative on Court

In June, Margaret Anne McParland was nominated by the Joint Union Liaison Committee to serve on Court as Employee Representative, to succeed Alex Ross. No other employee nominations were received during the nomination period and Ms McParland was appointed to Court for 2 years from 1st August 2012.

B.5 Representative of Glasgow City Council

Councillor Matt Kerr has been selected as the Glasgow City Council representative on Court, in succession to Councillor Jim McKechnie. Councillor Kerr is a Geography graduate of the University and has represented the Craigton ward on the City Council since 2007.

B.6 Clerk of Senate

At a Special Meeting of Senate held on 19 June, and following a ballot, Professor John Briggs was elected as Clerk of Senate, for a period of 4 years from 1 August 2012, in succession to Professor Graham Caie.
B.8 Court Business 2012/13

Standing Orders for Court are appended at Annex 6 for reference. The appendices include details of Court committee dates and memberships for this session.

Annex 7 contains the Statement of Primary Responsibilities, the Scheme of Delegated Authorities and the Schedule of Court Business for the coming year, for reference. The attendance lists for meetings of Court and its committees for 2011/12 have been reviewed; there are no issues to report in connection with this.

B.10 Honorary Degree Nominations

In line with the previously agreed arrangement with Senate to allow members of Court to submit observations on nominations for honorary degrees, the Clerk of Senate will advise Court of the 2012/2013 nominations on a confidential basis. Members of Court should contact the Clerk of Senate should they have observations to make.

B.11 Appointment of Head of School

The following appointment has been made:

College of Arts

School of Humanities

Professor Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh has been appointed as Head of the School of Humanities from 1 November 2012 until 31 July 2016, in succession to Professor Simon Ball.

B.12 QMU Constitution

In July 2012, the Board of the Queen Margaret Union approved some amendments intended to update the terms of its constitution. I have reviewed the proposed amendments, which are minor in nature, and approved them on Court's behalf.

B.13 Media Report

The latest media report is at Annex 8.

B.14 Resolutions

The following Resolutions have been approved. They were drafted following comments from the Senate and General Council, then reported to Court as having been approved in draft form, and no further comments were received during the notice period:

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

RESOLUTION NO. 564-4 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 564 – CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES
RESOLUTION NO. 564-5 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 564 – CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 621 – DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 628 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF NURSING

RESOLUTION NO. 629 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DESIGN IN FASHION AND TEXTILES

RESOLUTION NO. 363-2 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN VETERINARY SCIENCE
RESOLUTION NO. 382-1 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN DENTAL SCIENCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 636 – DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LETTERS

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

DN/DM
Court Strategy Discussion Day, 25 September 2012

Background
The purpose of the strategy day was for Court to be briefed on, and contribute to, the development or refinement of University KPIs, E-Learning, Campus Masterplan and Development Strategy.

1. Key Performance Indicators
Court members were reminded that to help staff, and Court, recognise whether progress was being made towards the University’s ambition as stated in its strategic plan Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision, the plan defined 20 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and a target to achieve against each by the end of 2014-15.

Given that the strategic plan had now been in operation for two full academic sessions, Court members were invited to review progress against the KPI targets and to reflect whether the current KPIs remained appropriate.

The University level KPI dashboard was provided, as well as details about how the KPIs were measured. The information included latest available data with respect to 2014/15 targets; progress in the last 12 months, which showed that nearly all KPIs had moved in a positive direction; and performance against the Russell Group, which had improved in the last 12 months.

A more detailed summary of progress was noted, with the University having done relatively well in a number of areas since Glasgow 2020 was published, including international student numbers and graduate employability having increased, and financial stability having improved, aiding over £20m of new investment in the next 12 months. In contrast, some areas including percentage of staff holding research grants and the size of the home PGT population had not progressed as well as had been hoped.

A summary of key developments in HE, and likely changes in the future, was also given as further context for considering whether any changes should be made to the University’s KPIs.

The following main questions were posed for discussion:

• Are the high level KPIs, and associated dashboard, considered to be useful in enabling Court members to understand progress, or lack thereof, being made by the University?

• Do Court members wish dashboards to be produced and circulated to them at College, School/RI and/or subject level?

• In hindsight are some of the targets set in Glasgow 2020 too ambitious or not stretching enough? If so, which ones and how should they be adapted?

• With the introduction of Outcome Agreements there is a danger that KPIs will be seen by some as external indicators of university success, rather than an internal governance tool. What should the University be doing to mitigate these effects?

The following themes emerged from discussion:

1. Broadly the KPI set and granularity were correct. The Outcome Agreement might result in some additional KPIs. Yearly reporting on University KPIs to Court was considered sufficient, with the understanding that the data were used widely and more regularly at SMG and College level, and that Court would be alerted to any
issues that arose in-year. College Heads should also be invited to brief Court, to include references to the main College KPIs.

2. There was a query over the uniform applicability of some KPIs, particularly relating to assessment of research output across all Colleges. This might be reviewed, including looking at possible references to REF and/or citations.

3. It was suggested that Finance KPIs include actual investments, as well as the surplus, in reflecting the institution’s ability to invest.

4. Widening Participation (including Progression) data might be considered for inclusion.

5. It was suggested that a trajectory could be reported, to replace or augment the colour coding.

6. Court would wish to have a watching brief on the development of the Key Information Set and Outcome Agreements.

7. The targets set in Glasgow 2020 should not be amended. The University should be ambitious and have a clear vision. Court might wish to explore in more detail (possibly at a separate session) any areas that were significantly not achieving targets, when the KPIs were reviewed in 2013.

8. Views on publishing KPI and related data were mixed, some considering that the University should proceed on the ‘front foot’, others that the details should not be available externally, but that, as part of good governance, the University should be accountable in terms of statutory external reporting, and internally to its community.

2. E-Learning

Court members heard that E-Learning provided the potential to support flexible teaching activity at a distance in multiple locations as part of, for example, Trans-National Education (TNE) and CPD for professionals with full-time jobs. It was, however, often mistakenly associated only with distance learning when in fact it was increasingly being used to support learning on campus and was changing the way in which the University engaged with students. The potential to deploy E-Learning had been greatly enhanced in recent years by developments in technology and the emergence of open access learning resources such as iTunes U, YouTube EDU and OpenLearn. The whole landscape was, however, changing very rapidly. All of this was augmented by a student population who increasingly lived their lives in a virtual space and had become used to accessing content when and where they need it.

In discussion it was agreed that getting staff engaged with training and support provided, was essential as the E-learning environment developed. The pressures on staff in this emerging technology needed to be acknowledged. Content management was critical, as material would become out of date quickly. IT infrastructure would need augmenting, including widespread bandwidth increases and the ability for multiple types of electronic devices to receive educational material across the campus. All of these issues would be considered in the development of the University’s E-Learning strategy, which was currently being developed, led by the VP (Learning & Teaching).

3. Campus Masterplan

An update was given on the purchase of the remaining 4 acres of the Western Infirmary site, which should be completed in the coming months; and on the proposed approach to building the Gilmorehill Estate Strategy, incorporating the Western Infirmary site. The opportunities presented by the acquisition of the new site were summarised: to leave a lasting legacy for future generations at the University and in the city; to support Glasgow 2020’s vision of internationalisation, excellence in research and the student experience; to
create a modern campus which reflected the character of the University: forward looking with cutting edge research, but respecting and enhancing the character reflected in the historic campus and buildings; and to provide a campus which was sustainable financially, environmentally and as part of the local and national community.

It was noted that there would be effective consultation and genuine engagement with a wide variety of stakeholders, as the strategy was developed. The next steps were that a project structure would be established, together with a resource and governance framework. The appointment of the advisory team was being completed.

Views were sought on changes needed to the current campus, and on the vision for the future campus. Key points in discussion were:

1. That consideration should be given to redefinition of parts (‘hubs’) of the campus so that they are open for longer hours than at present and attract students, staff and visitors year-round.
2. The redeveloped campus should be welcoming, accessible to all and attractive.
3. Sight must not be lost of the University’s intellectual agenda in developing the architecture of new buildings.
4. There is an opportunity to make a cultural change as a result of the redevelopment.
5. Greater pedestrianisation of the campus should be possible.
6. The importance of green spaces.
7. The opportunity to improve the various entrances to the campus.
8. That meeting areas for staff and students should be developed.
9. Student accommodation might be built on the expanded campus.
10. International student needs must be considered.
11. Retention of landbank rather than outright disposal, in some cases.
12. Commercial initiatives should be considered e.g. possible hotel, retail, small businesses.
13. A robust external and internal communications strategy will be essential prior to and during the development.
14. The University will need to be mindful of the potential isolation of more northerly areas of the campus and act accordingly to retain their appeal.

4. Development and Alumni Relations Strategy

A briefing on the Development & Alumni Office’s work was given, with information on donor participation and details of campaigns for fundraising. Court members heard that achieving strategic goals for the institution would require some investment in the area, to allow focus on major gifts, revenue fundraising for Colleges and increased international fundraising.

In discussion it was agreed that different modes of engagement with different generations of graduates should be further developed. With the development of better databases, targeted communications, for example by year of graduation/College, could be improved, providing a greater chance of active response. Although not a traditionally high donor group given their financial constraints, younger graduates should be kept interested via communications tailored to their interests. Collaboration with various internal fundraisers e.g. Hunterian, and with external partners, should be considered.
Higher Education Governance Review

Turning to university governance, in my last statement to Parliament, I welcomed the recommendations of Professor von Prondzynski’s thoroughly considered Review of Higher Education Governance. And I said I would consider the findings with the sector in the period ahead.

Since then I have discussed the review findings with a broad range of stakeholders. I will continue to do so, but I should indicate that I have accepted virtually all of Prof von Prondzynski’s recommendations.

I believe the most effective approach to implementing the recommendations is to do so in three distinct ways:

- Firstly by engaging key sector stakeholders as implementation partners;
- Secondly, by engaging the sector itself in implementing the recommendations by agreement and adapting them as necessary to reflect existing good practice; and
- Finally, by employing legislation as required - as previously announced, a bill will be brought forward at the earliest opportunity, although the key issue of an underpinning statute will require a second bill, hopefully in the lifetime of this Parliament.

I can therefore announce today that the recommendation to establish an Advisory Forum will be taken forward by the Scottish Funding Council. I accept Professor von Prondzynski’s proposal that the advisory forum should help consider Government and sector interests on strategic decisions and have asked that it is convened in time to inform our next guidance letter to the Scottish Funding Council.

I can also announce that, subject to agreement on membership, I have asked the Committee of the Scottish Chairs of Higher Education Institutions to lead a group to develop a new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance. Membership of the committee that does that must include the voices of students, staff and the small specialist institutions.
Circular 42/12

07 September 2012

Development of a Scottish Code of Good Governance

The Committee of Scottish Chairs has now appointed a Steering Group to take forward the work on developing a Scottish Code of Governance, in response to the report of the Review of HE Governance in Scotland. This approach was welcomed by the Cabinet Secretary in his statement to the Scottish Parliament on 28 June 2012. The Steering Group is committed to a transparent and open approach and will consult appropriately and widely with institutions, including students and staff. The Steering Group members are as follows:

- Lord Smith of Kelvin, Chancellor, University of the West of Scotland (Chair)
- Dame Elish Angiolini, Principal, St Hughes’ College, Oxford
- Mr Simon Pepper, Former Rector, University of St Andrews
- Mr Tony Brian, Chair of Court, Glasgow Caledonian University
- Mr David Ross, Chair of Court, University of Glasgow
- Mr Eric Sanderson, Chair of Court, University of Dundee
- Lord Vallance of Tummell, Chair of the Board of Governors, Royal Conservatoire of Scotland (Special Consultant for the SSIs)

The Steering Group has commissioned two former University Secretaries as expert advisors to help with the development of the Scottish Code of Governance. The expert advisors are:

- Mr Kevin Clarke, Former University Secretary, University of Stirling
- Mr Peter West, Former University Secretary, University of Strathclyde

At the Main Committee meeting on 19 June 2012, US members agreed that it was important for this work to be funded by the sector and were committed to the principle that each institution should make an appropriate contribution to a restricted fund to be administered by Universities Scotland on behalf of the Committee of Scottish Chairs.

At the US AwayDay on 28 August 2012, members approved a specific institutional contribution amount of £2,250 to meet the costs of the project.

US officers will shortly be invoicing institutions directly for their contribution in order to create the required restricted budget.

The Terms of Reference for the Steering Group are attached as Annex A.

Kind regards,
Darren Thompson
darren@universities-scotland.ac.uk
0131 225 0719
COMMITTEE OF SCOTTISH CHAIRS

PROPOSED CODE OF PRACTICE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE

1. Background

In June 2011, the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning commissioned a review of higher education governance which was chaired by Professor Von Prondzynski. The remit of this review was to

- consider whether current institutional governance arrangements in the higher education sector in Scotland deliver an appropriate level of democratic accountability given the level of public funding institutions receive;
- identify and examine proposals for change which observe the benefits of an autonomous sector but will also consider the importance of full transparency; and
- the effectiveness of management and governance, the clarity of strategic purpose and its efficient implementation.

The Review's consideration was required to encompass

- the purpose of university governance in Scotland in the 21st century.
- the different forms governance takes across all Scotland’s higher education institutions.
- where governance works well, where it does not and what standards of good practice should all governing bodies observe.

In this context the Review was asked to consider the following areas:

- The current engagement of institutions with their communities and stakeholders and specifically to examine the case for a supervisory council or forum representing such interests, its make-up, its remit and the role it might perform in improving institutional governance.
- The current size and composition of governing bodies and whether changes need to be made to enable them to fulfil their role.
- The arrangements for the appointment of Principals and governing body members and the potential for involvement of a supervisory council or forum in that process.
- The case for the introduction of a rector at all institutions.
- The current arrangements surrounding governing body effectiveness reviews and any changes required to deliver greater accountability.
- The effectiveness and transparency of information sharing between the executive and the governing body.
- The effectiveness of communication within institutions between staff, the executive and the governing body.
- The current arrangements and case for representation of students on all governing body committees.
- The current arrangements for the induction, training and ongoing support of lay governing body members and whether specific Scottish provision is needed.

The Review reported in February 2012 and made a number of recommendations on governance arrangements, including the recommendation that the Scottish Funding Council should commission the drafting of a Code of Good Governance for higher education institutions.

2. The Way Forward

The Higher Education sector in Scotland is a vital and successful part of the economy. It is important in terms of current employment, in developing the necessary skills of the workforce and in undertaking research into all sectors of the economy. It also generates significant income from overseas from educating foreign students and from the international research that it carries out and its reputation throughout the world is extremely high with several universities ranked with the top 100 in the world. Any Code of Practice must recognise the importance of the sector to the economy and ensure that the contribution to the success of the economy nationally and internationally is enhanced.
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Universities are communities made up of students, staff and other stakeholders and a successful university recognises the importance of students and the contribution made by staff and other stakeholders. As a result Good Governance requires that the way in which a university is governed must allow for the interests of all those stakeholders to be taken into account.

The Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) met to discuss how to take forward the recommendations of the Von Prondzynski Review and concluded that that they should commission that new Scottish Code of Good Governance. The Scottish Funding Council agreed with that approach.

The decision of the CSC to prepare that new Scottish Code of Good Governance was discussed with the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning on 22 May 2012 and CSC has took on board suggestions made by him at that meeting. In his statement to the Holyrood Parliament on 28 June the Cabinet Secretary stated that he had asked the CSC to lead a group to develop a new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance.

As a result the CSC has appointed a Steering Group to oversee the preparation of that new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance

3. Composition and Remit of the Steering Group.

The steering Group is made up of the following individuals:-

Lord Smith of Kelvin - Chair
Dame Elish Angioli
Tony Brian
Simon Pepper
David Ross
Eric Sanderson

with Lord Vallance of Tummel as a Special Consultee providing input from the SSIs

The Remit of, and process to be followed by the Steering Group, are set out in Section 4 below.

4.1 Terms of Reference

The remit of the Steering Group is to develop a new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance which:-

- takes account of the recommendations of the Von Prondzynski review;
- incorporates the standards of good practice existing in the Higher Education sector and elsewhere;
- makes proposals that are based on sound evidence;
- clearly identifies the separate duties and responsibilities of management and governing bodies;
- reflects both the inputs and the outputs required of governing bodies and governance;
- takes account of the importance of both the relationships and processes required to achieve good governance;
- considers the inter relationship which governing bodies should have with other bodies within their institutions concerned with governance;
- is suitably flexible so that it can be applied to all institutions including the Small Specialist Institutions; and
- addresses if, and to what extent, the Code should apply to the Scottish operations of institutions based in other countries and to overseas operations of Scottish institutions;

4.2 Process

In developing the new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance the Steering Group is asked to :-
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- operate in an open transparent manner publishing reports on its progress, consultations and responses received thereto and demonstrating the reasons for the terms of the new Code;

- consult students, staff and members of governing bodies at each Scottish Higher Education institution and Lord Vallance as Special Consultee for SSIs on the draft code as it is developed;

- consult other key external stakeholders in the sector on the draft as it is developed;

- Seek to complete its task by May 2013.
Annex 5

MyCampus

Key Performance Indicators

1  % undergraduates fully registered on the first day of Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 actual</th>
<th>2012 actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 academic enrolment</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: given that there will be no-shows, the 95% target effectively equates to full registration

2  % full-time registered undergraduates enrolled for a) 120 credits or more; and b) 60 credits or more on first day of Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>120</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 actual</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 actual</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012, adjusted for block enr.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3  % support calls resolved within 3 working days - all calls received up to first day of session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 actual</th>
<th>2012 actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 actual</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4  Student Debt

Key Performance Indicator to be analysed at the end of the financial year.
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University of Glasgow

STANDING ORDERS FOR COURT AND COURT COMMITTEES

1 The quorum for Court shall be seven (as determined by the Universities (Scotland) Act 1889) and for its committees shall be one third of members.

2 The lay Court members shall elect a senior lay member ("the Convener") from among their number.

3 The Rector shall be the Ordinary President of the Court and shall chair such parts of the Court meetings as the Court may from time to time decide.

4 The Convener shall chair those parts of the Court meetings not chaired by the Rector, and shall undertake all the other responsibilities expected of a chairman.

5 If a vote is necessary, the motion will be passed if a majority of those present vote in favour of it, provided that the meeting is quorate. The person chairing the meeting shall have a deliberative and a casting vote.

6 The Court shall review the remits of all its Committees every three years.

7 The Court shall review the membership of its Committees annually.

8 With the exception of ex-officio members:

   • members should normally be appointed to Committees for terms of four years;

   • no member of a Committee should normally serve for more than two terms consecutively;

   • a Committee shall have the right to remove as a member of the Committee persons who do not attend meetings on a regular basis (less than 60% attendance), provided that the person whose membership is proposed for termination shall have the right to be heard in his/her own defence by the Committee.

9 The Nominations Committee shall recommend to Court individuals to be co-opted on to Court; it may also recommend other individuals for Court to appoint as members of its Committees. Committees may, subject to Court approval, co-opt individuals with specific expertise as members in order to deal with specialist items of business.

10 If a Committee establishes a working group, it should clearly define its remit and the timescale within which it should work. The working group should be wound up when its function has been fulfilled.

11 Court has given authority to the Conveners of Committees to take urgent action on behalf of their Committees, when necessary, between meetings. If such delegated authority is exercised, the nature of and reason for the action should be reported to the next meeting of the committee.

12 Court has given authority to the Secretary of Court to act on its behalf between meetings on matters of routine business. The Secretary of Court shall be answerable to Court for any action which he/she takes on its behalf and a written report shall be
made to the next meeting of Court detailing any such action taken for endorsement by Court.

13 Court has given authority to the Convener, the Principal and the Secretary of Court to act together on behalf of Court between meetings on matters of other than routine business. These persons shall be answerable to Court for any action they take on its behalf and a written report shall be made to the next meeting of Court detailing any such action taken for endorsement by Court.

14 Committees should determine and publicise at the start of an academic year their schedule of meetings; thereafter changes to dates/times should be kept to a minimum.

15 The agenda and papers for meetings of Court and its Committees should normally be circulated not less than 7 days in advance of the meeting. Where Court must consider a particularly lengthy paper, this should be circulated at an earlier date wherever possible. Papers should only be tabled in exceptional circumstances.

16 If Court believes there may be good reason to remove an individual from membership of Court, it shall delegate the matter to the Nominations Committee, which shall consider the case, hear the member's defence and make a recommendation to Court. Criteria for removal from membership of Court shall include persistent absenteeism, medical incapacity, legal impediment and breaches of the Code of Conduct for Members of Court. (Appendix A).

17 Should Court members have concerns about the way Court is operating, they should in the first place raise these concerns with the Convener. The Senior Senate Assessor and the Chancellor's Assessor have joint responsibility for receiving any concern felt by a Court member about the conduct of Court business, where the member does not wish to raise this directly with the Convener, for identifying any concerns among Court members about the conduct of Court business, and for raising these with the Convener.

18 Court shall hold 5 regular meetings plus one Strategy Day in each academic year and, if business requires it, a special meeting may be called from time to time. In addition, briefing sessions may be arranged on matters of importance. Appendix B is a schedule of meetings of Court and of its Committees in 2012/13. Appendix C shows the membership of Court and the remit and membership of its Committees.

19 Court members are encouraged to consider attendance at suitable training events, which will be brought to members' attention by the Court Office on an annual basis. Court members are also encouraged to observe committees where they would be interested in knowing what business the committees discuss and how the meetings are conducted.
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
Appendix B

Schedule of Meetings of Court and its Committees 2012/2013

Court
Wednesday 10 October 2012
Wednesday 12 December 2012
Wednesday 13 February 2013
Wednesday 10 April 2013
Wednesday 19 June 2013

Audit Committee
Tuesday 18 September 2012
Wednesday 7 November 2012
Monday 18 February 2013
Wednesday 22 May 2013

Estates Committee
Thursday 30 August 2012
Tuesday 6 November 2012
Monday 7 January 2013
Monday 18 March 2013
Monday 20 May 2013

Finance Committee
Thursday 13 September 2012
Wednesday 14 November 2012
Wednesday 16 January 2013
Wednesday 27 March 2013
Thursday 30 May 2012 (to be rescheduled)

Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee
Wednesday 19 September 2012
Thursday 13 December 2012
Tuesday 12 March 2013
Wednesday 22 May 2013

Human Resources Committee
Friday 14 September 2012
Wednesday 7 November 2012
Wednesday 23 January 2013
Wednesday 27 March 2013
Wednesday 29 May 2013

Nominations Committee
To meet as required

Remuneration Committee
To meet as required
Appendix C

Membership of Court and Remit/Membership of its Committees 2012/2013

Court
Rector: Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP
Principal: Professor Anton Muscatelli
Chancellor’s Assessor: Mr Murdoch MacLennan
Assessor of the City of Glasgow Council: Cllr Matt Kerr
5 General Council Assessors:
Mr David Anderson, Mr Brian McBride, Mr Alan Macfarlane, Mr David Ross, Mr Kevin Sweeney
7 Senate Assessors:
Dr Marie Freil, Professor William Martin, Dr Alan Owen, Professor Miles Padgett, Professor Adrienne Scullion, Dr Donald Spaeth, 1 Vacancy
2 Employee Representatives:
Ms Susan Ashworth, Ms Margaret Anne McParland
President of the Students’ Representative Council: Mr James Harrison
Assessor of Students’ Representative Council: Mr Kenneth Law (to November 2012)
5 Co-opted members: Mr Ken Brown, Dr Robin Easton, Mr Peter Daniels, Ms Margaret Morton, Professor Michael Scott-Morton

Audit Committee
Remit:
To oversee on behalf of Court the arrangements for external and internal audit of the University’s financial and management systems and of activities and processes related to these systems.

Membership: Six lay members, of whom one member of Court. Dr Paul Brady, Mr Jo Elliott, Mr Hamish Guthrie, Mr Neil Menzies, Ms Elizabeth Simpson, Mr Kevin Sweeney (convener)

Estates Committee
Remit:
To develop and maintain strategic estate plans for consideration by Court, taking into account academic need, resource implications and the importance of environmental sustainability;
To develop policies to guide implementation of plans by Estates & Buildings.

Membership: Three lay members (Peter Daniels (convener), Margaret Morton, vacancy), Two Senate Assessors (Billy Martin, Marie Freil), Principal, Secretary of Court, Vice Principal Strategy & Resources, Director of Estates & Buildings, Director of Finance, SRC representative.

Finance Committee
Remit:
To monitor the income and expenditure of the University.
To consider financial policies and issues and to make recommendations to Court on:
- the annual revenue and capital budget;
- banking, borrowing and lending
- the investment of endowment funds; and
- other financial matters, always having regard to the importance of financial sustainability.
To advise Court on the financial implications of policy decisions being considered by Court.
To consider the financial statements of the University and make recommendations to Court thereon.
Having received a report from the Capex Committee: to make recommendations to Court on the budget for capital projects; to decide on all capex proposals involving expenditure of £500,000 or above, subject to these proposals being included in the Court approved capital plan and, where appropriate, having been approved by the Estates Committee; and to decide on all requests for capital budget variances of £500,000 or above.

To authorise individual items of revenue expenditure costing £1M or more.

Membership: Three lay members of Court (Ken Brown (chair), David Ross, Peter Daniels), External lay member (Iain Stewart), Two Senate Assessors (Adrienne Scullion, Miles Padgett), Principal, Director of Finance, President of the SRC.

Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee
Remit
The Committee is mandated by Section 2(7) of the Health & Safety at Work (etc.) Act 1974 and recognised by the Secretary of State under Statutory Instrument 1977 No. 500 Health and Safety - The Safety Representatives and Safety Committees Regulations 1977. It has the role of keeping under review the measures taken to ensure the effective management of the health and safety of employees, and also that of students, visitors, contractors and other persons who could be affected by the various work activities of the University of Glasgow or could, through their own work activity (ies), adversely affect the health and safety of themselves and/or others.

Membership: David Newall (chair), Robin Easton (lay member), Nicholas Elliott; 8 Members Appointed by JULC: Mr D Somerville, Mr A Ross, Dr D P Gilmore, Ms M Goodfellow, Dr J O'Dowd, E Richardson, D Robinson, R Arthurs; 5 Management appointees Ms J Ommer, J Malcolm, Dr C Martin, Mr P Phillips, G Duckett; 2 Members Appointed by SRC: J McGrellis, vacancy; Ex-officio Advisory Members: Dr D Maclean Dep Director SEPS, Mr J Gray Radiation Protection Officer, Ms S Woolcott Director Health Safety and Wellbeing, Ms A Allen Director of Estates & Buildings, Mr I Black Director of HR, Ms A Stewart Occupational Health Manager

Human Resources Committee
Remit:
On behalf of Court, to review the University’s HR Strategy and, through agreed performance indicators, monitor its relevance, implementation and effectiveness;
Ensure that the strategy is consistent with and supports the University’s mission, vision and values;
Monitor compliance with the legal and regulatory framework for HR and ensure the adoption of best practice;
Act as a sounding board for the University’s executive officers and HR function, providing advice, from a breadth of perspectives, on human resource management issues;
Ensure that the University’s senior management demonstrate the importance of HR to the institution by providing support and leadership to all its staff.
Membership: Two lay members of Court (Alan Macfarlane, David Anderson (convener)), External lay member (Stephen McCafferty), Three Senate Assessors (Alan Owen, Don Spaeth, Vacancy), Principal, Secretary of Court, Director of Human Resources, Two Heads of College (Anne Anderson, Ewan Cameron) Two non-academic service directors (Ann Allen, Helen Durndell).

Nominations Committee
Remit:
To make recommendations to Court on the appointment of co-opted lay members, having regard to the skills and experience required;
To make recommendations to Court on the appointment of Court committee members, and on the convenership of Court committees;
To advise Court on any other matter relating to its membership.
Membership: Convener of Court (David Ross (chair)), Two other lay members of Court (Alan Macfarlane, Robin Easton), Senior Senate Assessor (Alan Owen), Principal, Secretary of Court.

Remuneration Committee
Remit:
To formulate the University's remuneration policy, and to review that policy annually, recommending changes to Court as appropriate;
To determine salaries for members of the Senior Management Group, having regard to:
- their performance in advancing the University's strategic objectives,
- the need to offer salaries that are competitive with those of other major UK universities, as reflected in robust comparative data, and
- the budget approved by Court;
In the absence of the Principal, to determine the Principal's salary; and
On Court's behalf, to determine the University's policy on severance arrangements for staff, and to consider on an individual basis, any severance proposal for a member of the Senior Management Group.
Membership: Vice Chair of Court (David Ross), Principal (Anton Muscatelli), Three external members, who should be current or former lay members of Court (David Anderson, Ken Brown, Vacancy).
University of Glasgow

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
Scheme of Delegated Authorities

The following notes set out where responsibilities lie in the University across the main areas of financial, human resource and estates management and in respect of contractual issues relating to teaching and research.

A  Financial Management

1. Banking, Borrowing and Lending  Court, on recommendation of Finance Committee
2. University Budget  Court, on recommendation of Finance Committee
3. Management of College Budgets  Heads of College, Secretary of Court
4. Investment of Endowment Funds  Court, on recommendation of Finance Committee, advised by Investment Advisory Committee
5. Authorisation of expenditure:
   up to £25,000  relevant budgetholder
   £25,000 - £100,000  Head of School or nominee
   £100,000 to £250,000  Head of College or nominee
   more than £250,000  Principal, Secretary of Court or Director of Finance
   more than £1M  Finance Committee

6. Purchasing Authorisation
   up to £25,000  School Purchasing Officer
   over £25,000  Assistant Director of Finance - Procurement

B  Human Resource Management

1. Offers of Appointment  Director of HR, following decision by Appointing Committee (constituted per University Recruitment Policy)
2. Remuneration/
   Implementation of national agreements  Director of HR
   Members of SMG  Remuneration Committee
   Professorial /senior admin staff  Remuneration Committee, advised by Professorial Review Committee
   Other staff  College / University Services Recognition and Reward Committees
3. Promotions
   University Review Board, advised by College / University Services Promotions Committees

4. Termination of Employment
   Redundancy
   Director of HR, following decision by Court
   Misconduct/Incapacity
   Director of HR, in terms of University Disciplinary and Capability procedures
   Voluntary severance
   Director of HR, in terms agreed by Remuneration Committee

C Estates Management

1. Estates Strategy
   Court, on the recommendation of Estates Committee

2. Acquisition and disposal of land and buildings per Estates Strategy, and

3. Lease of Properties, per Estates Strategy:
   - transactions up to £500,000
     Secretary of Court
   - transactions over £500,000
     Court on recommendation of Estates Committee

4. Capital Works
   Approval of budget
   Court, on recommendation of Finance Committee
   Award of Capital contracts, within sums approved by Court
   - up to £250,000
     Director of Estates & Buildings
   - over £250,000
     Secretary of Court

   Approval of variances against budget:
   - up to £500,000
     Director of Finance
   - over £500,000 or 5%
     Principal, Finance Committee

   Approval of CAPEX applications, for consideration by Finance Committee
   - up to £500,000
     Director of Finance
   - over £500,000
     Principal, Estates Committee

   Approval of stage payments
   Director of Estates & Buildings

5. Contracts for maintenance and utilities, within approved budget
- up to £250,000  Director of Estates & Buildings
- over £250,000  Secretary of Court

6. Letting of University Accommodation

Residential lets  Director of Campus Services
Long-term lets  Estates Committee
Short lets  Director of Estates & Buildings

D Learning & Teaching

1. Student Admissions Policy  Senate
2. Student Admissions  Heads of College, working with University Services officers
3. Student tuition fees  Court, on recommendation of Finance Committee
4. Student Progression  Senate, through College Progress Committees
5. Degree Awards  Senate, through College Examination Boards
6. New degree programmes  Court, on receipt of draft resolution from Senate
7. Student Discipline  Senate, on recommendation of Senate Disciplinary Committee

E Research and Enterprise

1. Application for research grant applications  Heads of College + Director of Research & Enterprise
2. Acceptance of grant awards  Director of Research & Enterprise
3. Contracts for provision of research, short courses and services:
   - value up to £10,000  Head of School
   - value over £10,000  Director of Research & Enterprise
4. Licensing of Intellectual Property  Secretary of Court, advised by Director of Research & Enterprise

F Appointment of Auditors

Court, on the recommendation of Audit Committee
G Other Matters

1. Other matters of routine business arising between meetings of Court Secretary of Court

2. Other matters of non-routine business arising between meetings of Court Chair of Court, Principal and Secretary of Court, acting together

Approved April 2010
## ANNUAL SCHEDULE OF COURT BUSINESS

### (September/October)
- **Strategy Discussion Day**
- Report on any action taken under delegated powers over summer
- Report on Strategy Discussion Day
- Standing Orders, Code of Conduct, Committee remits and dates
- Statement of Primary Responsibilities
- Scheme of Delegated Authorities
- Schedule of Court business for forthcoming year
- Report on previous year’s attendance of Court and Committees
- Learning & Teaching update and KPIs from Vice Principal
- Report from Head of College
- Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
- Nominations Committee recommendations for forthcoming year
- Annual report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review of Teaching Quality (ELIR)
- Honorary Degree nominations

### (November)
- (Half day briefing on Governance, Funding, HE Policy) (if required)

### December
- Audited Accounts/Financial Statements for previous year (including subsidiaries’ financial statements and GU Trust statements)
- Report from Head of University Services
- Report on Investments (Finance Committee)
- Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
- Audit Committee annual report
- Human Resources KPIs

### February
- Report from Head of College
- SRC annual report
- Finance KPIs
- Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)

### April
- Research update and KPIs from Vice Principal
- SFC Main Grant Allocations for forthcoming year
- Report from Head of College
- Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)

### (May/June)
- (Half day briefing on University Finances)

### June
- Strategic Plan (annual update) including KPIs
- Capital Programme (annual update for approval)
- Budget Overview for forthcoming year/Financial Forecasts
- Report from Head of College
- Report on Investments (Finance Committee)
- Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
- Estates KPIs
Summary

This report summarises the University of Glasgow media coverage over the period July-September 2012. In addition to a digest of domestic and international media activity, the report also includes detail of our social media presence, our performance on ITunes U/You Tube and of traffic using the University of Glasgow website.

As the period under consideration covered the exam period and then the summer break, media uptake and output was somewhat less than in the previous quarter. However there were many significant, newsworthy stories on research, academic comment and in the positive positioning of the University of Glasgow as a leading institution. Effort was again placed on achieving qualitative coverage, as well as quantitative, and in promoting stories internationally and through our social media outlets. On the latter, there was conspicuous success, with a 21% increase in Facebook followers and a 14% increase in Twitter followers noted.

There was also a notable increase in traffic from external visitors to the University of Glasgow website - up 16% compared to the same quarter in 2011. Our ITunes U and You Tube output is also performing well, and achieving substantial hit levels.

International media coverage continues to be strong. For example, on one single day 6 of the 21 articles on the main education web page of the Times of India featured University of Glasgow stories.

Some of the major UK media stories to have emerged during the period are summarised below.

In August the University of Glasgow was chosen by the Cabinet Secretary for Education, Michael Russell MSP as the venue for his launch of a major announcement on student finance and support. This provided corporate communications with an opportunity to take forward previous work that had been done to highlight the substantial efforts made through schemes like Top-Up to widen access to students from disadvantaged backgrounds. In the following week two substantial pieces applauding the initiative appeared in the Herald, along with an editorial which stated:

“All universities should take encouragement from Glasgow’s Top-up success because it shows that disadvantaged 17 year-olds have the potential to become graduates of the highest calibre. As Professor Anton Muscatelli, the Principal of Glasgow University, points out, these students are more motivated than those who haven’t had to fight to get into university and prove just as able, if not more so.”

There was subsequent pick-up in the Scotsman, Metro, Press and Journal and on STV. Again the comments were favourable towards our initiatives, with supportive quotes from both the Scottish Government and the National Union of Students in Scotland.
Other stories that were developed in the media during this quarter were widely spread amongst the colleges, and the following gives a snapshot of some of these:

Research conducted into the regenerative power of stem cells to improve orthopedic implant surgery featured across BBC TV and the printed press. As with many of the stories now appearing on the University news page, a video element is included. This was also disseminated via our social media pages.

http://www.gla.ac.uk/news/headline_240245_en.html

There was also notable interest in research that found middle class teenagers identified with terms such as “ned” and “chav”; on the launch of the Magtem electron microscope; and on a study into missing persons which featured in a full page piece in the Guardian, other print and TV coverage and an interview on BBC Radio 5-Live.

A study into climate change and why Antarctica was once covered in palm trees was well received, as was a separate report which looked at geological records from many hundreds of millions of years ago to consider the impact of planet warming on global diversity. Research into healthier pizza and a separate study on the nutritional value (or not) of ready meals was also widely taken up, and there was great interest in the launch of a new website by the Centre for Robert Burns Studies. A report into how people use email and what it says about their character was also favoured by the press, across both the UK and internationally.

The launch of a new free and easy-to-access online resource on the People of Medieval Scotland site was not only a major media event, formally launched by the Principal and the Cabinet Secretary for Education, but also drove thousands of people to visit and use what is a remarkable site.

http://www.poms.ac.uk/

The University of Glasgow is increasingly being seen as the crucible of debate on Scotland’s constitutional future. This was seen earlier in the year when both Lord Wallace of Tankerness and the Deputy First Minister Nicola Sturgeon MSP gave their views in lectures arranged by the School of Law. In September the first in a series of seminars that seeks to find out how the ordinary people of Scotland might have engaged in major historical events took place under the banner of Vox Populi. The Scotsman was chosen as our media partner for this, not least because of the large online following that the Scotsman has amongst the Scottish Diaspora. The first of eight specially commissioned articles appeared to coincide with the start of this landmark series. The article may have helped swell numbers at the seminar, which was standing room only. Subsequent seminars will receive similar coverage in the Scotsman.

http://www.scotsman.com/news/declaration-triggers-a-clash-over-democratic-ideals-1-2543270

Colleagues from the School of Law are prominent in a joint initiative with Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh and Strathclyde universities on a new body formed in late September which aims to discuss some of the issues that may inform the constitutional debate. Corporate communications drove the initial media launch of the Scottish Constitutional Futures Forum, with coverage across print and online, include an opinion (op-ed) article in the Scotsman.

We are working with the Times newspaper to secure opinion slots in the main UK as well as the Scottish edition of the newspaper, and the first of these appeared in mid September on the independence referendum. Further opinion pieces are planned.

The announcement from CERN of the likely existence of the Higgs Boson particle led to media comment across print, broadcast and online from several of academic colleagues here at the University of Glasgow. Many were involved with CERN, and the media impact for Glasgow was substantial. It was also pleasing that the broadcast media sought comment from the University
of Glasgow on exam results, and we were able to provide expert analysis of subjects ranging from the US Presidential elections to the Mars explorer mission.

We are currently working with the BBC on a possible television series on philosophy. This is at an early stage, and updates will be provided in later media reports should the venture be taken to the next level.

It is also worth mentioning that our young alumnus Emile Sande continued to make reference to her links with the University of Glasgow in interviews and features that accompanied her appearance at both the opening and closing ceremonies of the London 2012 Olympic Games.

Staff within corporate communications also dealt with less positive media enquiries. Five stories involved negative coverage during the period under consideration, but none attained any significant spread, and all but one was restricted to the pages of the Herald and Glasgow Evening Times.

In August the Herald ran two stories relating to the technical problems we encountered with MyCampus. The pieces were reasonable within the context of the issues we were experiencing and did not lead to further take-up within the media. The Herald and Evening Times also gave space to possible changes to the opening hours of the Medical School Library, but here again the issue was promptly defused. In September there was reporting in the Herald and Metro on the sentencing of a student who had indecent images of children on his computer. Later that month, the Herald carried a small item on the decision to postpone the initial two week induction placement off postgraduate education students. The story was later developed by Times Educational Supplement Scotland. Finally, the Herald reported on the case of a former student who has been asked to leave the country as his visa has now expired.

Corporate communications staff offer guidance on all aspects of media engagement and would encourage colleagues to get in touch to discuss anything that might be of interest to a wider audience. The main office number is 0141 330 3535, but the following are the lead media officers for each college:

Stuart Forsyth, MVLS – 0141 330 4831; stuart.forsyth@glasgow.ac.uk
Ross Barker, Science and Engineering – 0141 330 8593; ross.barker@glasgow.ac.uk
Cara Macdowall, Social Sciences – 0141 330 3683; cara.macdowall@glasgow.ac.uk
Nick Wade – Arts – 0141 330 7126; nick.wade@glasgow.ac.uk

Peter Aitchison, Deputy Director (Media and Public Relations) 0141 330 7350; peter.aitchison@glasgow.ac.uk

As mentioned in our previous report, formal media training sessions with a professional media company have been arranged. Five sessions will take place, with the first planned for late October 2012.

**Media Activity Report – United Kingdom**

According to our main UK cuttings provider, we registered a total of 726 media clips in the period 1 July 2012 to 30 September 2012. These had an advertising value (AVE) of £3,642,177 and a total potential circulation of 592,262,943. This is down on the previous quarter, with 883 media clips generated during April - June 2012, and reflects the fact that the summer months are quieter both for research and academic comment.

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

Please note that we are changing our UK media cuttings supplier with effect from 1 October 2012. Subsequent media reports will have a different feel as the analytics provided differ from those currently used.
Corporate University includes all corporate services and other general university stories.

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

- July - 241
- August - 224
- September - 261

* 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 hits across Colleges**

Colleges generating the most media clips are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Prof Mike Lean</td>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>Healthy Pizza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dr James Bendle</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Antarctica Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Professor Gerard Carruthers</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Robert Burns Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Prof Dauvit Broun</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>People of Medieval Scotland online resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Robert Young</td>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>Research into identification of youth with terms such as Neds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dr Rob Jenkins</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Passport Images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Prof Alan Craven</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Magtem launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Several academics</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Higgs Boson discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Dr Matthew Dalby and Dr Nikolaj Gadegaard</td>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Nano hip technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dr Kamil Kranc</td>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>Leukemia Award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Coverage

Over the period under consideration there were 2,840 international media mentions, compared with 3,061 for the preceding three months. As usual, the USA accounts for the bulk of coverage (37%) while Germany is second (10%). Spain is the third country shown (7%) and this perhaps reflects increased interest in Scotland’s independence referendum debate. It is heartening to see India as the 4th biggest contributor (5%) to our media coverage total and reflects the concerted effort to target this important recruitment and partnership market. Coverage in China comes in at a respectable 2%.

The quieter summer period was reflected in the World 100 Aurora report which listed 11 key international stories from one selected week in the month of July. However, these stories achieved a very high average reputational impact score.

There has been continuing good coverage in India of research from Glasgow, as well as articles highlighting other aspects of the university from scholarships to careers support. Highlights include: an article highlighting the computer forensics in the Telegraph Kolkata; Science of Sport in Times of India, Careers Advice for Indian students in Careers 360, emailing style research in all the main Indian papers including The Hindu and Times of India.

In fact, of the 21 stories that are currently listed on the Times of India’s education site’s UK section - [http://www.myeducationtimes.com/section/95/UK](http://www.myeducationtimes.com/section/95/UK) - six of the stories are from the University of Glasgow.

Media activity in India continues to be supported through Comma Consulting, the PR agency hired through the Scottish Universities International Group media project, which the University of Glasgow coordinates. Corporate Communications assumed responsibility for seeking an agreement to continue with the project in India for a further 12 months from 8 of the 14 partners and made arrangements to handle the financial contributions from each.

In addition, the digital marketing agency Precedent was hired to assist in the development of a strategy and editorial policy and launch of a Sina-Weibo microblogging account in China. The project is progressing and is on schedule for official launch by October/November. Corporate communications, working in conjunction with RIO is also researching the possibility of creating a Chinese-language website/landing page in the near future.
The Media Relations Team has also met with new members of staff in RIO, including Andrew Zhao, Chris Yeomans, Graeme McDiarmid, Naomi Allum, and the new international recruitment coordinators.

A redrafted International Communications Strategy has also been finalised and will be presented for review and input to the International Steering Group later in October.

**Social Media Monitoring**

The analytics for social media monitoring suggest a very healthy increase across both Twitter and Facebook.

- 21% increase in Facebook followers over past 3 months
- 14% increase in Twitter followers over past 3 months

**Facebook**

Between 1 July and 30 September 2012 the number of our followers on Facebook increased by 5,990, from 28,035 to 34,025, or 21%.

This puts us sixth among the Russell Group universities. (Oxford [684,285 fans] and Cambridge [181,203 fans] have been omitted from the following table.)

**Number of fans per RG university: 26 Sept 2012**
Follower analytics:

Gender:
- Male: 7%
- Female: 93%

Age:
- 13-17: 1%
- 18-24: 12%
- 25-34: 22%
- 35-44: 4%
- 45-54: 7%
- 55-64: 4%
- 65+: 1%

Facebook audience breakdown by country of origin:
- India: 32%
- GB: 46%
- Saudi Arabia: 4%
- US: 8%
- Brazil: 1%
- Greece: 2%
- Germany: 2%
- Malaysia: 2%
- Thailand: 2%
- Singapore: 1%
Facebook audience by top cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fans</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,768</td>
<td>Glasgow, Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>London, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Edinburgh, Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Lahore, Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>Jakarta, Jakarta Raya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Karachi, Sindh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Bangkok, Krung Thep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Athens, Attiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>New Delhi, Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur, Wilayah Persekutuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Medan, Sumatera Utara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top stories:

07/09/2012: Photo album: ‘Images from our beautiful campus’ (724 likes)
07/09/2012: Photo album: ‘Your pics’ (1,140 likes)
23/08/2012: Photo: ‘A beacon of education’ (516 likes)
03/08/2012: Photo album: ‘Our city is pretty cool’ (708 likes)
10/07/2012: Photo: ‘A BEV from the BOB’ (894 likes)
The University of Glasgow has the third highest number of followers on Twitter of any University in the UK, behind the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Between 1 July and 30 September our twitter follower number rose from 17,238 to 19,688, an increase of just over 14%.

Twitter followers of Russell Group universities: 26 Sept 2012-09-26

[Bar chart showing Twitter followers for various Russell Group universities, with data points for both 06 July 2012 and 26 Sept 2012.]
Key events over the past three months included:

- MyCampus technical issues
- Freshers' Week
- Start of the academic year
- Olympics and Olympic parade
- QS World Rankings table released
- Undergraduate Open Day

**iTunes U**

For the period from 1 July-29 September 2012 we achieved the following totals:

- 111,582 browses
- 21,611 subscriptions
- 79,687 accessed content (downloading or streaming)

Clinical Skills and Writing for the Web continue to be among the most popular collections, although the Gifford Lectures and our various Philosophy collections enjoyed a prolonged boost after both were featured in the iTunes U home pages. New collections are enjoying solid viewing figures: the Hand-knitted Textiles & Economies of Craft in Scotland conference talks, for example. There were noticeable increases in browsing and viewing figures for the more central, promotional figures (Welcome to University of Glasgow), suggesting that people were looking for this type of content in the run-up to Open Day.

iTunes U has now made available the Course Manager function to individuals without requiring an institutional affiliation, as was previously the case. We are trying to take the initiative and keep things within the University of Glasgow site. The first step for doing
this has been an agreement with a senior lecturer in MVLS who is interested in putting his third year genetics course on iTunes U. If we can do this successfully (ie, it will show up as a new course rather than as a collection) we hope to encourage other academics to follow his example. Having new courses will boost our profile and appearances on the iTunes U site overall.

The iTunes U site manager is not ideal; it is difficult to access geographical spread data for the period in question. However, for the two-week period 16 September-01 October 2012, our geographical spread shows that the largest percentage of visitors came from the US (23%), followed closed by the UK (22.8%), China (12.2%), Italy (5.1%), Australia, Japan and Russia (all about 3.5%), etc. Viewers are then dispersed in much smaller percentages, together with 19.2% classified vaguely as ‘other’.

Video content continues to be transferred over to our YouTube channel in organised playlists to mirror the iTunes U collections, so that we can qualify for inclusion in the YouTube Edu category. We currently have 136 videos uploaded, with a lifetime viewing rate of 49,987. For the period 1 July-29 September 2012 the University’s videos have had 11,289 views. Top 10 countries in terms of number of views are as follows: 4,274 from the UK, followed by the US (1,351), India (397), Germany (309), Canada (242), Australia (230), Italy (206), Greece (205), Malaysia (185) and Hong Kong (183).

**Website**

External visitors to the University of Glasgow site showed a 16% increase in traffic during July, August and September of 2012 compared to the same period in 2011.

There were 1,318,177 unique visitors to the website, compared to 1,203,120 in July - September 2011.

Over the same time frames, the following also happened:

- The total number of page views increased by 16.33%
- The average visit duration increased by 4.56%
- The percentage of visits from overseas has risen from 29% to 31%

These figures show that we have more visitors, looking at more pages for longer during each visit.

Peter Aitchison
Deputy Director (Media and Public Relations)
Corporate Communications

2 October 2012
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Brief description of the paper
This report sets out those items considered at the Finance Committee'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/2012/05. Endowments Change of Use
The University had received approval from the Privy Council to change the use of endowments which had lain dormant for five years or more in order to ensure that the revenue was utilised to support the student experience. A number of endowments were gifted to the University with very strict parameters which over time became restrictive. Finance Committee was invited to approve the transfer of thirty three endowments totalling £1,219k in capital to the Post Graduate Scholarship Fund. Finance Committee approved the changes of use.

Court is asked to approve the changes of use.

B Items – for noting

CA/2012/04. UGPS Additional Pension Contribution
Finance Committee were invited to contribute an additional £850k to the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme (UGPS) in order to reduce the deficit in the fund. It was noted that this followed a decision of Finance Committee in 2007 to fund the pension scheme at 25.5%, as recommended by the actuary, and to make additional contributions where possible.

Finance Committee approved the additional payment of £850k to UGPS.

CA/2012/06. Laser Lithography and the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre (JWNC)
Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for £489k for a direct-write laser lithography tool for the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre. The Capex application projected a net present value (NPV) of £1.5m over ten years. It was noted that the tool would enhance
the work of the JWNC and replace a 21 year old electron beam lithography tool which was reaching the end of its functional life.

Finance Committee approved the purchase of the laser lithography tool.

CA/2012/07. Gilmorehill Halls Update
The Committee received an updated capital expenditure application for fabric and structural repairs to Gilmorehill Halls. Finance Committee approved the initial capital expenditure application of £1,850k in November 2011. The updated application requested a further £300k (total expenditure £2,150k) as the value of the successful tender was higher than had been budgeted.

The Committee approved the increased application to £2,150k.

