**Court**

**Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 11 December 2013 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, Dr Robin Easton Co-opted Member, Professor Christine Forde Senate Member, Dr Marie Freel Senate Member, Professor Nick Jonsson Senate Member, Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP Rector (Chair), Professor Karen Lury Senate Member, Mr Brian McBride General Council Member, Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Member, Ms Jess McGrellis SRC President, Mr Donald Mackay SRC Member on Court, Cllr Pauline McKeever Glasgow City Council Representative, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Representative, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Mr David Ross General Council Member (Convener of Court), Dr Duncan Ross Senate Member, Dr Donald Spaeth Senate Member

**In attendance:**

Ms Christine Barr (Director of Human Resources), Professor Steve Beaumont (Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate), Professor John Chapman (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Murray Pittock (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal)

**Apologies:**

**Members:** Professor Miles Padgett Senate Member, Professor Michael Scott-Morton Co-opted Member, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Member

**Attenders:** Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal)

**CRT/2013/14. Announcements**

Court welcomed Cllr Pauline McKeever, Glasgow City Council Representative, to her first meeting of Court and welcomed back Donald Mackay, who had been re-appointed as SRC Assessor. Court also formally welcomed Christine Barr to her first meeting as the newly-appointed Director of Human Resources.

Susan Ashworth, Peter Daniels and Robin Easton were attending their final meeting of Court. Court thanked them for their contributions to Court and wished them well in the future.

**CRT/2013/15. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 9 October 2013**

The minutes were approved.
CRT/2013/16. Matters Arising

With regard to the reference at the previous meeting to Professor Frank Coton convening a working group to look at how best to plan for large student intakes, Court noted that the exercise was in hand and its scope included better integration of teaching accommodation needs with current and future planning data. This was particularly important in the context of the recent sharp increase in student numbers. It was noted that there might be some reduction in flexibility of subject choice for students, given what was likely to be a more forward-planned and rigid timetabling/class accommodation system. Jess McGrellis requested that action was taken as soon as possible to maintain a good student experience and asked that consideration be given to more creative use of large spaces when they were empty. It was noted that early use of the Western Site once available was a possibility.

In the meantime service provision was being reviewed in areas such as Sport & Recreation, the Disability Service and at the Student Advisory & Counselling Service, given the current pressures on them arising from high student numbers.

CRT/2013/17. Report from the Principal

CRT/2013/17.1 Research Excellence Framework (REF)

The University had made its REF submission on 27 November. This had involved a tremendous amount of work and co-ordination across the University community and the Principal recorded his appreciation to all those involved. The outcome was expected in December 2014.

Professor Steve Beaumont, Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise, briefed Court on key aspects of the submission and on ongoing follow-up work. An analysis of the submissions and process was under way. The introduction of the Impact Assessment element had been a key new feature of the exercise; details of case studies were noted. Professor Beaumont thanked all those involved in the REF preparation and submission.

Court noted a summary of submission details, recorded its thanks to all those involved in what had been a major exercise, and commended it to the University.

CRT/2013/17.2 Recent Awards

The Boyd Orr Centre for Population and Ecosystem Health had been nominated for a Queen’s Anniversary Prize for Higher and Further Education, and had been successful. Court recorded its recognition for this achievement.

CRT/2013/17.3 Singapore Graduation - 18 October 2013 and Update on Trans-National Education Hubs

The event had been the University’s first graduation ceremony outside Scotland in its history. Eighty students had received scrolls in a special ceremony to mark the first cohort of students to complete the Honours programmes run in collaboration between the University of Glasgow Singapore (UGS) and the Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT).

2013 had also seen the first cohort of students on the jointly-delivered engineering programme involving the University of Glasgow and the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC). The collaboration had strengthened ties with UESTC, which had begun in 2009 with joint research and student mobility activity.

The application for a joint Graduate School with Nankai University in Tianjin was currently lodged with the Chinese Ministry of Education.

CRT/2013/17.4 Key Activities

Court noted a summary of some of the main activities in which the Principal had been involved since the last meeting of Court, covering internal and external activities beyond daily operational management and strategy meetings. The activities were under the broad headings
of: Academic Development and Strategy; Internationalisation activities; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; Internal activities and Communications.