CA/2012/08. Renewal of Banking Facilities
Finance Committee was invited to review the terms and conditions proffered by the Clydesdale Bank for provision of an overdraft and other banking facilities for 2012/13. The facilities included BACS Payroll facility up to a limit of £24m, Guarantees/Bonds/Indemnities to a limit of £60k and open credit of up to £500k.

The Committee approved the banking facilities provided by Clydesdale Bank for 2012/13.

CA/2012/09. Insurance Renewal 2012/13 (paper 6.1)
The University undertook a tendering processes for its main insurance policies (i.e. property, employers liability and public liability) in Spring 2012 as the existing Long Term Agreements (LTAs) expired in July 2012. The successful tender was submitted by Zurich Municipal and, despite increasing the Business Interruption indemnity period from three to four years, the successful tender was 16.7% lower than previous year. The total premium costs for 2012/13 was £1.36m, a saving of just over £261k.

CA/2012/15. Debtors Report as at 31 July 2012 (paper 7.3)
Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 July 2012. The Group Financial Controller reported that total debt stood at £25.86m representing a slight increase on year-on-year comparisons from £24.7m at July 2011.

Prepared by: Gavin Lee
Last modified on: Thursday 27th September 2012
The Convener welcomed Mr James Harrison, SRC President, to his first meeting of Finance Committee.

CA/2012/01. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 30 May 2012

The minutes of Finance Committee held on Wednesday 30 May 2012 were approved.

CA/2012/02. Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were noted.

CA/2012/03. Finance Committee Remit (paper 5.1)

Finance Committee were informed that each Court committee is required to formally review and approve the committee’s remit annually. Finance Committee approved the remit without amendment.

CA/2012/04. UGPS Additional Pension Contribution (paper 5.2)

Finance Committee received a paper requesting an additional contribution of £850k to the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme (UGPS) in order to reduce the deficit in the fund. The Committee noted that this followed a decision of Finance Committee in 2007 to fund the pension scheme at 25.5%, as recommended by the actuary, and to make additional contributions where possible. £850k reflected the additional budgetary provision for 2012-13. It was noted that the current pension liability stood at £119.3m at 31 July 2012, an increase from £57.1m at the same period in 2011. The decline in gilt yields, due to the government programme of quantitative easing, was the significant factor in the increase in liability.

Finance Committee approved the additional payment of £850k to UGPS.

It was noted that data collected in the 2011 census suggested that the life expectancy values used to calculate pension liabilities had been overestimated. A revaluation of this may lead to a reduction in the pension liability.
CA/2012/05. Endowments Change of Use (paper 5.3)

The University had received approval from the Privy Council to change the use of endowments which had lain dormant for five years or more in order to ensure that the revenue was utilised to support the student experience. A number of endowments were gifted to the University with very strict parameters which over time became restrictive. Finance Committee was invited to approve the transfer of thirty three endowments totalling £1,219k in capital to the Post Graduate Scholarship Fund. It was confirmed that the endowments had not been utilised for five years. It was agreed that in future endowments which had lain dormant for four years would be flagged to the relevant School or College in order to allow them time to consider suitable uses for the fund before it was incorporated into the Post Graduate Scholarship Fund.

Finance Committee approved the changes of use.

CA/2012/06. Laser Lithography and the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre (JWNC) (paper 5.4.1)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for £489k for a direct-write laser lithography tool for the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre. The Capex application projected a net present value (NPV) of £1.5m over ten years. It was noted that the tool would enhance the work of the JWNC and replace a 21 year old electron beam lithography tool which was reaching the end of its functional life. It was noted that the replacement lithography tool was proposed in the JWNC Business Plan in 2010 and highlighted in budget discussions in 2010 and 2012. The Committee noted the interdisciplinary nature of the Centre and the success of the Centre internationally.

Finance Committee approved the purchase of the laser lithography tool.

CA/2012/07. Gilmorehill Halls Update (paper 5.4.2)

The Committee received an updated capital expenditure application for fabric and structural repairs to Gilmorehill Halls. Finance Committee approved the initial capital expenditure application of £1,850k in November 2011. The updated application requested a further £300k (total expenditure £2,150k) as the value of the successful tender was higher than had been budgeted. The Director of Estates noted that the challenging nature of the project and the need for significantly more scaffolding than originally expected accounted for the increased cost.

The Committee approved the increased application to £2,150k.

CA/2012/08. Renewal of Banking Facilities (paper 5.5)

Finance Committee was invited to review the terms and conditions proffered by the Clydesdale Bank for provision of an overdraft and other banking facilities for 2012/13. The facilities included BACS Payroll facility up to a limit of £24m, Guarantees/Bonds/Indemnities to a limit of £60k and open credit of up to £500k.

The Director of Finance confirmed that the terms and conditions represented a continuation of the current terms and conditions and recommended them to the Committee.

The Committee approved the banking facilities provided by Clydesdale Bank for 2012/13.

CA/2012/09. Insurance Renewal 2012/13 (paper 6.1)

The University undertook a tendering processes for its main insurance policies (i.e. property, employers liability and public liability) in Spring 2012 as the existing Long Term Agreements (LTAs) expired in July 2012. The Engineering and Inspection Insurance was not included in this tender and is tendered separately by Estates & Buildings. The successful tender was submitted by Zurich Municipal and, despite increasing the Business Interruption indemnity period from three to four years, the successful tender was 16.7% lower than previous year. The total premium costs for 2012/13 was £1.36m, a saving of just over £261k.

Gla.fc.minute/2012-09-13
It was noted that the cost of insurance would increase if the University acquired property on the existing Western Infirmary site.

The Committee noted the 17 outstanding insurance claims which had been made against the University including 15 in relation to employment and 2 in respect of injury to third parties. It was reported that almost half the outstanding claims related to slips and trips though an increase in asbestos and asbestos-related claims had been noted. At September 2012, 4 outstanding claims were asbestos or asbestos-related.

CA/2012/10. Endowment Investment Reports (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee noted the endowment investment reports.

CA/2012/11. Minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee 4 May 2012 (paper 6.3)

Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee from 4 May 2012.

CA/2012/12. Consumables Summary Report (paper 6.4)

The Group Financial Controller provided an overview of the General Funds Consumables budget. The projected consumables budget for 2011/12 was £83.1m with an actual spend of £91.2m representing an overspend of £8.1m. Three Colleges reported an underspend on consumables in 2011-12 (College of Arts, MVLS and Science and Engineering) with a small overspend of £158k in the College of Social Sciences.

The overspend for University Services (£8.5m) included an element of agreed spending brought forward from 2012-13 and overspend. The consumables for Estates and Buildings show a spend of £4.365m beyond the budget which represented authorised accelerated expenditure.

The report also indicated total expenditure of £12.68m on ‘professional costs’ against a budget of £10.66m. The £2.019m overspend included £1.755m on consultancy costs such as extension of consultant’s contracts on MyCampus, consultancy support for the implementation of the new research system and support for the US GAAP accounts.

CA/2012/13. Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2012

The Group Financial Controller provided a verbal report on the overview of performance to 31 July 2012. The Committee noted that the University achieved an operating management surplus of £8.4m which was £0.6m ahead of budget. It was also noted that the surplus position had improved by £1m from the forecast at P11. The movements which contributed to the improved surplus included tuition fees at £1.5m ahead of budget, salary savings of £1.6m and an underspend on voluntary severance and early retirement payments by £1.6m. The Committee noted that the £8.4m management accounting surplus was expected to equate to a statutory surplus of approximately £10.4m.

At year end the University had £114m cash in bank which was below the projected £120m. It was noted that this was largely due to timing of working capital movements and that following the year end the cash in bank had increased to the projected level.

It was noted that the significant increase in pension liability (£119.3m in 2012 as compared to £57.1m in 2011) would impact on the surplus in 2012-13.

CA/2012/14. Capital Expenditure Report (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received an updated Capital Expenditure Report for capital projects approved by Finance Committee. It was noted that, as requested, the report now indicated which College the expenditure was related to.
The expected expenditure for all capital projects approved by Finance Committee totalled £124.5m with £52.1m of the expenditure expected to be met through donations, grants or Scottish Funding Council grants. As at 31 July 2012 gross expenditure stood at £57.5m and overall completion at 46%.

CA/2012/15. Debtors Report as at 31 July 2012 (paper 7.3)

Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 July 2012. The Group Financial Controller reported that total debt stood at £25.86m representing a slight increase on year-on-year comparisons from £24.7m at July 2011.

The levels of student and sponsor debt were significantly higher in 2012 (£5.9m) than 2011 (£2.7m) with student debt making up £4.1m of the total and sponsor debt the remaining £1.8m. It was noted that significant progress had been made in collecting student and sponsor debt with the number of accounts requiring follow-up (e.g. requiring payment, removing erroneous charges, attaching financial aid) reducing from 7,755 at 28 March 2012 to 1,685 at 24 August 2012. Of these accounts 1,112 were of low value (less than £250) and were not currently prioritised for collection. 158 students had agreed payment plans and 181 had made a ‘promise to pay’ by a certain date. It was expected that the debt levels would reduce further when students returned to study as students with an outstanding debt would not be permitted to register or enrol.

The Committee were reassured that accounts with outstanding debt were only referred to external debt collectors where all other reasonable means of trying to contact the student and encourage payment had been exhausted and that the University ensured a high standard of customer care in all aspects of debt management.

The Senate Assessor on Court for the College of Arts noted that PhD students required to have been awarded their doctorate in order for them to be eligible for Research Excellence Framework (REF) submission. It was noted that a PhD student with an outstanding debt would not be permitted to graduate and that this should be monitored in the approach to REF.

The Committee noted a slight reduction year-on-year in overall commercial debt (£19.4m as compared to £19.7m in 2011) with five debtors representing 89% of all debt more than three months overdue. Full recovery from the five debtors was expected in due course.

CA/2012/16. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 14 November 2012, 2pm.
Report from Meeting of the Audit Committee held on
18 September 2012
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AUDIT/2012/1. Minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2012

The Minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2012/2. Matters Arising

.1 Conference and Visitor Services Office Audit - update (Audit 2011/4)

Mr Newall reminded the Committee that the audit of CVSO had made recommendations relating to business planning, marketing and pricing. A new business plan and marketing strategy had been prepared, with input from an external consultant, but improvements were still required to the system of financial forecasting and reporting. A further report would be made in February 2013.

.2 Research Management System - update (Audit 2011/26.1)

The Committee noted an update on development of the research system. A number of processes within the University had required to be looked at together, to ensure that all were aligned. In terms of risk management the current system was being maintained while the new one was being developed.

.4 Misconduct Cases - update (Audit/2011/4, 16, 26.4 and 37.2)

Two members of staff had been dismissed under University procedures, with one case pending.

.5 Review of College Management: Science and Engineering (Audit 2011/38)

Staff with financial responsibilities would be reporting to the College Head of Finance, in order to ensure that audit recommendations were fully addressed. This arrangement would be rolled out to other Colleges if successful. The Committee would receive a further report on this matter at its next meeting. A programme of training was also being implemented.

.6 Higher Education Governance Review - update (Audit 32 and 37.5)

Mr Newall would update the Committee at a future meeting.
.7 General Ledger Adjustments (Audit 2011/39)

The Committee noted an update on the matter. Mr Charters would provide the Committee with more detail about threshold levels for journal entries being reviewed, at the next meeting.

.9 UK Border Agency Regulation Compliance (Audit/2010/38)

The Committee received an update paper on UKBA, which was noted. Since the internal audit had been published, the UKBA had made a number of changes to the immigration rules, with the main changes taking effect in July 2011 and March 2012. These changes had been part of a radical overhaul of the student visa system, through which the Government’s stated aims had been fourfold: to encourage growth; boost the economy; ensure that students could support themselves; and tackle abuse. A Tier 4 Compliance Officer had joined the University at the beginning of August 2012 and was now the focus for Tier 4 activities (i.e. admission of international students) including associated communications. The University’s overall licence to sponsor migrants was due for renewal in November 2012, covering staff as well as students. The Highly Trusted Sponsor Licence, applicable only to student sponsorship, was due its annual renewal in September and work was underway on that as well as on a communications strategy intended to raise staff awareness of their responsibilities in relation to UKBA regulatory requirements.

A working group had been established in May 2012 and had focused on improving arrangements across the University to ensure compliance with the UKBA licence and Highly Trusted Sponsor status. The group had focussed on four main areas: Increased standardisation of arrangements, including international admissions, and attendance monitoring; Improved data, including attendance data and details of recruitment agents; Improved communications and clarity of roles; and Improved reporting to UKBA. Changes had been made to business processes and practices. Mr Newall reported that the required degree of monitoring student attendance presented a challenge and would consume significant staff resource. The University was taking the matter extremely seriously, particularly in view of the devastating implications for London Metropolitan University of the UKBA’s decision to revoke its Highly Trusted Sponsor status.

.10 Campus Solutions Development/MyCampus (Audit/2011/38)

The Committee had received a pre-meeting briefing from the Director of IT Services, outlining the central and College IT structure; and MyCampus performance during the summer. A progress report had been given with respect to each College’s increased use of central resources, focusing on the key service areas of email, managed desktops (Standard Staff Desktop SSD), the Helpdesk and central filestore. Network upgrades had emerged as a significant requirement for Colleges and University Services. IT Services and College IT staff had prepared a detailed proposal for a comprehensive network upgrade programme, which the University had agreed to fund. Work was progressing on establishing College priorities leading to a detailed project plan for implementation. It was noted that additional, specialist IT support was required for certain areas of research and was independently managed, with attendant security risks if non-standard processes or equipment were used. A key point of contact between central services and the Colleges was the IT manager appointed within each College. Audit Committee was of the opinion that the IT manager should have a reporting line to the Director of IT Services, as well as to the College, something which Mr Newall agreed to raise when progress on the new IT structure was next reported to SMG.

ACTION DN

With regard to MyCampus, it had been reported at the briefing that problems had occurred with system performance when MyCampus was opened for student registration in early August. The reason for this had been established as a malfunction
in an Oracle software tool, ‘Weblogic’, whose purpose was to distribute load among servers. A short-term reconfiguration of the IT architecture had allowed Registration and Enrolment to proceed, and the issue would soon be addressed more fully by replacing the Weblogic software with a hardware load balancer.

Mr Menzies asked University managers present whether the University was satisfied that sufficient resources were in place to test the robustness of the system in August 2013. Mr Newall noted that this was an area of concern. Load testing of the system had been performed in 2011/12, and yet the system had failed in August 2012. The Project Board would pay particularly close attention to the scale and method of load testing in advance of Summer 2013.

AUDIT/2012/3. Internal Audit Plan 2012/13

The outline internal audit plan for 2012/13 had been circulated, detailing the proposed reviews for the coming year. It had been updated to reflect changes in the key risk areas over which the Audit Committee sought coverage and to take into account deferred projects from 2011/12. The plan was aimed at providing assurance over key financial and operational processes, the arrangements for managing governance and regulatory risks, as well as supporting the organisation through its strategic business change programmes. The reviews took account of the financial pressures being faced by the University, and the sector, and the need to control costs and achieve value for money.

The Committee commented that there appeared to be a relatively low level of time scheduled to be spent on financial management processes. Mr Gibson explained that the auditors had sought to address a number of the key strategic risks as well as these processes, and that a balance was required; there was an issue perhaps about classification, since a number of areas described for review within Colleges (core operations) were effectively about processes, therefore if the schedule was recast with terminology amended or consolidated, then approximately 30% of time would be devoted to financial management processes. It was also possible to move certain items up or down the list should the Committee so wish.

The Committee noted that some areas scheduled for audit appeared to be related to core management matters, and it was not clear why audit was required. Mr Gibson explained that a balance had been achieved, since these areas could contain complex IT processes that merited audit, or contain aspects where expert skills sets held by the auditors would be of benefit. The objectivity provided by the external perspective of the auditors was also important.

The Committee requested that details be provided about the resources (both in terms of numbers of days for the audits and the size of the spend of the operation under review), and the risks associated with the areas subject to audit. It was also requested that the outcome reports provide more of a cross-University ‘read-across’ analysis, identifying any trends or similarities, giving a ‘bigger picture’ view, perhaps with less fine detail within individual reports.

It was agreed that the plan would be reviewed by Deloittes in discussion with the University management, to include consideration of the proposed ‘peripheral’ audits and possible fine-tuning of the areas to be subject to review in 2012/13. The balance of areas of greatest risk vs. audits of very detailed areas would also be reviewed. The size of each review, in terms of hours to be spent and the level of spend of the area under review, would be quantified. The revised plan would be circulated to the Committee before the next meeting and would also appear on the agenda for the next meeting.

ACTION CG/DN/RF

AUDIT/2012/4. Internal Audit Update
Since the last meeting of the Committee, the auditors had completed reviews of Internationalisation Strategy, Application Handling, Virtual Learning Usage and Uptake, Website Structure and Effectiveness and four School reviews. The auditors were also in the process of completing reviews of Spin-Out and IP Management, Core Payroll Controls, IT Security and HR / Payroll System Implementation. Following deferral of the reviews of External Relationship Management, Workload Modelling and Campus Solutions Implementation, a further two additional reviews had been requested: Audio Visual Procurement and Ethical Approval Management.

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

**Review of Internationalisation Strategy**

The overall control framework of governance and management was adequate, with significant resource and senior management focus on this area. However, although the University had implemented a structure of International Leads and Deans, the level of administrative support for Deans and Leads was raised as an area of weakness resulting in them becoming burdened with administrative tasks. The monitoring and reporting of international activity was still work in progress, with further scope for improvement in relation to the current KPIs in place. There were three priority two findings, reflecting opportunities for improvement in localised procedures such as administration support structures and also in operating controls such as College and University Services International Plans and Key Performance Indicators.

**Review of Application Handling**

The controls regarding the admissions procedures across the University were adequate, with the exception of monitoring and reporting on turnaround timescales for applications for PG students. There was scope for improvement to ensure adequate admissions controls were in place across the College Graduate Schools and the RIO Admissions Team.

**Review of Virtual Learning Usage and Uptake**

Although the University had made good progress with the implementation of the virtual learning environment, there was scope for improvement. In order to progress with virtual learning and its enhancement of learning and teaching, the University required a Virtual Learning Strategy, defining the University’s aims and reflecting its overall objectives. There was no overall central oversight of the software packages used across the University, resulting in a lack of a consistent approach across the University. In addition, there was further scope for improvement within areas such as back-up and archiving procedures, and communications, both between the Schools and Colleges on TELT (technology enhanced learning and teaching) activities, and between the central Learning Technology Unit and Colleges on the TELT software in use.

**Review of Website Structure and Effectiveness**

Overall, the website for the University of Glasgow was a well designed resource that fulfilled its role of providing information to prospective students, presenting research undertaken and helping current students during their studies. The report did not highlight any control weaknesses but did identify a number of possible process improvements in relation to usage tracking and content quality.

**Financial controls in Schools across the University**

A cross-section of Schools had been audited in respect of financial controls. Overall, in each school, testing indicated that the majority of controls tested were operating effectively; however, there were some instances where exceptions had been identified
in the operation of the controls in respect of, for example, expenses claims, purchasing card processes, password policy and cash handling. It had been recommended in one area that in order to improve the current control environment, policies and procedures should be reinforced with all staff, from administrative staff to senior management level. In addition, training should be provided to emphasise why these policies and procedures were in place and their importance to the University.

In discussion, it was agreed that for the next cycle of School reviews, the report to the Committee would be a combined one, highlighting common themes, rather than providing a detailed report on each School. The Committee also agreed that the level of detail in the overall Audit report to it should be reduced, although a balance must be retained, so that the main messages and management responses were indicated, and any instances of management responses where recommendations were not being taken forward must be retained. The Committee would however wish to have electronic access to individual reports, should members wish to see them. It was agreed that a revised style of reporting, in line with what had been discussed, would be trialled at the November meeting.

**ACTION CG/GC**

The Committee expressed continuing concern about ongoing issues relating to non-compliance within some areas of the University, and the management responses to recommendations, which it did not consider adequate in some cases, for example the indicated timeline for compliance. It was requested that a summary list of audit recommendations be compiled and provided to MVLS College management ahead of their meeting with the Committee, as a basis for discussion. The Committee also requested that its concerns about control weaknesses and inadequate compliance culture be communicated to SMG, together with its view that a strengthening of sanctions for non-compliance was required.

**ACTION CG/GC/KS**

**AUDIT/2012/5. Implementation of Outstanding Priority 1 and 2 Recommendations**

The Committee had been updated on the degree of implementation of the audit recommendations. The Committee agreed that it was content with the reports and with the follow up actions that were evidenced in the reports.

**Finance Office**

Since the last meeting, 4 actions against audit reports had been completed, 4 had been partially implemented and 24 were being progressed, 13 of which would be addressed by the new Research Management System. 6 of the points would be addressed by the introduction of the new Core expenses system. A pilot of the Core expense system was planned to be run in University Services from 10 September 2012.

**Departments other than the Finance Office**

The key points were as follows:

Audit Reports 2005-10:

- **Business Continuity Management**

  There were five outstanding recommendations, all linked to the establishment of business continuity plans, within a standard framework, throughout Schools, Institutes and University Services. A standard template had been agreed and was being rolled out to Schools, Institutes and Service Departments. This would be followed by a regular testing of BCPs coordinated through the University's Emergencies Planning Group. These actions would address all five audit recommendations.
Other

Two recommendations appeared in the Staff Development audit, and related to the staff training record. These would be addressed by exploiting the functionality that would be offered by the new HR/Payroll System. Two recommendations on Data Handling remained to be fully implemented, with the steady rollout of a programme to introduce data handling training and a specific data handling policy for each University Service department. 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 EMIS and Agresso.

Audit Reports 2010/11:
There were no outstanding P1 recommendations. Of the nine recommendations still to be fully implemented, two, from the Student Feedback Audit would be addressed, assisted by the development of a new 'Student Voice' website, by December 2012; two, from the Portfolio Management Audit would be addressed by December 2012; two, from the Student Retention audit, would be addressed by June 2013. The remaining recommendations from three separate audits would be addressed by April 2013.

Audit Report 2011/12:

• Campus Solutions Development

This audit had five recommendations, all P3. Four remained to be addressed, by December 2012, by the Director of IT Services. They related to: Possible introduction of a Change Advisory Board, covering all business systems; More proactive monitoring of system performance; Possible introduction of OEM (an Oracle network monitoring tool); and Evaluation of a load balancing approach for managing high levels of network traffic.

• College of MVLS

Eight of the twelve recommendations in this audit had been implemented. Three remained to be addressed - by the College Head of Finance / College Secretary - by December 2012. The fourth action, involving a review of the University's consultancy policy, would be addressed by the Head of the University's Research Support Office.

• College of Science & Engineering

Four of the eight recommendations had been implemented. The remaining four (all P2) covered: Asset Registers; Purchasing Procedures; Administrative Support Structure; and Income Distribution to Psychology. All would be addressed, by the College Head of Finance / College Secretary, by March 2013.

• Library Cost Management

Five of the seven recommendations had been addressed. A P2 recommendation, involving an interface between the Agresso and Millennium systems, was being considered for possible implementation by the end of 2012/13. A P3 recommendation, on availability of payment systems, was being addressed with a pilot scheme to test a new debit/credit card machine in the Print Unit.

• School of Mathematics & Statistics

Three of the five recommendations remained to be fully addressed (by December 2012), in the areas of: Cash income; Petty Cash; and Management of IT Passwords.

• Value for Money Arrangements

Three P2 recommendations remained to be addressed, in the areas of: Procurement; Commercial Pricing; and Workforce Planning.
• **Janitorial & Security Service; Partnership Arrangements: Kaplan; and REF Planning**

There were no outstanding recommendations from these three audits.

**AUDIT/2012/6. Risk Management**

The updated register for 2013, which included details of the senior staff who would take individual matters forward, and progress on these matters, had been provided. The College risk register, which had been requested at the previous meeting, had also been provided. The item was carried forward to the next meeting.

**AUDIT/2012/7. Corporate Structure**

Details of the structure had been provided. The item was carried forward to the next meeting.

**AUDIT/2012/8. Allegations of Research Misconduct 2011/12**

A report on two research misconduct cases from 2011/12 had been provided. The report had been brought to the Committee’s attention as a Research Council requirement. The item was carried forward to the next meeting.

**AUDIT/2012/9. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**AUDIT/2012/10. Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 7 November 2012 at 10am in the Melville Room.

*Prepared by: Deborah Maddern, Clerk to Committee, deborah.maddern@glasgow.ac.uk*
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Report from the Meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Friday 14 September 2012
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- HR Committee Minute – 14 September 2012
- 2011/2012 P&DR Process – Possible success measures (Annex 1)
- Proposals for the management of organisational change and redundancy (Annex 2)
- Paper on Professorial Reward (Annex 3). Court has been updated on the Maximising Academic Performance and Career Development (MAPCD) project, which includes Professorial Reward/Zoning, via the minutes of the HR Committee in recent years. Professor Andrea Nolan will brief Court.

Action required

- Court is asked to note the HR Committee Minute – 14 September 2012.
- Court is asked to approve the success criteria for P&DR recommended by the HR Committee.
- After extensive consultation on procedures to address the requirements of the new Ordinance, the paper relating to Management of Organisational Change and Redundancy proposes a way forward which balances the requirements of Court’s overall scrutiny of employment matters and the University’s need for procedures which are commensurate with the different types of Organisational change which potentially involve staff redundancies. Court is asked to note the proposals, approve the principles of the tiered approach and to approve the establishment of a Procedural Review Group.

If agreed in principle, a final paper will be submitted to the December 2012 Court which will detail the procedures for Consultation, Avoidance and Mitigation on potential redundancies.

Ian Black, Director of HR
Gordon Scott, HR Policy Development Manager & Clerk to the HR Committee 26 September 2012
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Human Resources Committee

Minute of Meeting held in the Turnbull Room on 14 September 2012

Present:  Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), Professor A Muscatelli (AM) (from item HR/12/4), Mr A Macfarlane (AM), Professor A Anderson (AA), Mr D Newall (DN), Mr I Black (IHB), Mrs H Durndell (HD), Professor E Cameron (EC), Dr D Spaeth (DS), Mr S McCafferty (SMcC), Mrs A Allen (AAL), Mr G Scott (GS) (Clerk)

In attendance: Mrs W McAnerney (WMc) for item HR/12/5, Professor A Nolan (AN) for item HR/12/6, Mr S Wilson (SW) for item HR/12/7.

Apologies: Dr A Owen (AO)

DA opened the meeting and advised that GS had taken over as clerk to the HR Committee. DA expressed thanks on behalf of the Committee to Ann Hastings for all her efforts and work on behalf of the Committee during her role as clerk. DA welcomed Ann Allen to her first meeting of the HR Committee.

HR/12/1 Minute of the previous meeting

The minute of the previous meeting held on the 29th May 2012 was agreed.

HR/12/2 Matters arising

DA noted that the matters arising from the previous meeting would be dealt with later in the agenda.

HR/12/3 HR Director’s Report

IHB provided an update to his HR Director’s report in relation to pay discussions and the notification of ballots for industrial action. UCU had withdrawn and reissued a new notification of ballot on the 12th September. UNITE and UNISON are both expected to issue ballot notifications in the near future. IHB clarified that it was difficult to predict the impact of potential industrial action at this point in time.

IHB advised that Jean Chandler, Head of the Staff Development Service had left to take up a post at the Leadership Foundation. This has provided the opportunity to review the Staff Development Service to allow a greater focus on organisational development. The recruitment of the new Head of Staff Development role has commenced along with two other training and development posts.

SMcC asked if there was dedicated resource to deal with the implications of pension auto enrolment. GS advised that a small project team had been set up including a dedicated member of staff from pay and pensions.

HR/12/4 KPI’s Staff Attitude Survey

IHB gave a presentation providing an overview of the key issues arising from the staff attitude survey. There was discussion regarding the results and it was acknowledged that there were improvements in some areas including satisfaction with team communications and that the reduction in ratings of those enjoying working in the university was unsurprising given the level of recent organisational change. The importance of increasing staff engagement was acknowledged and it
was noted that that the next staff survey would be a key indicator of progress with this.

IHB advised that he was in the process of presenting the results to College Management Groups (CMG) and the University Services Management Group (USMG). AA advised that CMG’s would be developing action plans to address any issues identified. IHB explained that the results were also informing the development of the OD framework, the restructure of internal communications function with Corporate Communications and that Selina Woolcott has also been working with HR and the Staff Development Service on resilience training to support managers and staff effectively cope with pressure.

DA asked that a separate high level report should go to Court in December highlighting key actions and that a progress report should come to the HR Committee in the new year.

**HR/12/5 Organisational Development Framework**

Wendy McAnerney provided an overview of the Organisational Development (OD) Framework and associated Leadership and Management Programme and asked the HR Committee to agree them in principle. A key element of the framework is that it will be developed and implemented in conjunction with the Colleges and University Services to ensure that it meets their requirements and that there is joint ownership of the initiative. Funding for the programme has been agreed for two years.

There was discussion regarding the proposals and the Principal confirmed that the framework would be tailored locally and prioritised to maximise the benefits and avoid overload of staff. AA noted that it would be important to take account of staff commitments as a result of the REF when planning the implementation.

WMc advised that the framework would be considered at the next meeting of Senior Management Group and there would then be more detailed consultation with each of the Colleges. The members of the Committee indicated that they were supportive of the framework and it was agreed in principle.

DA asked for an update on progress to be provided to the HR Committee in a year’s time.

**HR/12/6 Science and Engineering HR Overview**

Simon Wilson, HR Manager for Science and Engineering, gave an overview of the HR function within the College. He outlined the College strategy, key initiatives and key HR activities over the past two years. Finally, SW outlined future challenges for HR and future plans and challenges for the College.

AA asked if HR managers had the facility to share experience and knowledge between colleges. SW and IHB explained that the HR team had regular meetings to update and exchange knowledge on key issues.

DA thanked SW for his excellent presentation.

**HR/12/7 Success Criteria for Performance & Development Review (P&DR)**

Professor Andrea Nolan advised that work had been undertaken within Human Resources to develop success measures for P&DR. IHB outlined that all
performance reviews at level 10 would be moderated by College Management Groups as the performance levels were linked to pay with oversight provided through the Principal's Board of Review. It was also proposed that statistical analysis and a sample of P&DR documentation from other grades would be undertaken to provide an assessment of quality.

It was agreed that the success criteria for P&DR should be recommended to Court.

**HR/12/8 Policy Update – Management of Organisational Change**

GS provided an overview of changes to the proposals for the management of organisational change following additional stakeholder consultation. He advised that following discussion with the lay members of Court and the Senate Assessors the tiered approach now incorporated a procedural review group to provide independent scrutiny, assess smaller changes and decide if they should be considered by Court. GS asked the HR Committee to agree the revised proposals and recommend them to the next meeting of Court.

DS outlined that the Senate Assessors had concerns about the oversight of the process and were not convinced that a clear case for change had been made to move away from strategic change and redundancy committees. He also highlighted that they felt the definition of a subject or discipline at level three was fuzzy and could be open to interpretation.

DN responded that the current system made no distinction regarding the scale of the change requiring the set up of a structural change and redundancy Committee as well as Court approval relating to a single post. This involved significant organisational resources including the involvement of lay members of Court. The proposals sought to address this and allow Court to focus on strategic issues with appropriate oversight.

DS suggested that the procedural review group should have the ability to recommend to Court additional oversight within the organisation to provide additional checks and balances such as the oversight provided by SMG at level three. DA responded that Court would have the power to ask for additional oversight in specific cases. DA suggested that the wording of the proposal could be amended to clarify that Court would have the ability to increase the level of scrutiny for specific cases at level 2 if appropriate.

It was suggested that the wording regarding the Universities commitment to mitigation and avoidance should also be strengthened in order to try and address concerns raised by the Trade Unions. GS advised that work was also being undertaken with the Careers Service to enhance the support available to staff potentially at risk of redundancy.

The HR Committee agreed to recommend the proposals to Court subject to the amendments and clarification discussed. A detailed procedure would be brought to the next meeting of the HR Committee.

**Action:** IHB / GS

**HR/12/9 Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee**

The minutes of the Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee on the 19th of June 2012 were noted. DA acknowledged and commended the significant amount of work that has been undertaken in this area.
HR/12/10 Public Sector Equality Duty

The paper outlining additional duties resulting from the Public Sector Equality Duty was noted. It was highlighted that equality outcomes would need to be developed by April 2013 and that these would come to the HR Committee for approval in March 2013.

HR/12/11 HR Project Update

GS advised that the second phase of the HR systems project had been approved by the Senior Management Group. This phase had now commenced and incorporates online training administration, performance and development reviews and e-recruitment including the Job Seekers Register.

DA noted the success of the first phase of the project on behalf of the Committee.

HR/12/12 Schedule of future meetings and actions 2012-2013

DA explained that a schedule of future meetings had been developed following the discussion at the last HR Committee and welcomed comments from the Committee.

The Principal suggested that the update on Managing Academic Performance and Career Development (MAPCD) could be shortened as this would be covered in detail at the December meeting of Court.

DN explained that John Lauwerys would attend the next meeting of the Committee as an observer as part of the review of Court effectiveness that he was undertaking.

AA suggested that an update on the wider implications of the REF would be beneficial in addition to the equality update from Mhairi Taylor in November. The Principal suggested that this could be covered by Professor Juster when he attends in March.

It was agreed that the schedule would be updated accordingly and circulated with the minute of the meeting.

Action: GS

HR/12/13 Any other business

There was no other business raised.

HR/12/14 Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the HR Committee will take place on Wednesday 7 November from 10am until 1pm in the Melville Room.
2011/12 P&DR Process - Possible success measures

1. Background
Over the past 3 years the University has made the improvement of the performance and development review (P&DR) a key objective to enable Glasgow to improve its academic and business performance, and to ensure that staff effort is better integrated to supporting delivery of the University strategy.

Completion rates have improved, more training has been taken up and the profile of P&DR has been raised. The development and implementation of specific grade descriptors, particularly in all academic areas, has allowed managers and staff to see clearly what the expected standard is for their role. Closer alignment with Recognition and Reward has increased the significance of P&DR processes and outcomes.

The new University structure, implemented in 2010, has encouraged a more focussed approach to delivering the strategy, and increased scrutiny of the P&DR outputs across the organisation. For some staff, this is seen as evidence of a more managerial approach, however for others, this has provided greater clarity of direction, better engagement with their managers, and opportunities to discuss development needs and plans.

Court, via the HR Committee, asked for some measures of the success of the process in 2011/12 which could also provide signposts for further improvements.

2. Criteria to measure success of the P&DR process
This paper presents a number of different criteria which may be considered when reviewing P&DR for 2011/12. These are a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessments.

A) Quantitative assessment:

- % completion rates across the University (at College/University Services levels and then at School / RI / US Division), and overall at all staff levels and in all job families. Target - 95% completion rate.

  Reasons for non completion will be recorded (e.g. recent appointment).

- The distribution of outcomes will be examined across the University focussing on College / US. A distribution profile of c. 10% outstanding, 85% High quality, 5% improvement required is expected. Significant variations from this distribution will be considered in more detail. [e.g. further investigation of alignment of the outcome profile with unit performance could be explored e.g. with international student numbers; research income, PGR student growth] .

- Changes in the outcome criteria between 2010/11 & 2011/12 mean that direct comparisons are not possible. However, some of the effects of a change in criteria may be visible in the distribution of outstanding/high quality outcomes.

- Outcomes at level 9 and below will not be moderated, but will only be analysed for the distribution statistics. Outcomes at level 10 will be
moderated, and it is suggested the distribution of moderated scores will be
reviewed.

B) Qualitative assessment criteria. It is proposed that the focus of this work should be
on

- Effectiveness of Objective setting. A sample of staff PDR documentation
  (from perhaps c. 300 staff members) would be considered across the
  University. The focus of this sampling would be on the percentage of
  objectives which are SMART and the percentage aligned with the relevant
  College/US/University strategies.

- Future Training and Development identification. Using this sample,
  congruence between the document narrative and the training requirements
  (e.g. leadership development) would be considered along with a view on
  explicit reference to development needs. It may also be possible to assess
  how much formal T&D defined in the previous year was undertaken by this
  sample.

- Effectiveness and relevance of written feedback comments. Does the written
  summary provide clear feedback (congruence with the overall outcome, key
  areas of achievement/success and, possibly, development needs as
  appropriate)?

C) Focus group work: systematic questioning of specific interest groups will be
undertaken. For example, CMGs will be asked to provide a commentary on P&DR
including

- Utility in general (with particular emphasis on the effectiveness of the process,
  utility of the rating system).

- Reported problems with/challenges inherent in setting SMART objectives.

- Links to development.

Feedback would also be sought and from the Recognition and Reward panels, from the
Principal’s review group and from the Trade Unions.
Court meeting of 10th October 2012

Proposals for Management of Organisational Change and Redundancy

Cover Sheet

Brief description of the paper
After extensive consultation on procedures to address the requirements of the new Ordinance, this paper proposes a way forward which balances the requirements of Court’s overall scrutiny of employment matters and the University’s need for procedures which are commensurate with the different types of Organisational change which potentially involve staff redundancies

Action Requested
Court is asked to note the proposals, approve the principles of the tiered approach and to approve the establishment of a Procedural Review Group.

If agreed in principle, a final paper will be submitted to the December 2012 Court which will detail the procedures for Consultation, Avoidance and Mitigation on potential redundancies.

Prepared by: I H Black, Director of Human Resources
Last modified on: 1st October 2012.
Proposals for Management of Organisational Change and Redundancy

Background

1. Members of Court will recall that the Ordinance relating to employment matters was changed by the Privy Council in October 2010.

Since then Gordon Scott, HR Policy Manager, and Ian Black, Director of Human Resources have consulted extensively with a range of parties to develop proposals relating to employment matters. Court has now approved new (Medical) Capability, Sickness Absence, Disciplinary and Grievance procedures, and all of these are in operation.

The issues surrounding potential redundancy and related organisational arrangements are an extremely sensitive matter for all parties, and there has been a long consultation process to try to balance the different interests.

Key decisions sought

2. Court is now asked to consider the principles of the management proposals on the Governance and Authority for such situations and to give management a general indication of the acceptability or otherwise of the proposals with a view to a final decision being made at the December Court. Assuming general acceptance is given, HR will finalise and consult on detailed proposals for any processes to be followed.

The new Ordinance

3. The new Ordinance (Appendix 1)
   - Protects Academic Freedom – 2 (a)
   - Requires the University to consult with the recognised Trade Unions – 2 (b)
   - Requires the Court to retain strategic oversight of the procedures adopted for the redundancy dismissal of staff – 2 (d)

Appendix 2 outlines in flowchart form the current procedure which must be applied for all potential cases of redundancy – whether the closure of one part-time post, or major restructuring.

4. Why is change required?
   - The present system attempts to use a “one approach fits all circumstances” system, regardless of size, area, nature and strategic or reputational significance
   - It is bureaucratic, slow and no longer reflects legislative changes
   - It requires at least two approaches to Court in all circumstances
   - It is confusing, and is spread across 2 separate policy documents
   - The emphasis on Court “controlling” the Executive runs counter to many managerial and governance approaches which focus on accountability and oversight rather than control
- The focus on a bureaucratic process driven by a Court meetings timetable creates more risk of the personal “people” issues being secondary
- It potentially sets different members of Court in conflict, and introduces employee relations issues to a venue which is not perhaps the best area to progress them

**Progress to date**

5. There has been *extensive consultation* on a tiered approach to managing potential redundancy situations.

Appendix 3 summarises in a tabular format the current proposals for a tiered approach.

The dependence on fixed-term funding for much Research activity results in a continuing cycle of potential redundancies for many Research staff who are not funded from “Core” Funding. The University and the Trade Unions have established effective, workable policies to consult, mitigate, redeploy in these circumstances, and these “Level 1” policies are not subject to fundamental discussion: they are only included to ensure Court is aware of the issues.

*Levels 4 and 5* have not been the subject of extensive debate because it is proposed that the strategic role of Court is maintained in such circumstances.

The discussion has concentrated around *levels 2 and 3*.

The differing academic terminology (course, programme, subject etc.) used in different Schools and disciplines precluded simple definitions of levels 2 & 3. Numbers of staff potentially under threat was also found to be an insufficient indicator of significance and potential Court interest and/or oversight – one could envisage certain key symbolic University roles where there is only one employee, but which Court would be very interested in!

Appendix 3 proposes:
- Which group would normally complete the initial strategic sign-off of any proposal, and define who would actually manage the process
- Which group would normally manage the process – including a clear requirement to avoid and/or reduce the need for compulsion, and to mitigate the effects of compulsion
- Which group would have oversight of progress, and
- Which group would sign off to accept that, after all avoidance and mitigation procedures had been exhausted, there was still a need for compulsory redundancies.
- That it is the responsibility of the group signing off a proposal to consider if there is a direct academic impact, and there is therefore a need for Senate to consider the implications.
To summarise the differing positions and the proposals made to address some of the concerns:

- The Trade Unions remain opposed to any dilution of Court’s oversight, authorisation, and (via the Redundancy Committee) control over potential redundancies. They do welcome the opportunity for earlier opportunities to discuss avoidance and mitigation.
- The Senate Assessors were all concerned that in the earlier proposals there was a lack of any mechanism for Court to have a strategic overview if it felt such was necessary in any case. This has now been addressed in good measure by the Procedural Review Group proposal (see 6 below). Some also believed the present measures worked well, and were a mechanism to hold the Executive to account.
- The SMG and College Management groups believed the present arrangements were too prescriptive for proposed small scale changes, and sought a simplified procedure. They were in no doubt that level 4 and 5 proposals would remain the domain of Court, but questioned Court’s current involvement in all level 2 and most level 3. They fully support the proposals in Appendix 3.
- The lay members of Court were consulted on 20th June. They endorsed the principles of a tiered approach, but were concerned that there was originally no proposal to have any form of scrutiny by Court even over issues that might be very contentious or have important reputational implications.

The HR Policy Manager and HRD have therefore worked with some members of the HR Committee and with the Senate Assessors to develop a proposal for a “light touch”, rapid oversight which is outlined in section 6 below.

The SMG has endorsed the principles of the oversight approach; the Trade Unions are apparently still of the view that Court’s role should not be diluted at all.

**Proposals for improved early views of issues by Court for level 2 issues**

6. One outcome of the extensive consultation has been the development of proposals for a *Procedural Review Group (PRG)* (appendix 4).

This group would provide *initial* Court scrutiny of *all* level 2 proposals before the decision is taken about which group(s) would sign off, manage and have final oversight of changes which might involve potential redundancies.

To be effective, the group would need the information outlined in the appendix: this information should normally be available when management is formulating its own proposals at the earliest conceptual stages of a project.

It is not envisaged that this group would meet to any pre-determined timetable or schedule, but would consider issues *ad hoc*. This eliminates the need for everything
to be driven by the Court schedule of meetings, but allows particular issues to be referred to the next Court meeting if required.

If adopted, this proposal would ensure that lay members of Court are able to gauge the significance and potential sensitivity of any proposal, and could require the matter to be dealt with at Court – emphasising the strategic overview Court has. It would also ensure that a Senate Assessor would have a similar early view of issues, and be able to discuss concerns with the lay members. These 3 Court members would be able to ensure light-touch strategic oversight by Court is maintained without the need for everything to go to Court.

To maintain consistency, it was proposed the 3 Court members be drawn from the Human Resources Committee.

The proposal to include the College VP was made to ensure that the 3 Court members would have rapid access to a key decision maker who could explain/amplify the rationale for a proposal, and can ensure any additional information the Group seeks is quickly obtained. The proposal is based on getting quick access to information. It is the intention that the 3 Court members will make the decision.

There may also be some cases at level 3 which require a modification of the standard procedure outlined in Appendix 3. This is covered by the 4th point of the PRG remit.

Finally, it is now proposed that Court be given a report of the outcomes of each initiative as it is concluded rather than an annual summary of all level 2 initiatives.

The HR Committee has welcomed these proposed changes.

The Senate Assessors welcomed the potential for increased scrutiny and the inclusion of an Assessor in the group.

The SMG has welcomed this approach.

Ian H Black
Director of Human Resources
1st October 2012
Appendix 1 – Ordinance

At the Court at Buckingham Palace

THE 15th DAY OF DECEMBER 2010

PRESENT,

THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
IN COUNCIL

The University Court of the University of Glasgow did on the 13th day of October 2010, in pursuance of the power vested in them by section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, make Ordinance No. 205 (Employment Matters) as set forth in the Schedule to this Order.

The provisions of the Act relating to the making of the Ordinance have been complied with.

The said Ordinance has been referred to the Scottish Universities Committee of the Privy Council, who have reported to Her Majesty that in their opinion the said Ordinance may properly be approved.

Therefore, Her Majesty, having taken the said Ordinance into consideration, is pleased, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, to approve it.


SCHEDULE

ORDINANCE of the UNIVERSITY COURT of the UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
No. 205
(EMPLOYMENT MATTERS)

At Glasgow, the 13th day of October, Two Thousand and Ten.

WHEREAS the University Court wishes its employment practices to comply with current and future legislation and regulation, with the principles of natural justice and with recognised good practice in relation to discipline, redundancy, grievance, dismissal and other removal from office of staff engaged in teaching, the provision of learning or research;
WHEREAS the University Court recognises its obligations regarding the desirability of ensuring the academic freedom of staff engaged in teaching, the provision of learning or research;

And WHEREAS the University Court wishes to promote equality of opportunity and dignity at work within the University;

THEREFORE the University Court of the University of Glasgow, in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by section 3 of, and paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 2 to, the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, by Ordinance No. 204 and all other powers enabling it in that behalf, statutes and ordains:

1. The Ordinance of the University Commissioners (Academic Staff) inserted by The University Commissioners (Statute Modifications) (University of Glasgow) Order 1992 (S.I. 1992/2698) is revoked.

2. Any regulations and resolutions made by the University Court in relation to the discipline, redundancy, grievances, dismissal and other removal from office of relevant staff must:-

(a) be made so as to give effect to the guiding principle that, in their areas of academic expertise, relevant staff employed by the University shall have freedom within the law to hold and express opinion, to question and test established ideas and received wisdom and to present controversial or unpopular points of view without placing in jeopardy their employment or any entitlements or privileges they enjoy;

(b) only be made following consultation with the recognised trade unions;

(c) include procedures for handling grievances and cases of unsatisfactory conduct, performance or capability (including without limitation through ill health) and for the regulation and termination of contracts (including without limitation through retirement and redundancy);

(d) ensure that the University Court retains strategic oversight of the procedures adopted for the redundancy dismissal of staff; and

(e) make provision for appeals by relevant staff against grievance or dismissal outcomes to be heard by a panel including a senior member of academic staff, drawn from a grouping proposed jointly by University management and the recognised trade union(s) and approved by the University Court.

3. In this Ordinance, “relevant staff” means any person engaged in teaching, the provision of learning or research in the University.

4. This Ordinance shall come into force after its approval by Her Majesty in Council on a date to be determined by the University Court.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF these presents are sealed with the Common Seal of the University Court of the University of Glasgow and subscribed on behalf of the said Court as required by Ordinance of the University Court No. 177.

Professor Anton Muscatelli
Member of the University Court

L.S.

Secretary
Appendix 2 – Outline of the current process

Court accepts RC conclusions
### Appendix 3 - Tiered governance arrangements for the management of organisational change & redundancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Management of Process</th>
<th>Initial strategic sign off</th>
<th>Senate involvement</th>
<th>Oversight</th>
<th>Final sign off of redundancies</th>
<th>Report to Court</th>
<th>Court approval currently required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fixed term funding</td>
<td>Principal Investigator (PI)</td>
<td>Head of School / Director of RI + College HRM / HRO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Head of School / Director of RI + HRM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fixed term contracts</td>
<td>or Line manager</td>
<td>Head of University Service + HRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of School / Director of RI + HRM</td>
<td>(Report to CMG / USMG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open ended contract with a funding end date (individuals, teams or groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>(Core Funding) Reduction in Individual post, team, group, programme or subsection of a School /RI or a College support service.</td>
<td>Head of School / RI / College Secretary + College HRM + Senior Academic/ HOSA * (*where appropriate)</td>
<td>College Management Group (then review group)**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>College Management Group</td>
<td>College Management Group ****</td>
<td>Update to each Court meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b.</td>
<td>Reduction in individual post, team, sub section of University Service</td>
<td>Head of US Service + US HRM + Senior manager* (*where appropriate)</td>
<td>University Services Management Group (then review group)**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>University Services Management Group</td>
<td>University Services Management Group ****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** At level 2 a procedural review group will undertake an assessment and may decide to refer to Court for the initial strategic decision

*** Where there is a direct academic impact the implications for Senate must be considered

---

3. Closure of an academic Subject / Discipline  
   Head of College + Other CMG Member + College HRM  
   Court (Proposal to Court from CMG/USMG/SMG)  
   Yes, consultation  
   SMG  
   SMG****  
   Yes  
   Yes

****For level 2 proposals referred to Court and level 3 proposals:- Court has the discretion to request additional oversight for specific cases e.g. they may decide in exceptional cases that SMG or the Procedural Review Group should review the case again at final sign off.

4a. Closure of School /RI  
   Head of College + Other CMG Member + College HRM  
   Court (Proposal to Court from CMG/USMG/SMG)  
   Yes, consultation  
   SMG  
   Court  
   Yes  
   Yes

4b. Closure of a University Service  
   Secretary of Court + Other Head of Service + US HRM  
   Court (Proposal to Court from CMG/USMG/SMG)  
   Report if appropriate  
   SMG  
   Court  
   Yes

5. University wide change/ Closure of a College  
   Designated VP / Head of College + HRM  
   Court  
   Yes, consultation  
   SMG  
   Court  
   Yes  
   Yes

(2, 3 & 4 could include cross College closures / changes.)
Appendix 4 - Proposals for Procedural Review Group (PRG)

Remit
1. To act as an independent review group for all level 2 proposals which involve organisational change which might result in staffing reductions.
2. To decide, on strategic and/or key reputational grounds, or for other exceptional reasons, if the matter should receive initial strategic sign off by Court, or remain entirely in the Management sphere.
3. To assess, in especially sensitive matters, if the group or Court need to review the final outcome before any change occurs. This is likely to be the exception, with most outcomes being reported to Court on completion.
4. The Policy requires Stage 3 issues to receive the initial strategic sign off by Court. In some cases, Court may decide that it wishes the group, as per point 3 of the remit above, to review the final outcome before any change occurs.

Membership
- 2 lay members of Court
- 1 Senate assessor
- VP / Head of College / Secretary of Court for affected area

The role of the Head of College / VP on the group is to provide organisational context and explain/amplify the rationale for a proposal. The court members will make the decision.

(It is suggested that the lay members and senate assessor would come from HR Committee for consistency).

Standard information to be provided to the Procedural Review Group

Outline of the change proposal
- Change proposed
- Details of posts / who are likely to be potentially affected (number of posts by grade and job family)
- Area affected
- Timescales
- What improvements / savings are sought
- What is the strategic impact of the proposed change
- Alternative approaches / strategies that have been considered
- Previous proposals for reduction in this area in the past 3 years
- Group responsible for managing the change

Avoidance and mitigation
- Potential for redeployment – (at the early stages it will be difficult to be precise).
- Avoidance measures proposed
- Mitigation measures proposed
- Indication of potential desire for VSER
Impact of the proposal
- Impact on academic provision (direct and indirect) and plans for consultation with Senate (if appropriate)
- Impact on student / other services
- Is there a requirement to consult other groups?

External Issues
- Significant external issues
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Meeting of Court on Wednesday 10 October 2012

MAXIMISING ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE & CAREER DEVELOPMENT – PROFESSORIAL REWARD

1. Introduction

Glasgow 2020 – a global vision details the University’s strategic imperatives for the period up to 2015 specifically:-

- Delivering excellent research
- Providing an excellent student experience
- Enhancing global reach & reputation

Our ‘people’ are instrumental in the realisation of these strategic objectives. It is therefore imperative that the University provides a conducive environment to enable academic performance and development, providing a clear career structure and facilitating future succession planning coupled with a robust and effective pay and remuneration framework.

A major project, Maximising Academic Performance & Career Development (MAPCD) is the vehicle through which the University is driving forward its ambitions and opportunities for our current and future academic leaders by:-

- Increasing University competitiveness
- Attracting & retaining high quality staff
- Applying fair & equitable pay & performance mechanisms
- Rewarding excellence
- Building leadership capacity & capability development
- Providing clear career structure
- Assisting future succession planning

This paper provides the recent background and context around MAPCD, professorial pay and reward in particular, in advance of a presentation on these developments along with the University’s future plans in this direction at the forthcoming meeting of Court on 10 October 2012.

2. MAPCD

There were four major and integrated phases to the project as outlined below, under the direction of the Project Lead, Professor Andrea Nolan overseen by a Project Board (see Appendix 1 – Project Brief).

(i) Increasing effectiveness of Performance & Development Review (PDR)
(ii) Introduction of Professorial Zoning
(iii) Application of evidence-based quantitative and qualitative Academic Promotion Criteria
(iv) Implementation of Early Career Development Programme with Integrated Career Track
The diagrammatical representation above illustrates the inextricably interlinked aspects of an academic career through the annual PDR and early career development processes, each of these aspects inform annual reward & recognition and subsequently future academic promotion prospects where academic staff performance and outputs are distinguished.

Phase 1 involved a significant overhaul to the annual performance and development review process to ensure its fitness for purpose, including robust objective setting and the introduction of an overall performance assessment outcome for all staff. Professorial zoning represented Phase 2 of MAPCD upon which there is further elaboration below. The University’s academic promotion criteria were substantially revised in Phase 3 to be consistent and aligned with the academic career path and the evidence base/metrics applicable to the zone descriptor definitions of professorial zoning. The final phase of the project is ongoing and focuses upon early career development. This will take the form of an accelerated programme to enable early career academics to reach the career grade of senior lecturer within a period of 5 or 6 years.

3. Professorial Zoning

Implementing professorial zoning enabled the University to provide a robust and effective framework for determining pay, rewarding performance, facilitating a clear career structure and succession planning for this group. In their leadership roles, the professoriate is instrumental to the realisation of the University’s strategic goals and ambitions. The introduction of a modernised zone based structure with four broad bands to replace the senior salary scale (which previously began at the top of the substantive pay and grading structure for substantive staff) has enabled the University to provide an effective pay and remuneration framework for these key people that is consistent, transparent and fair, and which reflects equality of opportunity with respect to development and career progression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
<th>SALARY BOUNDARIES (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Normal entry level for professors with international reputation.</td>
<td>57-70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment in each of the four zones takes into consideration the alternative career paths within the University (see Academic Career Track attached as Appendix 2) across seven areas of academic activity namely: Research Outputs, Award Generation, Research Supervision, Knowledge Exchange & Impact, Learning & Teaching, Leadership & Management and Esteem (see Appendix 3 – College Zone Descriptors).

### 3.1 Zoning Outcomes & Distribution

Figure 1 below illustrates zone distribution based on professorial salary levels prior to the zoning exercise and the overall outcomes following implementation.

The table and graph below illustrate the overall outcome of the zone assimilation exercise based on salary levels. The professorial profiles for the majority (68%) of the professorial population were directly assimilated into an appropriate zone consistent with current salary level, without any commensurate change in salary placing. Professors with academic profiles assimilated to a zone that equated to a salary range above current salary level i.e. green-circled (24%), received a salary increase to the bottom of the higher applicable zone.

The academic profile of a minority of professors (8%), excluding those for whom a market element related to subject discipline applied, were assimilated to a zone equating to a salary range below current salary level (i.e. red-circled). In these cases, the salary level will be preserved at its current level and pay protection applied for a period of two years following assimilation. During the conservation period, professors within this category will be encouraged to develop their role profile with the support and assistance of their Head of School / Director of Research Institute. This process will be informed by the annual performance and development review, which may in time enable the profile to meet the requirements of the higher zone. In the event that this is not possible, the commensurate salary will be reduced to the top of the lower applicable zone at the end of the conservation period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Outcome</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198 (68%)</td>
<td>68 (24%)</td>
<td>25 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Movement between Zones

Professorial staff may be considered for movement into the next zone, subject to satisfying the zone descriptors of the higher level. Professorial staff may apply for movement into the next zone, subject to providing specific evidence demonstrating that their level of performance and associated outputs match the zone descriptors of the higher zone.

Applications for movement between zones will be subject to a rigorous and robust internal process. Each case will be considered by a College Assimilation Panel (consistent with the arrangements applied in the implementation of professorial zoning). Recommendations and views will be sought from recognised external assessors specific to each College for those applying to move to zones 3 and 4. Applications for movement between zones will be invited early next year, consistent with and concurrent to the timetable for the Academic Promotion round.

Cases deemed as satisfying the zone descriptors of the higher zone, will proceed for final decision and moderation to the Principal's Board of Review. To facilitate benchmarking with international standards, this board will include an external assessor.

3.3 Movement within Zones

The University has long since removed any expectation (on the part of the professoriate) of a consolidated performance related financial reward on a regular basis although professors qualify for annual cost of living awards, currently agreed on an annual basis at national level with the following exceptions:

(i) those for whom salary is preserved for a period of time
(ii) those for whom improved performance is required (as identified in the annual PDR process.)
The PDR outcome informs any recommendation by SMG to Remuneration Committee in relation to any annual recognition and reward sum payable in addition to the cost of living award. The University is committed to rewarding professorial performance assessed as “outstanding” in the annual performance and development review process. In recent years, where such an award has been merited it has been payable on a non-consolidated basis. The value and practice of recognition and reward vary from year to year dependent upon University budgetary and performance considerations, ultimately the decision of the Remuneration Committee.

Remuneration Committee recently agreed that where a non-consolidated award occurs twice in any 3 year period in the future, the award applied in the second or third year (whichever is the second non-consolidated award) will be consolidated. Further, the level of any consolidated award is determined by the Remuneration Committee on an annual basis. For the avoidance of any doubt, the outcomes of the 2011/12 P & DR cycle will represent the third of the current three year reference period.

3.4 Market Supplements

The University retains the ability to pay market supplements to match ‘going rates’ in many disciplines and to match competitive offerings in the run up to REF. This is achieved and has became fairly regular practice within particular subject disciplines providing the University’s Market Supplement Policy is appropriately utilised and justifies the payment of supplements, based on regularly reviewed and published market rates within the sector.

4. Current Context – Professorial Reward

The implementation of the zone based pay & reward structure earlier this year has generally been well received by the professoriate in terms of zone placement. On conclusion of the full exercise, 24% of the professorial population was green circled i.e. assimilated to a zone at a higher level than their current salary level and 8% red circled. The extent of green circling was proportionally higher than originally anticipated which may be explained by the remuneration strategy of non-consolidation in recent years in relation to any reward and recognition awards to the professoriate. This has resulted in the concept of professorial zoning being perceived less positively than originally planned in introducing fairer, transparent and equitable pay arrangements for senior staff. While this strategy has since been reviewed, with outstanding performers in any two out of three year period, eligible for consolidation, these plans will take some time (years) to affect to redress a relative pay freeze trend for some members of the professoriate. Further, efforts are currently focused on the ongoing development and review of aspects of the College zone descriptors. These include applying relevant benchmarking data for award/PGR supervision, the ability to assess overseas equivalence in the application of metrics and enabling appropriate recognition for the performance of leadership and management tasks.

Professor Andrea Nolan
Christine Barr
2 October 2012
**PROJECT BRIEF – SMG ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Last updated</th>
<th>Lead Officers</th>
<th>SMG Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximising Academic Performance &amp; Career Development</td>
<td>28.11.11 8.0</td>
<td>Christine Barr (HR - Deputy Director) - Phases 1-4 Lesley Cummings (HRM) - Phase 1 Simon Wilson (HRM) – Phase 4</td>
<td>Professor Andrea Nolan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

Phase 1. To ensure the effective performance management and reward and recognition of Professorial and Senior Administrative staff (level 10).

Phase 2. To facilitate the effective grading and reward of Professorial and Senior Administrative staff across the University.

Phase 3. To review and revise academic promotion criteria to include evidence-based quantitative and qualitative assessment measures for all other Research & Teaching.

Phase 4. To review academic probation in order to develop a holistic early career development path to support ‘new’ academics.

**Timescale**

- Phase 1 - December 2009 - May 2010, subsequent review 30 June 2011
- Phase 2 - June 2010 - March 2012
- Phase 3 - July 2011 - December 2011
- Phase 4 - July 2011 – June 2012

**1. Aims & Objectives**

**Phase 1**

1. a) Identify quantitative and qualitative performance targets / criteria for the effective performance management and recognition & reward of professorial and senior administrative staff linked to University strategy and KPIs.

**Phase 2**

1. a) Develop professorial and administrative level 10 grading structure
2. b) Conduct review of existing professoriate and senior administrative staff
3. c) Assimilate into new zone structure – methodology to be determined.

**Phase 3**

1. a) Review and revise promotion criteria for grades 6 to 9 research & teaching staff, to include evidence-based quantitative and

**Deliverables**

- Reports to SMG
- Agreed performance assessment criteria for all levels of research and teaching staff setting out clear expectations and objectives linked to the University’s goals.
- Support excellence in staff performance by ensuring close integration with strategies linking development, reward and career progression.
- Agreed research and teaching competences.
- Performance and contribution driven professorial/senior MPA grading & reward structure.
- Buy-in from professorial staff.
- Academic training and development leading to recognised career development pathway
- Improve and develop an Integrated Performance Management Framework and support cognate groupings in effectively managing performance, including monitoring impact through the provision of local and corporate key performance metrics.

**Project Team – Phase 1 Review**

- Christine Barr - Lead Manager
- Lesley Cummings
- Andrea Nolan - Senior Vice Principal
- Steve Beaumont
- Neal Juster
- Frank Coton
- Robert Fraser
- David Newall
- Ian Black
- Heads of College
- Heads of Schools

**Project Team – Phase 2**

- Christine Barr - Lead Manager
- Lesley Cummings
- Andrea Nolan - Senior Vice Principal
- Steve Beaumont
- Neal Juster
- Frank Coton
- Robert Fraser
- David Newall
- Ian Black
- Directors of Finance
- Secretary of Court
- Director of HR

**Project Team – Phase 3**

- Christine Barr - Lead Manager
- Lesley Cummings
- Andrea Nolan - Senior Vice Principal
- Steve Beaumont
- Neal Juster
- Frank Coton
- David Newall
- Vice Principals
- Secretary of Court
qualitative assessment measures.

b) Identify quantitative and qualitative performance targets / criteria for recognition and reward of research & teaching staff (Grades 6 to 9).

Phase 4 -

a) Review and revise current academic probation arrangements.

b) Develop probation programme and associated career development track for research & teaching staff.

- Identify and develop staff for the future through effective talent management and succession planning strategies, enhancing capability in academic excellence, service delivery and business development.

- Research best practice in relation to probation within HE sector and outline options to SMG by November 2010.

- Introduce new probation structure

Ian Black
Heads of College

Director of HR

Project Team – Phase 4
Christine Barr  Lead Manager
Simon Wilson  HR Manager
Ann Hastings  HR Ops Manager
Andrea Nolan  Senior Vice Principal
Steve Beaumont  Vice Principal
Neal Juster  Vice Principal
Frank Coton  Vice-Principal

Steering Group
Senior Management Group

Stakeholders – Internal

- All Vice Principals
- All Deans/Heads of Colleges/Services
- Secretary of Court
- Director of HR
- Director of Finance
- Professors
- Employees

Stakeholders – External

Applicants

Risks/Issues

- Patchy implementation of PDR
- Lack of complete buy-in at first line management level to full and proper PDR and reward/recognition
- Non-stretching objective setting often unrelated to strategy
- Potential increase in costs associated with re-bandng senior staff which does not reflect commensurate improvement in overall academic performance
- Anticipated increase in performance mgt. initiatives - competence, capability, etc.
- Failure to follow through on identified shortfalls in performance/competence in instigating procedures.

Mitigation of Risks

- Processes in place to police Uni. wide completion of PDR feeding into reward/recognition processes
- Head of Colleges to review performance targets/objectives set for all academic staff on annual basis.
- Random sampling of PDR documentation to identify shortfalls in process.
- Ongoing training and awareness raising of performance expectations
- Potential overspend on budget figure in implementing senior reward structure – ability to demonstrate any potential increase in cost offset by new income generated through ultimate achievement of KPIs.

Critical Success Factors

Critically evaluate and review effectiveness of PDR and reward/ recognition process for 2008/09

No. of applications and no. of successful applications as a % of former for Professorial Review, R & R and promotion in comparison to previous years to evaluate the extent to which expectations have been met.

Scope – What’s Included

- Established performance targets/criteria and effective PDR mechanism for all research and teaching staff
- Effective pay and reward mechanism driven by performance and contribution for all research and teaching staff
- Recognised career pathway and succession plan for academic structure

Costs/resource implications

Initial costs associated with senior staff re-banding recommendations costed at approx £600K (Spring 2009).

Business case to be developed to support initial increase in cost, although through time absorbed as outlined in mitigation of risks above as well as reduced outlay for those on protected arrangements which cease.
managed in comparison to KPIs. No’s of staff managed in accordance with ongoing competence, capability and performance mgt. processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope – What’s Not Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Performance targets/criteria and competences for Support Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Academic Career Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Level</th>
<th>Research &amp; Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Veterinary Clinician</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor Research Fellow</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Snr. Research Fellow</td>
<td>Snr. University Teacher</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>University Teacher</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>University Teacher</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is flexibility to change career tracks at all levels.

**Promotion to Readership**: Applicants should demonstrate a sustained and distinguished research profile bringing external recognition to the applicant and the University on the basis of distinction in Research, in addition to satisfying the Grade 9 criteria applicable to Senior Lecturer.
Assessment in each of the four zones will draw on the following illustrative statements. It is assumed that a Professor at Level 2 has many of the attributes of 1, and one at Level 3 has the attributes of 1, and 2, etc.

There are different career paths so that staff may be appointed for excellence and academic leadership in i) Research, ii) Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (see relevant criteria) or in iii) Clinical Veterinary Medicine (see relevant criteria). Whichever career track staff are following, the quality of input and outcome should be high in all cases.

It is expected that for promotion to any Zone, a professor would normally be able to demonstrate meeting the majority of the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the College zone descriptors. It is recognised that distinction in all of the areas detailed in the zone descriptor will very rarely be achieved. Professors will be placed into the appropriate zone normally on the basis of ‘best’ fit with the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the relevant College zone descriptor and ultimately to the zone to which there is an overall preponderance of conformance.

All professors, at every level, are expected to demonstrate significant collegiality and to lead both actively and by example with respect to School and College research, teaching and administrative responsibilities. For the avoidance of any doubt, it is a normal expectation that all professorial staff make a significant contribution to UG/PG teaching. Examples can include submitting and marking exam papers within deadlines, giving lectures as assigned and evidence of course development that has benefited the student experience. Administrative responsibilities may include caring for the welfare of relevant research groups of their School and mentoring younger colleagues. Professors at all levels should contribute to public engagement, and to external activity which benefits the national and international standing of the University.

ZONE 1: This is the normal entry level for those appointed to the Professoriate. Working at this level indicates an international reputation, reflected by a range and balance of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 2: The level for Professors with considerable academic distinction, and with ongoing excellent performance. Working at this level indicates an established international reputation for academic leadership, reflected by a range of the activities listed below as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 3: The level for Professors of excellent academic distinction internationally. Working at this level requires evidence of an internationally leading reputation for shaping the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 4: The level for Professors of the highest academic distinction. Working at this level requires evidence of international recognition as one of a group of world leaders in the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION A RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes 4 outputs in the most recent 6-year period which are likely to achieve an average rating of 3* (RAE/REF equivalent, judged against current national criteria) and with none of these four outputs below 2*. A monograph may substitute for two outputs.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes, 4 outputs in the most recent 6-year period likely to achieve an average rating of at least 3* (RAE/REF equivalent, judged against current national criteria), at least two of which should meet the criteria for 4*, and with none of these outputs below 2* A monograph may substitute for two outputs.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes, 4 outputs in the most recent 6-year period likely to achieve an average rating of at least 3* (RAE/REF equivalent, judged against current national criteria), at least three of which should meet the criteria for 4*. A monograph may substitute for two outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Generation</td>
<td>Principal Investigator on RCUK, EU and/or other competitively awarded grant or on project funded by charitable or commercial body. Typically a research income in excess of the Russell Group average for the discipline group.</td>
<td>A sustained grant portfolio (as Principal Investigator) with a significant RCUK or EU component, together with other charitable or commercial grant income. Typically a research income in excess of the Russell Group upper quartile for the discipline group.</td>
<td>A sustained grant portfolio (as Principal Investigator) with a significant RCUK or EU component, together with other charitable or commercial grant income. Typically a research income in the Russell Group top 10 percent for the discipline group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>PGR supervision equal to, or better than, Russell Group average.</td>
<td>PGR supervision equal to, or better than, Russell Group upper quartile.</td>
<td>Leading the growth of PGR numbers, e.g. through externally funded places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION B KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE &amp; IMPACT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of developing research-based knowledge for the benefit of non-academic communities. Evidence of a commitment to public and/or cultural</td>
<td>A record of significant engagement with non-academic bodies (which may include community-based organisations) with successful collaborative initiatives. Evidence of a commitment to the</td>
<td>Extensive experience of advising governmental and non-governmental agencies on research policy. Advisory or leadership role in private, public and/or cultural</td>
<td>Key advisor to international non-academic agencies or communities, including companies, governmental bodies, non-governmental organisations and cultural institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/zonebasedpaystructure/grantsandcontracts/
www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/zonebasedpaystructure/pgrsupervision/
**SECTION C
LEARNING & TEACHING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External examining at UG or PG level.</td>
<td>Winner of teaching awards from national bodies.</td>
<td>Leadership role in national and/or international educational agencies with responsibilities for higher education policy and curriculum development.</td>
<td>Key role in major company resulting from transfer of research expertise, generating significant benefits to UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams.</td>
<td>Leading a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams.</td>
<td>Track record of participation in major government education advisory bodies or agencies with remits covering the education sector as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of subject review panels at other universities.</td>
<td>Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained track record of innovation in teaching, supporting student learning and/or assessment.</td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained contribution to School (subject discipline) level learning and teaching committees.</td>
<td>Sustained contribution to university level learning and teaching committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership of significant L&amp;T or related initiatives at School/University level addressing key strategic priorities (e.g. retention, graduate attributes, improving assessment, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership of significant L&amp;T or related initiatives at School/University level addressing key strategic priorities (e.g. retention, graduate attributes, improving assessment, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D
LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role in the management and support of strategic initiatives at Subject, School, College levels.</td>
<td>Significant leadership and management responsibilities for shaping the future of the relevant Subject/School within the University, e.g. College Dean.</td>
<td>Member of AHRC (or equivalent) policy team or strategic advisory groups.</td>
<td>Member of an RCUK Council (or equivalent) Leadership of the development of policy at international levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 4 building on the previous zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION E ESTEEM INDICATORS</td>
<td>Fellowship of subject specific societies.</td>
<td>Committee chairmanship or council membership within subject specific society.</td>
<td>Fellowship of a major international Academy e.g. FBA, FRS or equivalent international academy (American European academics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A track record of regular invited talks at international conferences/events and/or UK HEIs.</td>
<td>Membership of editorial board of high impact journal(s) or book series.</td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from overseas bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant contribution to the University’s international profile in research and/or teaching.</td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions and/ or public bodies.</td>
<td>Conferment of Honorary Degree(s) from the world’s top 100 Universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer for international research bodies.</td>
<td>Significant media exposure.</td>
<td>Key advisor to international governmental and non-governmental bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of effective links with research funders, e.g. through Research Council college membership or other equivalent roles</td>
<td>Visiting national appointments.</td>
<td>Presidency of major society with significant international profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant input to the development of policy at School level.</td>
<td>Appointment as external assessor for professorial positions in other HEIs.</td>
<td>Chair of RAE/REF sub-panel or equivalent major public research service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of appointment, assessment or advisory committees at other HEIs.</td>
<td>RAE/REF panellist or equivalent major public research service.</td>
<td>Accountability in the implementation of long term strategic developments at School, College or University levels with significant internal/ external impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant contribution to the University’s international profile through development of partnerships in education or research.</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-University initiative in research, teaching or enhancement of the student experience including international partnerships.</td>
<td>Chair of RAE/REF Main Panel or equivalent major public research service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of agenda setting in research through e.g. participation/advisory roles in professional or government bodies</td>
<td>Evidence of early career staff mentoring over a sustained period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLEGE OF MVLS

PROFESSORIAL ZONE DESCRIPTORS (Research & Teaching)

Assessment in each of the four zones will draw on the following illustrative statements. It is assumed that a Professor at Level 2 has many of the attributes of 1, and one at Level 3 has the attributes of 1, and 2, etc.

There are different career paths so that staff may be appointed for excellence and academic leadership in i) Research ii) Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (see relevant criteria); or in iii) Clinical Veterinary Medicine (see relevant criteria). Whichever career track staff are following, the quality of input and outcome should be high in all cases.

It is expected that for promotion to any Zone, a professor would normally be able to demonstrate meeting the majority of the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the College zone descriptors. It is recognised that distinction in all of the areas detailed in the zone descriptor will very rarely be achieved. Professors will be placed into the appropriate zone normally on the basis of ‘best’ fit with the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the relevant College zone descriptor and ultimately to the zone to which there is an overall preponderance of conformance.

All professors, at every level, are expected to demonstrate significant collegiality and to lead both actively and by example with respect to School and College research, teaching and administrative responsibilities. For the avoidance of any doubt, it is a normal expectation that all professorial staff make a significant contribution to UG/PG teaching. Examples can include submitting and marking exam papers within deadlines, giving lectures as assigned and evidence of course development that has benefitted the student experience. Administrative responsibilities may include caring for the welfare of relevant research groups of their school and mentoring younger colleagues. Professors at all levels should contribute to public engagement, and to external activity which benefits the national and international standing of the University.

ZONE 1: This is the normal entry level for those appointed to the Professoriate. Working at this level indicates an international reputation, reflected by a range and balance of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 2: The level for Professors with considerable academic distinction, and with ongoing excellent performance. Working at this level indicates an established international reputation for academic leadership, reflected by a range of the activities listed below as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 3: The level for Professors of excellent academic distinction internationally. Working at this level requires evidence of an internationally leading reputation for shaping the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 4: The level for Professors of the highest academic distinction. Working at this level requires evidence of international recognition as one of a group of world leaders in the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION A: RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes at least 4 papers in the most recent 6 year period which are likely to achieve an average RAE/REF level of 3* (e.g. RAE 3* ≈ 3X average citations for field). None of these four outputs to be below 2*.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date which includes 4 papers in the most recent 6 year period likely to achieve an average RAE/REF level of at least 3*, at least 2 of which should meet the criteria at 4* with none of these outputs below 2* level.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes 4 papers in the most recent 6 year period likely to achieve an average RAE/REF level of at least 3*, at least 3 of which meet the criteria for 4* as principal /senior author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award Generation</strong></td>
<td>Principal Investigator or key contributor on current grants supporting at least one post doctoral researcher. Research income in excess of the Russell Group average for the discipline group.</td>
<td>A current grant portfolio (as Principal Investigator) sufficient to support a research team. Research income in excess of the Russell Group upper quartile for the discipline group.</td>
<td>A current grant portfolio (as Principal Investigator) (as Principal Investigator) comprising multiple large grants, supporting a very large (&gt;15) externally funded research team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td>PGR supervision equal to, or higher than, Russell Group average.</td>
<td>PGR supervision equal to, or higher than, Russell Group upper quartile.</td>
<td>Leading the growth of PGR numbers, e.g. through externally funded places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION B: KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE &amp; IMPACT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONE 1</strong></td>
<td>Industrial connectivity, illustrated by contract, licence and/or consultancy income. Evidence of a commitment to public and/or cultural engagement, and/or to policy development in public institutions. Sustained track record of involvement in knowledge creation and transfer to improve the performance of business.</td>
<td>Research leading to industrial benefit as demonstrated by job creation and/or significant licensing or other income. Research to inform policy documents leading to changes in governmental legislation and guidelines.</td>
<td>Demonstrable evidence of role as senior policy advisor to Government. Research-based leadership of policy change with demonstrated societal impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key advisor to international governmental and non-governmental bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key role in major company resulting from transfer of research expertise, generating significant benefits to UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</td>
<td>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION C: LEARNING &amp; TEACHING</strong></td>
<td>External examining at UG or PG level. Contributing to a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams. Membership of subject review panels at other universities. Sustained track record of innovation in teaching, supporting student learning and / or assessment. Sustained contribution to School (subject discipline) level learning and teaching committees.</td>
<td>Winner of teaching awards from national bodies. Leading a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams. Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of the discipline. Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions. Sustained contribution to university level learning and teaching committees. Leadership of significant L&amp;T or related initiatives at School/University level addressing key strategic priorities (e.g. retention, graduate attributes, improving assessment, etc).</td>
<td>Leadership role in international educational agencies with responsibilities for higher education policy and curriculum development. Track record of participation in major government education advisory bodies or agencies with remits covering the education sector as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION D: LEADERSHIP &amp; MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>Leadership role in the management and support of strategic initiatives at Subject, Institute, School, College levels. Significant input to the</td>
<td>Significant leadership and management responsibilities for shaping the future of the relevant Research Institute/School within the University, e.g College Dean.</td>
<td>Member of an RCUK (or equivalent) policy team. Leadership of the development of policy at national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</td>
<td>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION E: ESTEEM INDICATORS</td>
<td>Fellowship of subject specific society.</td>
<td>Committee chairmanship within subject specific society.</td>
<td>Fellowship of the Royal Society of Edinburgh or equivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A track record of regular invited talks at international conferences/events and/or UK HEIs.</td>
<td>Membership of editorial board of high impact (upper quartile) journal(s).</td>
<td>Many plenary/keynote talks at major international conferences and/or invitations to deliver distinguished named lectures/lecture series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant contribution to the University international profile in research and/or teaching.</td>
<td>Membership of education committees of professional and/or public bodies.</td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from national bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer for international research bodies.</td>
<td>Significant media exposure.</td>
<td>Visiting international appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of effective links with research funders, e.g. through Research Council college membership or other equivalent roles</td>
<td>Visiting national appointments.</td>
<td>Presidency of major subject specific society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial board of leading international scholarly journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on learning and teaching at national and international levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellowship of the Royal Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from overseas bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conferment of Honorary Degrees from the world’s top 200 Universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key advisor to international governmental and non-governmental bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presidency of major society with significant international profile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment in each of the four zones will draw on the following illustrative statements. It is assumed that a Professor at Level 2 has many of the attributes of 1, and one at Level 3 has the attributes of 1, and 2, etc.

There are different career paths so that staff may be appointed for excellence and academic leadership in i) Research, ii) Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (see relevant criteria) or in iii) Clinical Veterinary Medicine (see relevant criteria). Whichever career track staff are following, the quality of input and outcome should be high in all cases.

It is expected that for promotion to any Zone, a professor would normally be able to demonstrate meeting the majority of the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the College zone descriptors. It is recognised that distinction in all of the areas detailed in the zone descriptor will very rarely be achieved. Professors will be placed into the appropriate zone normally on the basis of ‘best’ fit with the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the relevant College zone descriptor and ultimately to the zone to which there is an overall preponderance of conformance.

All professors, at every level, are expected to demonstrate significant collegiality and to lead both actively and by example with respect to School and College research, teaching and administrative responsibilities. For the avoidance of any doubt, it is a normal expectation that all professorial staff make a significant contribution to UG/PG teaching. Examples can include submitting and marking exam papers within deadlines, giving lectures as assigned and evidence of course development that has benefitted the student experience. Administrative responsibilities may include caring for the welfare of relevant research groups of their School and mentoring younger colleagues. Professors at all levels should contribute to public engagement, and to external activity which benefits the national and international standing of the University.

ZONE 1: This is the normal entry level for those appointed to the Professoriate. Working at this level indicates an international reputation, reflected by a range and balance of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 2: The level for Professors with considerable academic distinction, and with ongoing excellent performance. Working at this level indicates an established international reputation for academic leadership, reflected by a range of the activities listed below as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 3: The level for Professors of excellent academic distinction internationally. Working at this level requires evidence of an internationally leading reputation for shaping the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 4: The level for Professors of the highest academic distinction. Working at this level requires evidence of international recognition as one of a group of world leaders in the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION A: RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes at least 4 papers in the most recent 6 year period which are likely to achieve an average RAE/REF level of 3* (e.g. RAE 3* ≈ 3X average citations for field). None of these four outputs to be below 2*.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date which includes 4 papers in the most recent 6 year period likely to achieve an average RAE/REF level of at least 3*, at least 2 of which should meet the criteria at 4* with none of these outputs below 2* level.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes 4 papers in the most recent 6 year period likely to achieve an average RAE/REF level of at least 3*, at least 3 of which meet the criteria for 4* as principal/senior author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Generation</td>
<td>Principal Investigator or key contributor on current RCUK, EU and/or other grants supporting at least one post doctoral researcher. Research income in excess of the Russell Group average for the discipline group.</td>
<td>A current grant portfolio (as Principal Investigator) with a significant RCUK or EU component and/or other commercial/charity income, sufficient to support a research team. Research income in excess of the Russell Group upper quartile for the discipline group.</td>
<td>A significant current grant portfolio (as Principal Investigator) comprising multiple large RCUK/EU grants and/or other commercial/charity income, supporting a very large (&gt;15) externally funded research team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>PGR supervision equal to, or higher than, Russell Group average.</td>
<td>PGR supervision equal to, or higher than, Russell Group upper quartile.</td>
<td>Leading the growth of PGR numbers. e.g. through externally funded places.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION B: KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE &amp; IMPACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial connectivity, illustrated by contract, licence and/or consultancy income. Evidence of a commitment to public and/or cultural engagement, and/or to policy development in public institutions. Sustained track record of involvement in knowledge creation and transfer to improve</td>
<td>Research leading to industrial benefit as demonstrated by job creation and/or significant licensing or other income. Research to inform policy documents leading to changes in governmental legislation and guidelines.</td>
<td>Leadership of industry/RCUK governmental funding streams. Leadership of successful spin-out and/or licensing process. Research-based leadership of policy change with demonstrated societal impact.</td>
<td>Key advisor to international governmental and non-governmental bodies. Key role in major company resulting from transfer of research expertise, generating significant benefits to UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</td>
<td>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION C: LEARNING &amp; TEACHING</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External examining at UG or PG level.</td>
<td>Winner of teaching awards from national bodies.</td>
<td>Leadership role in international educational agencies with responsibilities for higher education policy and curriculum development.</td>
<td>Track record of participation in major government education advisory bodies or agencies with remits covering the education sector as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams.</td>
<td>Leading a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams.</td>
<td>Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of the discipline.</td>
<td>Leadership role in international educational agencies with responsibilities for higher education policy and curriculum development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of subject review panels at other universities.</td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions.</td>
<td>Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of the discipline.</td>
<td>Track record of participation in major government education advisory bodies or agencies with remits covering the education sector as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained track record of innovation in teaching, supporting student learning and / or assessment.</td>
<td>Sustained contribution to School (subject discipline) level learning and teaching committees.</td>
<td>Leadership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of the discipline.</td>
<td>Leadership of international educational agencies with responsibilities for higher education policy and curriculum development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained contribution to School (subject discipline) level learning and teaching committees.</td>
<td>Leadership of significant L&amp;T or related initiatives at School/ university level addressing key strategic priorities (e.g. retention, graduate attributes, improving assessment, etc.).</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at national level.</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at international levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION D: LEADERSHIP &amp; MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role in the management, and support of strategic initiatives at Subject, School and/or College levels.</td>
<td>Significant leadership and management responsibilities for shaping the future of the relevant Subject/School within the University, e.g. College Dean.</td>
<td>Member of an RCUK policy team (or equivalent).</td>
<td>Member of an RCUK Council (or equivalent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant input to the development of policy at School</td>
<td>Appointment as external assessor</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at national level.</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at international levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAE/REF panellist and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td>RAE/REF panel chair and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A track record of regular invited talks at international conferences/</td>
<td>Committee chairmanship within subject specific society.</td>
<td>Many plenary/keynote talks at major international conferences and/or invitations to deliver distinguished named lectures/lecture series.</td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from overseas bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events and/or UK HEIs.</td>
<td>Membership of editorial board of high impact (upper quartile) journal(s) or book series.</td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from national bodies.</td>
<td>Conferment of Honorary Degree(s) from the world’s top 200 Universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant contribution to the University international profile in</td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions and/or public bodies.</td>
<td>Visiting national appointments.</td>
<td>Key advisor to international governmental and non-governmental bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research and/or teaching.</td>
<td>Significant media exposure.</td>
<td>Visiting international appointments.</td>
<td>Presidency of major society with significant international profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer for international research bodies.</td>
<td>Visiting media exposure.</td>
<td>Presidency of major subject specific society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of effective links with research funders, e.g. through Research Council college membership or other equivalent roles</td>
<td>Visiting national appointments.</td>
<td>Editorial board of leading international scholarly journal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on learning and teaching at national and international levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level.</td>
<td>for professorial positions in other HEIs.</td>
<td>equivalent major public research service.</td>
<td>equivalent major public research service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of appointment, assessment or advisory committees at other HEIs.</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-University initiative in research, teaching or enhancement of the student experience including international partnerships.</td>
<td>Accountability in the implementation of long term strategic developments at School, College or University levels with significant internal/external impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant contribution to the University’s international profiles through development of partnerships in education or research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of agenda setting in research through e.g. participation/advisory roles in professional or government bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of early career staff mentoring over a sustained period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment in each of the four zones will draw on the following illustrative statements. It is assumed that a Professor at Level 2 has many of the attributes of 1, and one at Level 3 has the attributes of 1, and 2, etc.

There are different career paths so that staff may be appointed for excellence and academic leadership in i) Research, ii) Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (see relevant criteria) or in iii) Clinical Veterinary Medicine (see relevant criteria). Whichever career track staff are following, the quality of input and outcome should be high in all cases.

It is expected that for promotion to any Zone, a professor would normally be able to demonstrate meeting the majority of the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the College zone descriptors. It is recognised that distinction in all of the areas detailed in the zone descriptor will very rarely be achieved. Professors will be placed into the appropriate zone normally on the basis of ‘best’ fit with the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the relevant College zone descriptor and ultimately to the zone to which there is an overall preponderance of conformance.

All professors, at every level, are expected to demonstrate significant collegiality and to lead both actively and by example with respect to School and College research, teaching and administrative responsibilities. For the avoidance of any doubt, it is a normal expectation that all professorial staff make a significant contribution to UG/PG teaching. Examples can include submitting and marking exam papers within deadlines, giving lectures as assigned and evidence of course development that has benefitted the student experience. Administrative responsibilities may include caring for the welfare of relevant research groups of their school and mentoring younger colleagues. Professors at all levels should contribute to public engagement, and to external activity which benefits the national and international standing of the University.

ZONE 1: This is the normal entry level for those appointed to the Professoriate. Working at this level indicates an international reputation, reflected by a range and balance of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 2: The level for Professors with considerable academic distinction, and with ongoing excellent performance. Working at this level indicates an established international reputation for academic leadership, reflected by a range of the activities listed below as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 3: The level for Professors of excellent academic distinction internationally. Working at this level requires evidence of an internationally leading reputation for shaping the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 4: The level for Professors of the highest academic distinction. Working at this level requires evidence of international recognition as one of a group of world leaders in the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION A: RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes 4 outputs in the most recent 6-year period which are likely to achieve an average rating of 3* (RAE/REF equivalent, judged against current national criteria) and with none of these four outputs below 2*. A monograph may substitute for two outputs.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date, which includes 4 outputs in the most recent 6-year period likely to achieve an average of at least 3* (RAE/REF equivalent, judged against current national criteria) at least two of which should meet the criteria for 4*, and with none of these outputs below 2*. A monograph may substitute for two outputs.</td>
<td>A sustained record of publication resulting in an outstanding body of world-leading scholarly output which has become an essential point of reference for the discipline. The four leading outputs in the most recent six-year period should meet the national criteria for 4*. A monograph may substitute for two outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Generation</td>
<td>Principal Investigator on RCUK, EU and/or other grant charitable or commercial grant income. Typically a research income in excess of the Russell group average for the discipline group.</td>
<td>A sustained grant portfolio (as Principal Investigator) with a significant RCUK or EU component together with other charitable or commercial grant income. Typically a research income in excess of the Russell Group upper quartile for the discipline.</td>
<td>A sustained record of major grant holding with an ongoing commitment to capacity building. A substantial record of managing major international projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>PGR supervision equal to, or better than, Russell Group average in discipline.</td>
<td>PGR supervision equal to, or better than, Russell Group upper quartile in discipline.</td>
<td>Leading the growth of PGR numbers, e.g. through externally funded places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/zonebasedpaystructure/grantsandcontracts/">www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/zonebasedpaystructure/grantsandcontracts/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td><strong>SECTION B:</strong> KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE &amp; IMPACT</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial experience of engaging in applied research with, or in transferring other research to, practitioner communities from the private, public, or third sectors.</td>
<td>A record of significant engagement with successful collaborative initiatives, for example through working with professional practice, or through the development of industrial, public agency, third sector, or international partnerships.</td>
<td>Leadership of industry, RCUK/governmental, or third sector funding streams.</td>
<td>Key advisor to international practitioner communities, including for example companies, governmental bodies, and non-governmental organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of a commitment to public and/or cultural engagement, and/or to policy development in public institutions.</td>
<td>Research to inform policy documents leading to changes in governmental legislation and guidelines.</td>
<td>Advising national or international governmental and non-governmental bodies on research or other policy.</td>
<td>Key role in major company resulting from transfer of research expertise, generating significant benefits to UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained track record of involvement in knowledge creation and transfer to improve the performance of business, commerce and/or industry.</td>
<td>Application of knowledge to improve public sector performance and quality of life by informing public policy and government or by significantly influencing the cultural and heritage sector.</td>
<td>Research-based leadership of policy change with demonstrated societal impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of knowledge to improve public sector performance and quality of life by informing public policy and government or by significantly influencing the cultural and heritage sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th><strong>SECTION C:</strong> LEARNING &amp; TEACHING</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External examining at UG or PG level.</td>
<td>Winner of teaching awards from national bodies.</td>
<td>Leadership role in international educational agencies with responsibilities for higher education policy and curriculum development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams.</td>
<td>Leading a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams.</td>
<td>Track record of participation in major government education advisory bodies or agencies with remits covering the education sector as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of subject review panels at other universities.</td>
<td>Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained track record of innovation in teaching, supporting student learning and / or assessment.</td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained contribution to School (subject discipline) level learning</td>
<td>Sustained contribution to university level learning and teaching committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION D: LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role in the management and support of strategic initiatives at Subject, School, College levels.</td>
<td>Significant leadership and management responsibilities for shaping the future of the relevant Subject/School within the University, e.g. College Dean.</td>
<td>Member of an RCUK (or equivalent) policy team or strategic advisory groups.</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at international levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant input to the development of policy at school level.</td>
<td>Appointment as external assessor for professorial positions in other HEIs.</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at national level.</td>
<td>Chair of RAE/REF Main Panel and/or equivalent major public research service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of appointment, assessment or advisory committees at other HEIs.</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-University initiative in research, teaching or enhancement of the student experience including international partnerships.</td>
<td>RAE/REF panellist or equivalent major public research service.</td>
<td>Member of an RCUK Council (or equivalent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant contribution to the University's international profile through development of partnerships in education or research.</td>
<td>Evidence of agenda setting in research through e.g. participation/advisory roles in professional or government bodies</td>
<td>Accountability in the implementation of long term strategic developments at School, College or University levels with significant internal/external impact.</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at international levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of early career staff mentoring over a sustained period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of RAE/REF Main Panel and/or equivalent major public research service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION E: ESTEEM INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship of subject specific societies.</td>
<td>Committee chairmanship or council membership within subject specific society.</td>
<td>Fellowship of the Royal Society of Edinburgh or the Academy of Social Sciences or equivalent.</td>
<td>Fellowship of the British Academy or overseas equivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A track record of regular invited talks at international conferences/events and/or UK HEIs.</td>
<td>Membership of editorial board of high impact journal(s) or book series.</td>
<td>Many plenary/keynote talks at major international conferences and/or invitations to deliver distinguished named</td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from overseas bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conferment of Honorary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant contribution to the University's international profile in research and/or teaching.</td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions and/ or public bodies.</td>
<td>Lectures/lecture series. Winner of medals/prizes from national bodies. Visiting international appointments. Presidency of major subject specific society. Editorial board of leading international scholarly journal or book series. Impact on learning and teaching practice at national and international level.</td>
<td>Degree(s) from the world's top 100 Universities. Key advisor to international governmental and non-governmental bodies. Presidency of a major society with significant international profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer for international research bodies.</td>
<td>Significant media exposure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of effective links with research funders, e.g. through Research Council college membership or other equivalent roles</td>
<td>Visiting national appointments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLEGE OF MVLS

PROFESSORIAL ZONE DESCRIPTORS (Veterinary Clinical)

Assessment in each of the four zones will draw on the following illustrative statements. It is assumed that a Professor at Level 2 has many of the attributes of 1, and one at Level 3 has the attributes of 1, and 2, etc.

There are different career paths so that staff may be appointed for excellence and academic leadership in i) Research ii) Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (see relevant criteria); or in iii) Clinical Veterinary Medicine (see relevant criteria). Whichever career track staff are following, the quality of input and outcome should be high in all cases.

It is expected that for promotion to any Zone, a professor would normally be able to demonstrate meeting the majority of the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the College zone descriptors. It is recognised that distinction in all of the areas detailed in the zone descriptors will very rarely be achieved. Professors will be placed into the appropriate zone normally on the basis of ‘best’ fit with the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the relevant College zone descriptor and ultimately to the zone to which there is an overall preponderance.

All professors, at every level, are expected to demonstrate significant collegiality and to lead both actively and by example with respect to School and College research, teaching and leadership/management responsibilities. For the avoidance of any doubt, it is a normal expectation that all professorial staff make a significant contribution to UG/PG teaching. Examples can include submitting and marking exam papers within deadlines, giving lectures as assigned and evidence of course development that has benefited the student experience. Leadership/management responsibilities may include conducting performance and development reviews of academic staff within the School / Research Institute and mentoring junior colleagues. Professors at all levels should contribute to public engagement, and to external activity which benefits the national and international standing of the University

ZONE 1: This is the normal entry level for those appointed to the Professoriate. Working at this level indicates an international reputation, reflected by a range and balance of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 2: The level for Professors with considerable academic distinction, and with ongoing excellent performance. Working at this level indicates an established international reputation for academic leadership, reflected by a range of the activities listed below as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 3: The level for Professors of excellent academic distinction internationally. Working at this level requires evidence of an internationally leading reputation for shaping the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline

ZONE 4: The level for Professors of the highest academic distinction. Working at this level requires evidence of international recognition as one of a group of world leaders in the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION A SCHOLARSHIP</th>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td>Recent (6-year) publication output constituting a substantial contribution to knowledge and practice of Veterinary Medicine internationally, taking into account the dimensions of the field to include 4 outputs in the most recent 6-year period which are significant (as evidenced by peer-review and other forms of recognised output including textbooks) and have influenced the practice of veterinary medicine / surgery.</td>
<td>Outstanding (6-year) publication output that results in demonstrable change to veterinary practice or knowledge internationally, taking into account the dimensions of the field.</td>
<td>Scholarship outputs commensurate with acknowledged leader in the international field</td>
<td>A sustained record of publication resulting in an outstanding body of world-leading scholarly output which has become an essential point of reference for the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award Generation</strong></td>
<td>Leadership of, or substantial contribution to, clinical team generating clinical service income with positive contribution after full economic costs. Assumes direct engagement with clients at a substantial level. Sustained growth in annual contribution (e.g. &gt;5% increase/annum) over recent (4 year) period and/or Research income in excess of the Russell Group average for the discipline group.</td>
<td>Leadership and responsibility for large clinical team generating clinical service income with positive contribution after full economic costs &gt;£100k. Assumes direct engagement with clients at a substantial level. Sustained growth in annual contribution (e.g. &gt;5% increase/annum) over recent (4 year) period. Leadership of new income generating initiatives yielding significant additional contribution in recent period (4 year) and/or Research income in excess of the Russell Group upper quartile for the discipline group.</td>
<td>Successful hospital level leadership with sustained contribution growth of clinical service income (e.g. through improved efficiency of service and/or new activities) over 4 year period (average increase per annum &gt;£100k or &gt;10% of turnover) and/or A current grant portfolio (as Principal Investigator) with a significant RCUK or EU component and/or other commercial/charity income, sufficient to support a sizeable research team.</td>
<td>Successful hospital level leadership with major contribution growth of clinical service income over 4 year period (average increase per annum &gt;£200k or &gt;20% of turnover) and/or A sustained record of major grant holding with an ongoing commitment to capacity building. A substantial record of managing major international projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td>Principal responsibility currently for more that 2 PGR students/residents and track record (over last 6 years as appropriate) of successful outcomes</td>
<td>Principal responsibility currently (and associated workload) for more that 3 PGR students/residents/trainee staff and track record (over last 6 years as appropriate) of significant number of successful (e.g. awards of PhD or diplomate status).</td>
<td>Track record of leading significant growth of PGR/resident numbers e.g. through significant number of externally funded places and delivery of large number of doctorates/diplomates to promote progression of international clinical practice in the discipline.</td>
<td>The successful launch and sustained delivery of a major programme(s) in postgraduate training appropriately supported by major new funding streams (e.g. &gt;£100k a year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</td>
<td>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION B KNOWLEDGE, EXCHANGE &amp; IMPACT</strong></td>
<td>Generation of income additional to clinical service (e.g. CPD, consultancy, clinical trials or other income) from which the University benefits financially at &gt;£20K contribution per annum.</td>
<td>Generation of income additional to clinical service (e.g. CPD, consultancy, clinical trials or other income) from which the University benefits financially at &gt;£40K contribution per annum.</td>
<td>Generation of income additional to clinical service (e.g. CPD, consultancy, clinical trials or other income) from which the University benefits financially at &gt;£60K contribution per annum.</td>
<td>Key advisor to international non-academic agencies or communities, including companies, governmental bodies, non-governmental organisations and cultural institutions. Key role in major company resulting from transfer of expertise generating significant benefits to UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application of knowledge to improve public sector performance and quality of life by informing public policy and government and/or influencing the practice of veterinary medicine and/or public opinion.</td>
<td>Significant engagement and demonstrable impact on government policy, practice of veterinary medicine and/or public opinion.</td>
<td>Internationally recognised opinion leader in the field.</td>
<td>Leadership role in policy development at an International level. Accountability in the implementation of long term strategic developments at School, College or University levels with significant internal/external impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable influence on the practice of veterinary medicine and/or the health and welfare of animals in the wider community.</td>
<td>Significant impact on development of new products and new veterinary protocols.</td>
<td>Major role within regulatory and advisory bodies allied to the profession and/or animal charities/welfare organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity associated with development of new products and new veterinary protocols.</td>
<td>Strong links with regulatory and advisory bodies allied to the profession and/or service in support of animal charities/welfare organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong links with regulatory and advisory bodies allied to the profession and/or service in support of animal charities/welfare organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION C LEARNING &amp; TEACHING</strong></td>
<td>External examining at UG or PG level.</td>
<td>Winner of teaching awards from National Bodies.</td>
<td>Leadership role in policy development at an International level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions and/or public bodies.</td>
<td>Periodic subject review (or equivalent) panel member at another highly-rated university.</td>
<td>Accountability in the implementation of long term strategic developments at School, College or University levels with significant internal/external impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of subject review panels at other universities.</td>
<td>Leading a major initiative in the growth of teaching income (e.g. PGT).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustained contribution to School level learning and teaching committees.</td>
<td>Significant and successful leadership and management role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</td>
<td>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION D LEADERSHIP &amp; MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Leadership role in the management and support of clinical activity</td>
<td>Significant leadership and management responsibilities shaping the future of clinical activity and school performance.</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at international levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership role in the management and support of clinical activity</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at national level.</td>
<td>Accountability in the implementation of long term strategic developments at School, College or University levels with significant internal/external impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to the management and support of strategic initiatives at Subject, School, College levels such as contributing to a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams.</td>
<td>Appointment as external assessor for professorial positions in other HEIs.</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-university initiative in research, clinical service, teaching or enhancement of the student experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant input to the development of policy at Hospital/School level.</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-university initiative in research, clinical service, teaching or enhancement of the student experience.</td>
<td>Leadership of the development of policy at international levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of appointment, assessment or advisory committees at other universities.</td>
<td>Membership of appointment, assessment or advisory committees at other universities.</td>
<td>Membership of appointment, assessment or advisory committees at other universities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant contribution to the University’s international profile through development of partnerships in clinical activity or education.</td>
<td>Significant contribution to the University’s international profile through development of partnerships in clinical activity or education.</td>
<td>Significant contribution to the University’s international profile through development of partnerships in clinical activity or education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of the ability to influence, stimulate and inspire others in developing learning and teaching practice and / or effective mentoring of staff engaged in / supporting clinical work.</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-university initiative in research, clinical service, teaching or enhancement of the student experience.</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-university initiative in research, clinical service, teaching or enhancement of the student experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of early career staff</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-university initiative in research, clinical service, teaching or enhancement of the student experience.</td>
<td>Leadership of a major cross-university initiative in research, clinical service, teaching or enhancement of the student experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of the discipline.</td>
<td>Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of veterinary education.</td>
<td>Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of veterinary education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track record of developing innovative approaches to teaching, supporting student learning or assessment e.g. development of inquiry based approaches, provision of high quality feedback to students on their learning, design of new assessment procedure, effective use of and engagement with technology to support student learning.</td>
<td>Track record of developing innovative approaches to teaching, supporting student learning or assessment e.g. development of inquiry based approaches, provision of high quality feedback to students on their learning, design of new assessment procedure, effective use of and engagement with technology to support student learning.</td>
<td>Track record of developing innovative approaches to teaching, supporting student learning or assessment e.g. development of inquiry based approaches, provision of high quality feedback to students on their learning, design of new assessment procedure, effective use of and engagement with technology to support student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mentoring over a sustained period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION E</th>
<th>ESTEEM INDICATORS</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zones</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>Fellowship of and/or leadership role in, and evidence of contribution to subject specific societies.</td>
<td>Committee chairmanship within subject specific society (e.g. European college or national society).</td>
<td>Editor of prestigious veterinary journals.</td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from overseas bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A track record of regular invited talks at international conferences/events and at UK/International HEIs.</td>
<td>A sustained track record of invited talks (4/year) at international conferences.</td>
<td>Many (3/year) plenary/keynote talks at major international conferences.</td>
<td>Fellowship of a major international Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant contribution to the University international profile in scholarship and/or teaching.</td>
<td>Significant positive media exposure.</td>
<td>Invitations to deliver distinguished named lectures/lecture series.</td>
<td>Conferment of Honorary Degree(s) from the world’s top 100 Universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of editorial board of discipline related journals</td>
<td>Fellowship of esteemed societies.</td>
<td>Visiting international appointments in last 5 years.</td>
<td>Key advisor to international governmental and non-governmental bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions and/ or public bodies.</td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from national bodies.</td>
<td>Demonstrable positive impact on veterinary education and practice at national and international level.</td>
<td>Presidency of major society with significant international profile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFESSORIAL ZONE DESCRIPTORS (Teaching, Learning and Scholarship)

Assessment in each of the four zones will draw on the following illustrative statements. It is assumed that a Professor at Level 2 has many of the attributes of 1, and one at Level 3 has the attributes of 1, and 2, etc.

There are different career paths so that staff may be appointed for excellence and academic leadership in i) Research (see relevant criteria) ii) Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (see below) or in iii) Clinical Veterinary Medicine (see relevant criteria). Whichever career track staff are following, the quality of input and outcome should be high in all cases.

It is expected that for promotion to any Zone, a professor would normally be able to demonstrate meeting the majority of the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the College zone descriptors. It is recognised that distinction in all of the areas detailed in the zone descriptors will very rarely be achieved. Professors will be placed into the appropriate zone normally on the basis of ‘best’ fit with the criteria outlined across the range of academic activity in the relevant College zone descriptor and ultimately to the zone to which there is an overall preponderance.

All professors, at every level, are expected to demonstrate significant collegiality and to lead both actively and by example with respect to School and College research/scholarship, teaching and leadership/management responsibilities. For the avoidance of any doubt, it is a normal expectation that all professorial staff make a significant contribution to UG/PG teaching. Examples can include submitting and marking exam papers within deadlines, giving lectures as assigned and evidence of course development that has benefited the student experience. Leadership/management responsibilities may include conducting performance and development reviews of academic staff within the School / Research Institute and mentoring junior colleagues. Professors at all levels should contribute to public engagement, and to external activity which benefits the national and international standing of the University.

ZONE 1: This is the normal entry level for those appointed to the Professoriate. Working at this level indicates an international reputation, reflected by a range and balance of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline

ZONE 2: The level for Professors with considerable academic distinction, and with ongoing excellent performance. Working at this level indicates an established international reputation for academic leadership, reflected by a range of the activities listed below as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 3: The level for Professors of excellent academic distinction internationally. Working at this level requires evidence of an internationally leading reputation for shaping the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.

ZONE 4: The level for Professors of the highest academic distinction. Working at this level requires evidence of international recognition as one of a group of world leaders in the relevant field of study, reflected by a range of the activities listed below, as appropriate to the opportunities and expectations of the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION A</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td>A sustained record of publication resulting in an outstanding body of world-leading scholarly output which has become an essential point of reference for a wide range of academic disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established scholar as evidenced by contributions to the advancement of knowledge and understanding, its creative or professional application in the field of teaching and learning at an international level; outputs to included 4 outputs in the most recent 6-year period which are significant (as evidenced by peer-review and other forms of recognised output including textbooks) and have influenced the practice of teaching or improved the student experience within the subject area and/or research field.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly output over career to date with international impact which includes 4 outputs in the most recent 6-year period which are significant and have influenced the practice of teaching or improved the student experience beyond the immediate subject area.</td>
<td>A sustained record of publication resulting in an outstanding body of world-leading scholarly output which has become an essential point of reference for the discipline and has demonstrable impact in other disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typically income of £100k in total over the last 6 years for developments in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Typically income in excess of £150K over the last 6 years for developments in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Typically income in excess of £300K over the last 6 years for developments in teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track record of successful PGR supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Typically income of excess of £500K over the last 6 years for developments in teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A substantial record of managing major international projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION B</strong></td>
<td><strong>KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE &amp; IMPACT</strong></td>
<td>Experience of developing knowledge for the benefit of non-academic communities e.g. through employer engagement.</td>
<td>A record of significant engagement with non-academic bodies (which may include community-based organisations) with successful collaborative initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of a commitment to public and/or cultural engagement, and/or to policy development in public institutions.</td>
<td>Evidence of a commitment to the development of industrial, public agency, third sector, or international educational partnerships.</td>
<td>Extensive experience of advising governmental and non-governmental agencies on educational policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application of knowledge to improve public sector performance and quality of life by</td>
<td>Contribution to inform policy</td>
<td>Extensive experience as a key advisor to international non-academic agencies or communities, including companies, governmental bodies, non-governmental organisations and cultural institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1</td>
<td>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 3 building on the previous zone</td>
<td>ZONE 4 building on the previous zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SECTION C**  
LEARNING & TEACHING | External examining at UG or PG level.  
Membership of subject review panels at other universities.  
Membership of national bodies with responsibilities for shaping the future of the discipline  
Sustained contribution to School (subject discipline) level learning and teaching committees.  
Sustained track record of developing innovative approaches to teaching, supporting student learning or assessment e.g. development of inquiry based approaches, provision of high quality feedback to students on their learning, design of new assessment procedure, effective use of and engagement with technology to support student learning. | Leadership role in national and/or international educational agencies with responsibilities for higher education policy and curriculum development.  
Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions.  
Sustained contribution to university level learning and teaching committees  
Leadership of significant L&T or related innovation at College/University level addressing key strategic priorities (e.g. retention, graduate attributes, improving assessment, etc). | Track record of participation in major government education advisory bodies or agencies with remits covering the education sector as a whole.  
Leadership of significant L&T or related innovation that has impacted on Higher Education practise. | Key advisor to international non-academic agencies or communities, including companies, governmental bodies, non-governmental organisations.  
Key role in major company resulting from transfer of research expertise, generating significant benefits to UK |
| **SECTION D**  
LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT | Leadership role in the management and support of strategic teaching / student support initiatives at Subject, School, College levels such as leading a major initiative in the growth of UG or PGT numbers resulting in new income streams  
Significant input to the development of policy at School level. | Significant leadership and management responsibilities for shaping the future of the relevant Subject/School within the University. e.g. College Dean.  
Appointment as external assessor for quality reviews of other HEIs.  
Leadership of a major cross-University initiative in teaching or enhancement of the student | Leadership of the development of policy at national level.  
Accountability in the implementation of long term strategic developments at School, College or University levels with significant internal/ external impact. | Leadership of the development of policy at international levels. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 1</th>
<th>ZONE 2 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 3 building on the previous zone</th>
<th>ZONE 4 building on the previous zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION E ESTEEM INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td>Fellowship of subject specific societies.</td>
<td>Committee chairmanship or council membership within subject specific society.</td>
<td>Fellowship of the Royal Society of Edinburgh or equivalent international academy (MRIA, FAHA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A track record of regular invited talks at national / international conferences /events and/or UK HEIs in relation to teaching and or the scholarship of teaching.</td>
<td>Membership of editorial board of journal(s) or book series.</td>
<td>Many plenary/keynote talks at major international conferences and/or invitations to deliver distinguished named lectures/lecture series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A track record of leading workshops, seminars in Learning and Teaching for national bodies such as the HEA and QAA.</td>
<td>Chairmanship of national working groups on aspects of learning and teaching</td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from national bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of education or training committees of professional institutions and/or public bodies.</td>
<td>Significant media exposure.</td>
<td>Visiting international appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant contribution to the University’s international profile in teaching.</td>
<td>Visiting national appointments.</td>
<td>Winning international appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winner of teaching awards from national bodies.</td>
<td>Presidency of a major subject specific society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of international committees, etc. concerned with teaching in Higher Education; collaboration with external bodies</td>
<td>Impact on learning and teaching practice at international level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winner of medals/prizes from overseas bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conferment of Honorary Degree(s) from the world’s top 100 Universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key advisor to international governmental and non-governmental bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presidency of major society with significant international profile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Court is asked to:

- **Note** that the University’s Carbon Management Plan had been re-drafted and that it would be presented to Court in December 2012. Court is asked to **note** that the existing level of financial investment (£2m) is insufficient to deliver on the University’s Carbon Commitment (EC/2011/44.1 refers)

- **Note** Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications in respect of:
  
  LM11/443 Gilmorehill Hall Fabric and Structural repairs in the sum of £300k (additional funding) (EC2011/45.4.1 refers); and

- **Note** the remainder of the minute of 30 August 2012.

Originator of the Paper

Lynn Duncan
Clerk to Estates Committee
15 September 2012
UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW  
Estates Committee

Minute of the meeting held in the Turnbull Room on  
Monday 30 August 2012

Present:
Mrs A Allen, Mr P Daniels (Convener), Mr R Fraser, Ms M Freel, Mr J Harrison, Professor N Juster,  
Professor W Martin, Ms M Morton, Mr D Newall

In Attendance:
Mrs L Duncan, Mr R Kilpatrick, Mr S Sutton

Estates Committee extended a warm welcome to the new Senate Assessor, Ms Marie Freel.

Apologies:
Principal

EC/2011/41 Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19 March 2012
The minutes were approved.

EC/2011/42 Matters Arising

EC/2011/42.1 Stevenson/GUU (EC/2011/37.3.2 refers)
The first meeting of the Project Board was scheduled to take place on 12 September 2012 at which a  
Major Projects Governance Structure would be agreed.

EC/2011/43 Declarations of Interest
There were no declarations.

EC/2011/44 Estates Strategies and Policies

EC/2011/44.1 Carbon Management Plan (CMP) and Next Steps
Estates Committee noted that reduction in the University’s carbon footprint is one of the twelve KPIs  
reported to Court each year and in 2011/2012 this was one of only two “red” KPIs.

Committee noted that Estates and Buildings had worked with The Carbon Trust to review and re-draft  
the University’s Carbon Management Plan which sets out a clear target for 2015/16 and identifies the  
projects which will deliver this target. The plan was reviewed by the Carbon Management Committee  
on 20 August 2012. Carbon reduction of 20% or 9,868 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent had been  
supported by the Carbon Management Committee.

Estates Committee was asked to consider the Plan and provide feedback after which the draft will be  
finalised with a view to approval by Court in December 2012.

Committee noted that the largest contributor to the University’s carbon consumption was electricity. The  
Plan therefore has a focus on building and infrastructure projects. In 2012/2013 it was proposed that  
£0.9m would be spent to deliver 47 projects with a carbon saving of 542 tonnes and a revenue saving of  
£0.1m.
In addition to improved building performance, the Plan identifies opportunities to reduce carbon consumption through greater staff and student engagement in energy saving, green travel and recycling and through changes in ways of working, notably developing video and telephone conferencing and other social network mediums to reduce the need for business travel.

Estates Committee noted that the re-drafted Plan had identified 95 projects with 89 currently funded. It also noted that the current investment of £2m would be insufficient to deliver on the University’s carbon commitment and that additional investment requires to be considered. Any request for additional funding would be supported by a fully developed business case.

The major unfunded projects, which would provide 25% of the total reduction required, were noted as: Replacement of current steam main and boiler point in lieu of CHP and district heating scheme with estimated savings of 1010 tCO₂e; CHP system for Library/Stevenson/Boyd Orr buildings (1000 tCO₂e; and roll-out of Building Energy Management System (BEMS) across campus.

Estates Committee noted that the Plan requires to be fully costed after which approval would be sought from Estates and Finance Committees.

The Committee agreed that: Estates and Buildings should commence the 2012/2013 projects immediately ensuring delivery during the current financial year; The Carbon Management Committee should be updated on the discussion at Estates Committee and asked to engage in progressing proposals for reduction in business travel; and Estates and Buildings should develop proposals for unfunded projects and build a business case to be brought to the November meeting.

EC/2011/44.2 Carbon Management Committee (CMC) 20 August 2012

The Committee noted the content of the minute of 20 August 2012.

EC/2011/45 Project Updates

EC/2011/45.2 Acquisition Site B Western Infirmary Update

Estates Committee was advised that progress was being made towards the acquisition of Site B and the Pharmacy site and that both parties were actively engaged in reaching agreement on Heads of Terms.

The Committee noted that work was on-going in relation to the practicalities of the NHS decant from the site and that a detailed exercise was underway to identify maintenance implications during the NHS tenancy period.

The Committee noted also the need to ensure that arrangements were made by the Health Board to allow suitable replacement of existing embedded space occupied by the University within the Western Infirmary and at Yorkhill.

EC/2011/45.3 Approved Projects Status (RAG)

The Committee noted the current status of approved projects.

EC/2011/45.3.1 CP01/525R: Translational Research Centre: The Committee was advised that there was a time delay as a result of commissioning, quality and some exterior landscaping issues. It noted that the University had applied its right to seek financial damages for the delay and that the revised final handover was expected to take place by the end of October 2012.

EC/2011/45.3.2 CP10/401: Boyd Orr Building (Level 10) Labs: The project was delayed by two weeks but would be completed prior to the commencement of teaching to allow technical space preparation time.

EC/2011/45.3.3 CP10/369: Post Graduate Social Space: The project was delayed by two weeks as a result of decant issues at the start of the project and a consequent two week delay in the commencement of works.
EC/2011/45.4 CapEx Applications

EC/2011/45.4.1 Gilmorehill Hall Fabric and Structural Repairs Update

Estates Committee noted that further to its approval of the original CapEx Funding application in the sum of £1.85m to include design fees and VAT (EC/2011/23.1 refers), a single stage tender exercise had been undertaken. The value of the winning tender for the construction elements was £1,519,214.00 plus VAT (£1,823,056.00). This tender value was in excess of the sum anticipated by the cost consultants of £1,307,000.00 plus VAT (£1,568,400.00).

In addition there had been additional/increased costs in respect of: tender price increase over original budget cost (£212,214.00); increase in Design Team fees (19,523.69); extension to scaffold hire period (£20,000.00); and VAT on these additional costs (£50,347.38).

Estates Committee noted and approved an additional funding application in the sum of £300k.

EC/2011/46 Estates Committee Operating Matters

EC/2011/46.1 Critical Path

The Director of Estates introduced the 2012/2013 Estates Committee Critical Path which would give the Committee foresight of the planned and scheduled activities in the forthcoming one-year business horizon and ensuring that sufficient notice and time is scheduled to debate known key issues.

EC/2011/47 Estates and Buildings Department Matters to Note

EC/2011/47.1 Operating Plan 2012/2013

Estates Committee was pleased to note the first Estates and Buildings Operating Plan which would focus predominantly on three Strategic Goals around People, Strategy and Delivery.

EC/2011/48 Any Other Business

There was no other business.

EC/2011/49 Schedule of Meetings for 2012/2013

Estates Committee noted the remaining scheduled meetings in session 2012/2013: Tuesday 6 November 2012; Monday 7 January 2013; Monday 18 March 2013; and Monday 20 May 2013.
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Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 19 September 2012 at 10:00 AM in the Senate Room

Present:

Ms Mae Boyd, Dr Gordon Duckett, Mr Robert Kilpatrick, Ms Joanne Mcfadden, Mr David McLean, Mr John F Malcolm, Dr Catherine Martin, Mr David Newall, Dr John O'Dowd, Ms Julie Ommer, Mr Paul Phillips, Mr Deric Robinson, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Selina Woolcott, Ms Jessica McGrellis

In Attendance:

Dr Nick Elliott, Mr Gordon MacKenzie, Mr Andy MacKay, Mrs Portia Lamb, Mr John Lauwerys, Dr Ann Galbraith (Clerk)

Apologies:

Mr Ian Black, Mr James Gray, Mr David Somerville, Dr Robin Easton, Mrs Ann Allen, Ms Kirsty Main (SRC)

Convenor’s business:

The Convenor welcomed Ms Mae Boyd (UCU), Ms Joanne Mcfadden (UNISON) and Ms Jessica McGrellis (SRC) as new members of the Committee and Mrs Portia Lamb (SEPS Safety Adviser), Mr Andy MacKay (SEPS Fire Safety Manager), Dr Nick Elliott (E&B Asbestos Manager) who were attending. In addition he welcomed Mr John Lauwerys, an independent consultant undertaking a review of governance at the University who was observing the working of the Committee,

H/FE/2012/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 30 May 2012

The Minute of the meeting of 30 May 2012 was approved.

H/FE/2012/2 Matters arising

The Convenor drew the attention of the Committee to the table of actions dated 30 May 2012 and in particular to those relating to portable appliance testing (PAT) in Social Sciences and to gas cylinder maintenance. It was agreed that Mr D MacLean and Mr J Malcolm would progress the action relating to PAT out with the Committee meeting. Mr D MacLean reported that the NHS did not have a contract for gas cylinder maintenance. A framework agreement for the purchase of compressed gases was under development for the H/FE sector at a national level and would be amended to incorporate the provision of maintenance services. This would be made available to the University when completed.

There were no matters arising from the Minute other than those to be dealt with through the Agenda.
HSWC/2012/2.1 Evacuation Chairs - practice and policy (verbal update DN)

Mr D Newall reported that he had discussed this with Mr D MacLean and Mr G MacKenzie and that these discussions were ongoing to clarify individual responsibilities.

HSWC/2012/2.2 Student safety, Kelvin Way (Paper 1)

Mr G Mackenzie reported that, following a recent serious assault in the area of 1 Lilybank Gardens, Central Services had been in contact with a number of relevant organisations, including the Police. A brief note on progress had been circulated to the Committee. Kelvin Way was confirmed as a potentially problematic area due to its proximity to the park. A number of potential remedies were discussed by those concerned but it had been agreed that there were no failsafe options. The University had now convened a group (The Personal Safety Co-ordination Group) comprising a number of agencies from within and outwith the University. Whilst it recognised that the University had a role to play in ensuring good management of its own areas, the Police and Local Authority were responsible for public areas where the University role could only be to support the production and promotion of messages around maintaining personal safety. One such message card was circulated at the meeting.

The Committee noted that the crime rate on campus was extremely low, relative to its population, and most reported crimes were thefts of bicycles. Outwith the campus the crime rates were also comparatively low in relation to the population. Nonetheless the University would continue to focus on the safety of students that were integrated into the wider community and to make any necessary changes that may support personal safety on the campus. The Committee thanked Mr G MacKenzie for his work on this.

HSWC/2012/2.3 SEQOHS accreditation (verbal update AS)

Ms A Stewart reported that the evidence in support of the application for accreditation had been submitted and an assessment visit scheduled for 9 October 2012. To date, the process had been very time consuming, particularly against the current background of their routine response to the influx of new students at this time of year. It was unknown when the outcome of the process would be notified.

HSWC/2012/3 Progress with programme of audits (Paper 2)

Ms S Woolcott reported that the 6 month programme of audits, undertaken by Marsh, were now complete and reports had been sent to Mr D McLean, Ms S Woolcott and the managers relevant to the areas audited.

The audits examined 38 factors for each of the 20 Colleges or Schools. The duration of each audit ranged from 1/2 to 1 day depending on the size of the unit being audited and was carried out by 2 consultants employed by Marsh. For each area audited, a score between 1 (best) and 5 (least good) was allocated for each factor. The outcome for the majority of these was a score of 2 (very good); however there were some areas/factors that scored 3 or 4 and a few where the score was 5. SEPS have been following up on how any scores of 5 have been responded to by the Management Unit.

For each Unit audited, the auditors gave a list of top 10 areas requiring attention. This grouping was based on a balanced view of the measures in place versus the actual risk. Some common themes had been identified in these shortcomings including lack of documentation, review procedures and other formalised procedures. It was agreed that whilst these shortcomings did not necessarily compromise safety, they may give the
impression of a lack of managerial control and oversight in the event of litigation and so were of importance.

SEPS would continue with a programme of follow up audits that would focus on specific topics and areas and would work to support Management Units by producing template documents and improving guidance where relevant.

Both Mr P Phillips and Mr D McLean noted that the process of audit was very time consuming for the Units being audited, Mr Phillips expressed concern that these activities were being required against a background of decreasing staff resource. Mr D Newall reported that this issue had been discussed by SMG and that Heads of College had indicated their full support to ensure that the necessary staff time was allocated.

Mr G Duckett thanked Mr D McLean and Ms S Woolcott for their help in addressing the issues raised in the audit and noted that the appointment of a Chief Technician in Chemistry would help them to address some of the issues that had been generated by that post being vacant for a period.

HSC2012/4 Management of Stress & Wellbeing Policy (Paper 3)

The University had carried out a staff attitude survey in March 2012. This was structured around a question set developed by Health & Safety Executive (HSE) that allowed organisations to benchmark outcomes. It used 35 questions to address 7 factors including stress, relationships and change. The response rate was similar to previous surveys that had been carried out, however the outcome demonstrated a general decline in scores compared with both the UK Employment Sector and Education Sector since the last survey in 2009. This effect was most noticeable in relation to manager and peer support (all Colleges) and, to a lesser extent, in demands (Research & Teaching and Clinical grades).

In the period between the recent surveys the absence management policy had been relaunched and Ms S Woolcott highlighted the following:

- Trends varied considerably between Colleges.
- In general, the number of absences related to mental health issues had reduced, but average duration of absences had increased.
- Overall, the numbers of referrals to Occupational Health for mental health issues had decreased, however self-referrals for mental health issues, particularly those that were work related, had increased.
- University wide, the average number of days lost through sickness absence was similar to that in the preceding year.

Ms S Woolcott also reported on the Employee Assistance Programme (EAP). Overall the use of EAP was low.

The Committee noted the following during discussion:

- The recent survey had taken place against a background of significant change in the University, principally organisational and systems change and staff reductions.
- The finding should inform good management for any future organisational change.
- The outcome allowed a clear focus on areas for improvement and this had begun with Ms S Woolcott working with SDS to ensure that appropriate training be delivered for team building, leadership development and support to managers.
• Training and development may be required by managers at all levels, including junior
managers, and this should be available. It was agreed that that Mr D Newall, Ms S
Woolcott and Mr I Black would progress this.
• Whilst there may be a range of measures in place to support staff, unless they were
willing to allow the involvement of line managers, the ability to address concerns
would be limited.
• Line managers needed to engage more with staff on a regular basis.
• Staff time/resource could be a significant constraint.

The Committee agreed that:

• The survey findings validated initiatives already underway to develop more resilient,
resourceful and effective leaders of engaged, supportive teams.
• Colleges also needed to consider/continue local initiatives on enhanced engagement,
supportive management and teamwork, and, in some areas, workload management.
• The availability of stress management training had not been as well promulgated as it
may have been and it was important that this was made available, particularly to
support managers of employees returning to work after absence.

HSWC/2012/5 Asbestos Management (Paper 4)

Dr N Elliott reported that:

• Mandatory training for staff in Estates & Buildings was complete.
• A central repository for asbestos had been established which would provide
specialist advice in planning work activities.
• A number of resources, including guidance, was under development.
• A “term” contract for asbestos removal would be developed and a contractor
appointed.
• The spend on asbestos removal for the period March to September 2012 had been
£200K and the future areas targeted would include the Boyd Orr building, James
Watt South building and Virology.

Dr Elliott thanked his colleagues in SEPS and elsewhere for the support he had received in
making progress and Mr Newall complimented him on the extent of this progress during the
short time since his appointment.

HSWC/2012/6 OH Report (Paper 5)

The Committee noted the comprehensive occupational health report and, in particular, the
following issues that were highlighted by Ms A Stewart:

• Much of the activity within Occupational Health was seasonal.
• Overall, appointments peaked in the final quarter of the year and self referrals in the
second quarter.
• There had been a large increase in the level of health screening reported. This
reflected a change in the way these were recorded with “paper” screening activities
now being included but also included an increase in appointments for screening.
• There had also been an increase in appointments associated with health
surveillance. This resulted from the service having identified a wider need for
surveillance in some Colleges/Schools that had not previously been addressed, The
Committee welcomed this improvement.
• The service carried out external work (e.g. for the MRC and Beatson). This would decrease when MRC staff were incorporated into the University. There would be a resultant drop in income.
• The service had increasingly become involved in the issue of "research passports". This development reduced the requirement for repeat screenings in staff whose activities required them to work in different institutions.
• The vaccination requirement for some undergraduate groups had increased due to a reduction in some vaccination types being given to children at school.
• Overall University Services was the largest user of the appointment system.
• The total number of self referrals had decreased when the second quarter of 2012 was compared to the same period in 2011. However, management referrals had increased. This may be linked to the re-launch of the sickness absence policy and the Committee generally noted this as a desirable trend.

HSWC/2012/7 Accident Statistics (Paper 6)

The Committee noted the report on accident statistics and in particular the following issues that were highlighted by Mr D McLean:

• There was a close similarity between the accident numbers recorded for the second quarter of 2011 and 2012.
• The number of accidents reported generally fluctuated in relation to the number of people on campus, with a decrease being seen during the summer period.
• The accident types reported fluctuated in relation to the work and study types being carried out at different times of year.
• The classifications of injury used by SEPS reflected those used by HSE. During the second quarter of 2012 there were 43 accidents reported to SEPS of which 2 resulted in an absence from work of more than 7 days and so required reporting to HSE.
• The HSE reporting criteria had changed and they now only wished to receive reports of absences greater than 7 days. To reflect this, future reports to the Committee would continue to record absences over 3 days but would also show absences of over 7 days.
• The principal causes of injury were animals, sporting activity and slips, trip and falls.

The Committee thanked Mr D McLean for his report.

HSWC/2012/8 Terms of Reference and Policy Statement (Paper 7)

The Committee is required to review its terms of reference annually. Mr D Newall and Ms S Woolcott had edited the remit to reflect recent changes, the major change being the incorporation of the role of the Radiation Safety Committee within the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee. The revised remit was available on the web at http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_239848_en.pdf and members were encouraged to review this and bring any issues to the Committee. The document would be reviewed again in 2014.

HSWC/2012/9 Employee Assistance Programme Report (Paper 8)

The Committee noted the report on the EAP and in particular the following issues that were highlighted by Ms S Woolcott:

• The service provider changed on 1 February 2012 and was now Positive People Company (PPC).
• Use of the new service was comparable to the use made of the previous provider during the same period.
• Total uptake of the service averaged 9 users per month and 78% of users received telephone counselling with the balance attending face to face sessions.
• Not all issues dealt with were work related. Of those that were, stress, bullying and disciplinary events were common features. Of the presenting problems during the report period only 6 were assessed as being work related.
• Service users were entitled to 6 sessions of counselling.
• One complaint was received during the report period. The provider had not identified that a service user would require support beyond the 6 sessions offered by them until the 5th session. The waiting time for this type of support through the NHS was 3 months thereby resulting in a significant gap. This would be further investigated. Although every effort was made to do so it was not always possible to make an appropriate diagnosis early on in the support, The Committee noted that, if issues around confidentiality could be overcome, it may be possible to provide interim support from within Occupational Health in these circumstances. Ms S Woolcott would investigate this possibility.
• The format of data and reports provided by PPC would change in future and the new format should be more useful to the University.
• PPC was negotiating a partnership agreement with other EAP providers and this may bring benefits to the University.
• Ms S Woolcott was pursuing the provision of targeted campaign information by PPC and this should raise the profile of the availability of the service.
• The University would not offer EAP support to staff family members as this was a taxable benefit in kind. A recent change to taxation had seen this liability extended to the provision of financial advice. At present the University provided financial information, but not advice, and care should be taken to note this change when developing future contracts.

Following discussion the Committee also noted that any increase in the current number of sessions would see a significant increase in cost and this could not be offset against the overall low use of the service. It was agreed that additional publicity of the availability of the service was required.

HSGC/2012/10 Employee Liability Report (Paper 9)

The Committee noted that there were currently 15 employee claims ongoing compared with 13 in September 2011.

HSGC/2012/11 Draft Fire Safety Policy (Paper 10)

Mr D McLean introduced the draft Policy that had been written by Mr A McKay and that had previously been made available to the Committee for comment. The Policy was an amalgamation of existing information that remained current with the addition of new information. Key amongst the new information was the addition of a description of the management structure relating to fire safety and also the duties of some key staff positions. The University approach to staff training was addressed in the Policy. With the reduction in the staff levels in SEPS fire safety section, an on-line approach to safety training was being considered and it was hoped that this change in approach might lead to a better management of training uptake by staff. The exception to this approach would be in training for Area Fire Officers and Fire Wardens where the intention was to increase the frequency of face to face training.
The Policy also set out target frequencies for the delivery of fire risk assessments with high risk areas (such as houses in multiple occupation and areas where there was a risk to sleeping occupants) undergoing 2 yearly reviews and other buildings being reviewed on a 3 or 4 yearly cycle depending on the risks associated with them. The Policy also included basic fire safety advice.

Mr A McKay also advised the Committee that there was a legal requirement for each building to have a fire action plan. It was not possible to make such documents entirely generic in nature due to the requirement to address disabled evacuation, the means for which had not been formally agreed by the University. In absence of suitable arrangements for evacuation it would be necessary to restrict the use of some buildings where special evacuation procedures would be required, but were not in place.

The Committee approved the terms of the Policy as drafted and agreed to ask Court for its approval to publicise the document. Subject to Court’s agreement the Policy would be publicised to Heads of School and Area Fire Officers and would be made available on SEPS web site.

**HSWC/2012/12 Health & Safety Risk Register progress report (Paper 11)**

The Committee noted that the report on this was generally positive and that it would be reviewed at the end of the year.

**HSWC/2012/13 Any Other Business**

There was no AOB

**HSWC/2012/14 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Thursday 13 December 2012 at 10:00AM in the Melville Room
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University Court - Wednesday 10 October 2012

Communications to Court from the meeting of Senate held on 4 October 2012

1. Induction of the Clerk of Senate

Having taken the oath of faithful administration in office, Professor John Briggs was inducted as Clerk of Senate. Professor Briggs was warmly congratulated by Senate on his appointment.

2. Honorary Degrees

The Clerk of Senate submitted the nominations for receipt of Honorary Degrees in 2013 recommended by the Honorary Degrees Committee. As previously arranged, the Clerk of Senate will provide the list of nominations on a confidential basis in an oral report to Court at its meeting on 10 October.

Senate endorsed a recommendation for the award of an Honorary Fellowship of the University. In accordance with the procedures for the consideration of Honorary Fellowships, this will be forwarded to Court for final approval.

It was noted that the Honorary Degree of DLitt would be conferred upon Dr Marilyn Cochran-Smith at the Graduation ceremony at 12.00 on 30 November. Members of the University Court are always warmly welcome to join the Academic Procession for Graduation ceremonies (further details of dates and times are included at the end of these communications). For gown hire, please contact Mrs Irene Aitken in the Senate Office at irene.aitken@glasgow.ac.uk giving the date of the ceremony which the gown is required for, height, Awarding University and Degree awarded.

The Clerk of Senate reported that His Excellency Nelson Mandela, the former President of South Africa, had agreed to accept the award of an Honorary Degree of the University. Discussions were presently taking place with the South African High Commission and the private office of Mr Mandela concerning the timing and nature of the occasion when the Honorary Degree would be conferred.

Senate also approved measures to speed the process for the consideration of nominations for Honorary Degrees. Arrangements will be made for the revision of the associated University Resolution.
3. Research Excellence Framework

Professor Beaumont, Vice-Principal (Research & Enterprise) updated Senate on progress with preparations for REF (Research Excellence Framework) 2014. In general, progress was being made in line with plans.

The University’s Code of Practice for the selection of staff for inclusion in the REF had been approved by the Higher Education Funding Council for England in July. The internal quality thresholds had been formally approved by Court in June. The threshold was a personal gradepoint average of 2.5, with no output rated at less than 2.0, with the exception of three Units of Assessment, which had set a higher threshold of 3.0.

The roles of key bodies involved in preparations were now confirmed: the College Assessment Panels, UoA Champions, the University Equality & Diversity Committee (which will consider cases of complex personal circumstances) and the REF Working Group. Categories of personal circumstances have been defined. The aim is to notify staff of outcomes by the end of October 2012.

The College Assessment Panels, which will decide whether staff are included in the REF, will operate until the end of 2012. It is intended to notify all staff of their status by 31 December 2012. An appeals procedure will operate until the end of June 2013.

It is anticipated that a total of 139 Impact case studies will be required. A total of 177 are being developed. Progress is in line with plans, which involve external review of the Impact case studies in March 2013.

Targeted recruitment or investment will be made where there is the potential to enhance the quality of submissions. The Lord Kelvin/Adam Smith Leadership Fellowship Schemes is also intended to help improve the University’s outcome.

4. Outcome Agreement with the Scottish Funding Council

At its meeting in June, Senate had received a report on the introduction of ‘Outcome Agreements’ between universities and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC). It had been reported that the rapid implementation of Outcome Agreements for 2012-13 precluded Senate and Court involvement in the development of the University of Glasgow Agreement. The University’s Agreement was circulated to Senate in early September.

At the meeting on 4 October, Senate heard that the negotiations with the SFC in the development of the University Agreement had proceeded positively; there had been recognition on both sides of their respective positions and responsibilities and SFC officers had been comfortable with the University’s approach.

Following the completion of the Outcome Agreements for the sector, SFC had met with institutional representatives to consider the development process. While the Funding Council had acknowledged the difficulties arising from the very urgent timescale for finalising the 2012-13 Agreements, the timescale for production of the 2013-14 would remain hectic. However, there would be the opportunity to consult Senate at its meeting on 6 December. Senior Vice-Principal Professor Nolan reported that the headings for the 2013-14 Agreements had just been announced. These were:
• Patterns of Participation
• Pattern of Provision
• Research Competitiveness
• University and Industry Collaboration
• Graduate Skills

It was also understood that additional funding would be available for access and possibly for knowledge exchange initiatives. Funds for these initiatives were expected to be significant: provided through use of the grant to the sector formerly provided for Rest of UK (RUK) student numbers.

It was noted that the Outcome Agreement for the University for 2012-13 referred to the Staff Satisfaction Survey as one of the University’s KPIs. It was queried whether the Survey findings had been embargoed. The Director of Human Resources, Mr Black, reported that the overall findings of the Survey were available online. HR were in the process of discussing with College Management Groups how to disseminate the Survey outcomes. It was important that School level information was provided, but this had to be balanced with consideration of sample sizes. A plan for organisational development was being produced in light of the Survey findings and would include actions relating to peer and management support. The Survey would be discussed further at the meeting of Senate on 6 December.

5. University provision in Nursing

Professor Nolan noted that the Outcome Agreement included reference to the University’s keenness to contribute to the national consideration of the coherence of nursing provision, and that, to that end, had initiated discussion with Glasgow Caledonian University colleagues to consider options for greater collaboration and integration. Senate was also reminded of the Academic Shape consultation exercise concerning Nursing that had taken place in 2011. The consultation had noted that the Chief Nursing Officer for Scotland had been requested to carry out a review of nursing and midwifery education and had recommended that the University should await the outcome of that review before making any decisions concerning future provision at the University. Professor Nolan continued that the national review had not been published, and that there was need to conclude the University consultation. In the meantime, there had been other very significant developments external to the University. The Cabinet Secretary, Mr Russell, and the SFC Chief Executive had both stated publicly that nursing student numbers were too high and that there were too many providers of nursing education. Providers had been requested to collaborate with neighbouring institutions to consider how provision could be better coordinated on a regional basis. This had underlain the statement in the University’s Outcome Agreement. Internally, members of the University consultation panel had met recently and, recognising the profound nature of the national developments, were submitting to Court a recommendation to end the internal consultation exercise. The associated report would be received by Court on 10 October.

Senate further heard that, in line with the SFC request, a Joint working Group had been established with Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU). The Working Group was being tasked with producing three options for collaboration between the universities. Professor Pignatelli, the Head of the Medical School, and Professor Nolan had met with Nursing staff to discuss the remit for the Joint Working Group and the resulting document had been agreed with GCU. The
Working Group had been asked to report by December. Discussions were also continuing with the SFC.

Mrs Sneddon, Head of the Division of Nursing & Health Care, reported that Nursing at the University had faced substantial challenges in the preceding 18 months, but wished to note that progress had been made. Events had just been held to mark the 30th anniversary of nursing education at the University, and Mrs Sneddon expressed her thanks to members of the Senior Management Group for their support. Mrs Sneddon continued that concerns continued, however, and she urged that the University’s consultation exercise was brought to a positive conclusion ahead of detailed discussions with Glasgow Caledonian. An indication of continuing support by the University would be very helpful in negotiations. Mrs Sneddon was concerned that uncertainty regarding the position of Nursing could undermine its negotiating position. The SRC convener for the College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences also reported that she had received expressions of concern from Nursing students that if the University was not publicly clear about its support for Nursing, it would make a poor impression on discussions with GCU.

The Principal thanked Mrs Sneddon for her comments. He reaffirmed that it was being recommended to Court that the internal consultation should be concluded. The Principal noted also that the external pressures affecting Nursing at the University were considerable. At the University, student numbers in Nursing were decided internally and formed part of the University’s allocation of funded student numbers. This contrasted with the position regarding other institutions’ provision, where numbers were directly controlled by Government. However, the Government had indicated that it wished to exert control over student numbers throughout Scotland, regardless of the basis on which their education was funded. In 2012-13, the University had suffered a 10% reduction. As the smallest provider nationally, the University was vulnerable. Any further cuts would seriously undermine viability and would at any event necessarily drive the University to discuss the future of its Nursing provision with other institutions. The distinctive nature of the University’s BN degree made it very important that it was preserved.

Mrs Sneddon reported that staff in the Division accepted there was need to collaborate. She requested that the treatment within the University of the options produced by the Joint Working Group was transparent. The Principal stated that the options to be produced by the Joint Working Group were likely to be broad in the first instance. He confirmed that Senate and Court would be involved in the consideration and approval of resulting proposals.

6. UK Border Agency Audit of the University

At the meeting of Senate in June, the Principal had reported that, along with all other HEIs, the University has been notified that it would undergo an audit by the UK Border Agency of its responsibilities as a ‘Tier 4’ (i.e., overseas student) licence holder before the end of 2012. This exercise was extremely important, as any finding of serious shortcomings in University practices with respect to the monitoring of students could lead to the suspension or even withdrawal of the University’s licence to sponsor non-European Economic Area students. The UKBA had advised that the audit could involve a team of their officers interviewing as many as 10% of the University’s Tier 4 population: over 300 students. Senior Management Group had established an Action Group to oversee preparations for the audit. The Group was convened by Dr Dorothy Welch, Deputy Secretary, and included representatives from the four Colleges and relevant University Services. The dates of the audit had not yet been confirmed to the University.
The Principal noted the recent withdrawal of London Metropolitan University’s ‘Highly Trusted Sponsor’ UKBA licence. While being challenged legally by London Metropolitan, the UKBA action had had an extremely serious impact on the students concerned and could harm the reputation of the UK as a country that welcomed overseas students. Other institutions had had their licences suspended and then restored.

The Principal stressed that the UKBA prescriptions concerning students were beyond the control of the University and the University was required to adhere to the terms of its Tier 4 licence. The University had a duty of care to its students to help ensure their continuing entitlement to remain in the country. Staff were strongly urged to assist in this. Senate received copies of the guidance that had been issued to Schools and Research Institutes detailing arrangements for monitoring student attendance.

7. Slavonic Studies Update

Senate received an update on developments concerning provision in Slavonic Studies from Professor Macklin, Head of the School of Modern Languages and Cultures (SMLC). Following the decision of Court in 2010-11 to discontinue the existing MA Slavonic Studies programme, Senate had invited SMLC, in conjunction with the School of Social and Political Sciences (SSPS), to consider devising a new interdisciplinary programme in the broad area of Slavonic Studies/East European Studies in which the study of at least one Eastern European language would be a compulsory component. The University taught a number of Eastern European languages within and outwith SMLC and these would all be available to students on the degree.

Colleagues from the relevant subject areas in SMLC had held a series of meetings to review current provision from Level 1 to postgraduate. A provisional shape to the degree had been established.

Colleagues in Central and East European Studies (CEES) had been consulted on the shape of the degree and to ensure differentiation of provision. It had been agreed that the programme would be run from SMLC. The programme might be available in the 2013-14 session, though 2014-15 was more likely.

Professor Macklin suggested also that the two Schools and two Colleges within which they were located might consider how best in future to organise co-operation more effectively and successfully through an enhanced Research Centre with a clear remit and overall responsibility for all Postgraduate Teaching and Research in the area of Central and East European Studies.

Professor French, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences (SSPS), noted that he was content for discussions to proceed regarding the new programme and for consideration be given to the suggestion regarding the promotion of a coordinated approach. There was agreement that there was no need for a further strategic review; it was preferable for matters to be taken forward by the staff directly concerned.

8. Research Misconduct – Policy and Code of Practice

Senate received for approval a revised Code of Policy and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research. The University’s procedures for investigating allegations of research misconduct were last updated in 2007. Since then, the Vice-Principal (Research & Enterprise)’s Office had investigated a number of allegations of research misconduct made
against University of Glasgow staff, including one complex case involving a number of other institutions in the UK and overseas. Each case had provided the opportunity to reflect on the procedures and a number of areas for improvement in process or clarity have been identified. In addition, the Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching, Research & Enterprise and the Senate Office had requested clarity in relation to investigating allegations of research misconduct involving students. The revision of the existing policy:

- Brought the procedures into alignment with the University’s new structure;
- Revised the definitions used for research misconduct;
- Proposed a number of procedural changes to the process (including clarification of the scope of the policy in relation to postgraduate research students, staff, visiting researchers, and former employees);
- Clarified the additional sanctions that may be imposed should an allegation be upheld, including arrangements for the retraction/correction of publications;
- Provided more detail about how multi-centre investigations will be managed;
- Revised provisions concerning timeframes so that these are more realistic and manageable.

Senate approved the proposed revised policy and procedures.

9. Senate and University Governance

It was recalled that numerous additional measures had been set in place that were intended to improve the effectiveness of Senate.

The Guide to Governance at the University, produced by Senate in conjunction with the Court and Principal’s Offices, contained provision for the establishment in appropriate circumstances of a Joint Senate/Court Working Group. The Working Group is not a standing body. However, in order to allow such a Working Group to convene rapidly, Senate had previously decided that it would proceed to identify its representatives on the group. It was agreed that proposals for determining the membership would be submitted to Senate for consideration at its meeting on 6 December. It was noted that SRC representation on the Working Party should be considered at that point also.

Senate also recalled the review of Higher Education Governance carried out by a group convened by Professor von Prondzynski and which had been published in February 2012. Senate had agreed a draft response to the report. It was reported that the Cabinet Secretary, Mr Russell, had spoken at Parliament in June, indicating that he supported ‘virtually all’ of the recommendations of the von Prondzynski review. Legislation was planned for the current Parliament, though it was expected that this would be concerned mainly with Further Education issues and widening access. With respect to Higher Education, the von Prondzynski recommendations involving the role of the Privy Council in HE governance, and possibly the development of a single statute might follow at some later date. It was likely that these activities would not be completed before the next parliamentary election. In the meantime, with the agreement of Scottish Government, a small group of Chairs of university courts had been established, to produce a new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance.

The possibility of new legislation meant that the Privy Council would be unlikely to consider the draft Ordinances concerning the composition of Senate. A further issue was that meetings of Senate are rarely quorate. The quorum is one-third of the total Senate membership of c. 500. It
was recalled that the quorum is not a matter that can be addressed directly through a new Ordinance; change would require fresh primary legislation. The Clerk of Senate proposed to submit recommendations to the meeting of Senate on 6 December to address, insofar as was possible, the matter of Senate meetings being inquorate. Senate approved this proposal, and agreed also that a small Working Group would be established to develop recommendations. The Working Group would comprise members of the Senate Business Committee (two elected, two ex officio members), the Clerk of Senate (Convener), SRC President, and the Director of the Senate Office and a further member of the Senate Communications Working Group.

10. MyCampus Update

The Secretary of Court provided an update on progress with MyCampus. Since the Senate meeting in June, the system had dealt with the graduations, student progression, undergraduate admissions and registration and enrolment. The greatest concern in 2011-12 had been for registration and enrolment. Problems had been experienced, and it was noted that some staff were dissatisfied, but there had been improvement over 2011-12, including the operation of the software. An IT infrastructure problem had caused difficulties at the start of registration. As a result, the planned introduction of direct admissions had been deferred. A review of experience of system use would be conducted, and staff were encouraged to participate. The SRC would consult students on their experience. It was expected that improvements would be made year-on-year.

In discussion, it was noted that staff had received payments in recognition of having dealt with severe difficulties at the start of 2011-12 in August 2012. This had meant that the payments had unfortunately coincided with the early difficulties experienced in the current session. This would be noted and the University would seek to avoid such circumstances in future. Members noted that there were local difficulties with registration and that inaccurate class lists had been produced in some instances. These matters were known about and steps were being taken to deal with them. The lack of a facility for the production of cohort lists was also noted as a desirable development.

11. Enhancement-led Institutional Review of the University

Senate noted that the third cycle of ELIRs carried out by the Quality Assurance Agency on behalf of the SFC would commence in 2012-13. The University’s ELIR3 would take place in February and March 2014.

The substantial aspects of the approach of ELIR 2 would be retained for ELIR3. The most significant and potentially helpful change was the increased focus on enhancement, with quality assurance matters being mainly dealt with at the outset of the review.

12. Senate Business Committee

The composition of the Senate Business Committee had hitherto comprised the Principal, Clerk of Senate, Vice-Principals and President of the Students’ Representative Council. It was recalled that Senate had agreed to expand the composition of the Senate Business Committee through the addition of eight members: one professorial and one non-professorial member of Senate from each College. The following appointments had so far been made:-
Ms Ann Gow, College of Arts  
Dr Simon Kennedy, College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences  
Professor Thomas Munck, College of Arts  
Dr Helen Purchase, College of Science & Engineering

The Senate Office would shortly seek nominations for the remaining vacant positions.

13. Appointment of Dean of Faculties

Senate was pleased to approve the Recommendation of the Principal to reappoint Emeritus Professor Jan McDonald for a third term as Dean of Faculties for three years from December 2012.

In recommending Professor McDonald’s appointment, the Principal noted that she had fulfilled the role of Dean extremely well, and had not missed a single Graduation in almost six years. Professor McDonald made a tremendous contribution to our graduations, providing a wonderful welcome to guests and prize-winners, graduates and honorary graduates. The Principal wished to record his thanks on behalf of Senate to Professor McDonald for the support she had provided.

The appointment of the Dean of Faculties is made by Senate every three years. The office of the Dean has existed since before the Reformation and is now entirely honorary. The official duties extend to attending graduation ceremonies and substituting for the Vice-Chancellor at graduations in the event that the Vice-Chancellor is unexpectedly indisposed. Professor Jan McDonald was the first woman to serve in the role in the University's history.

In approving Professor McDonald’s nomination, Senate noted that there were precedents for individuals serving three successive terms as the Dean: Archibald Campbell of Blythswood, MP, did so in the 1830s - having before that served no less than four separate terms.

14. Intimations

Senate stood in silence to mark its respect for two former members whose deaths had recently been announced.

Emeritus Professor Robert Davidson  
Emeritus Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature from 1972-91 and Principal of Trinity College from 1982-91, Professor Davidson had the unusual distinction of having held teaching positions at all four of the Scottish ancient universities. He received honorary degrees of Doctor of Divinity from the Universities of Aberdeen and Glasgow and held office as Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland from 1990-91.

Emeritus Professor Robert Ferrier  
Emeritus Professor of Natural Philosophy and Honorary Senior Research Fellow in the School of Physics and Astronomy, Professor Ferrier held the Chair in Natural philosophy at the University 1973-2002. Prior to this he was a Fellow of Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge and held research posts including positions at the Atomic Energy Research Establishment, Harwell, and at the Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge.
15. Service of Remembrance

Remembrance Sunday falls this year on 11 November. The Service of Remembrance will be held in the University Chapel at 10.45am and the sermon will be delivered by Reverend Norman Drummond.

Members of Court are warmly welcome to join the academic procession. Those who wish to do so are requested to assemble in the Fore Hall by 10.30am (dress: academic gown, hood and dark tie). In view of the limited seating available, members wishing to attend are asked to advise Mrs Irene Aitken, ext 3292, e-mail: Irene.Aitken@glasgow.ac.uk by 12noon on Monday, 5 November.

16. Senate Guest Night

The next Senate Guest Night, to which members of Court are warmly welcome, will be held on Thursday, 8 November 2012 at 7.00 for 7.30pm in the Senate Room. (Dress code: less formal, lounge suit.) Further details on the evening, including a reply slip, will appear shortly on the Senate Office website.

17. Winter Graduations

Winter Graduations will be held as follows:

- 26 November, 12.00noon Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences
- 27 November, 11.00am Science and Engineering
- 27 November, 4.00pm Arts
- 28 November, 12.00noon Social Sciences
- 29 November, 12.00noon Social Sciences
- 30 November, 12.00noon Social Sciences