In response to a question from Duncan Ross regarding workload modelling, it was noted that further details would be brought to Court at a future date. An IT-based system was currently being developed, based on a common framework to be agreed, and which it was noted would be sufficiently flexible for local variations to occur. Court noted a request from Don Spaeth that lessons be learned from the MyCampus implementation and that the workload modelling system use existing data harvested from databases rather than require new data entry.

CRT/2013/18. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2013/18.1 Review of Governance Arrangements

Court had agreed in June 2013 that a Working Group should consider the composition of Court and report to the October meeting. In October, Court had approved the Working Group’s recommendation to proceed with Draft Ordinance 206, as originally approved by Court in February 2011. The draft Ordinance was intended to ensure a clear lay majority, and to assist Court in achieving a suitable balance of skills and experience. If the Ordinance were approved, the number of Co-opted members would increase from 5 to 10, the number of General Council Assessors would fall from 5 to 2, and the number of Senate Assessors would fall from 7 to 5.

The Ordinance had been on hold at the Privy Council since March 2011, on the advice of the Scottish Government and pending the outcome of the Review of HE Governance in Scotland. David Ross and David Newall had recently visited the Scottish Government to explain Court’s desire to proceed with the new Ordinance in order to comply with the terms of the new Scottish Code of HE Governance. They had asked that the Government confirm its support for the new Ordinance as soon as possible, or alternately that it clarify any concerns it may have regarding it. A response was awaited from the Scottish Government. Advice was also being sought on whether the Scottish Government or the Privy Council would require the University to undertake further consultation before finalising the text of the Ordinance.

Court agreed that, given the urgency arising from the timing of upcoming vacancies on Court in 2014, David Ross, the Principal and David Newall should brief Court by email if a response from the government was received before the next meeting. Court noted a request from Don Spaeth that Senate’s interest in this matter should be borne in mind also.

On a related matter, the Committee of Scottish Chairs had met in October and discussed the universities’ response to the new Scottish Code. As the body responsible for the new Code, the Chairs intended, in the spring of 2014, to review universities’ compliance with the new Code and to invite them to report on steps they had taken to improve their governance practice following publication of the Code in July 2013.

CRT/2013/18.2 Nominations Committee Business

CRT/2013/18.2.1 Court membership

At the June meeting, Court had approved a recommendation that an advertisement seeking co-opted members of Court be drawn up, with the aim of recruiting three suitably qualified members with expertise in, respectively, financial, estates and academic management. The current position regarding these three appointments was:

Finance: Suitable candidates had been interviewed for this position and Nominations Committee was recommending that Graeme Bissett be invited to become a Co-opted member of Court and a member of the Finance Committee for a period of 4 years with effect from 1 January 2014. Court approved the nomination.
Estates: Four suitable candidates had been interviewed for this position, with a final candidate to be interviewed on 17 December, following which a recommendation would be made to Nominations Committee, and, assuming that Nominations Committee agreed on a recommendation to Court, Court’s approval would be sought by email. The recommended candidate would then assume membership of Court with effect from 1 January 2014 and being able to attend the February meeting of Court.

Academic: The timescale for appointment to the academic management role on Court was less pressing, with the preferred candidate to assume office on 1 April 2014. It was intended to bring a recommendation to Court, via Nominations Committee, at the February meeting.

CRT/2013/18.2.2 Committee membership
There was currently a vacant position on Audit Committee and, in addition, Court had agreed in June that Remuneration Committee should be augmented by the appointment of an external lay member. A report on these two positions would be brought via Nominations Committee to Court in February. In addition, as previously advised, once the new co-opted members of Court were appointed, Court would be invited to appoint two new members to the Nominations Committee. This would be to fill the vacancy that will arise at the end of Robin Easton’s current term of office, on 31 December, and to increase by one the number of lay members on Nominations Committee, as agreed by Court in June 2013.

CRT/2013/18.2.2 Nominations Committee review
Court agreed to an external person being engaged to undertake a review of the way in which the Committee operated, by way of good governance practice.

CRT/2013/18.3 Glasgow University Union
On 25 November, Glasgow University Union had published the report of the inquiry into the culture within the Union. The inquiry had been convened by Professor Noreen Burrows, and contained a series of recommendations on future procedures, practice and constitutional arrangements. The GUU Board had published its response to the inquiry, accepting all the recommendations and setting out the steps that would be taken to implement them. Amendments to the GUU’s constitution would be considered by the Union’s AGM in March. These would require Court approval, and a paper would therefore be brought to the April meeting of Court.

With regard to progressing actions which the Board had previously indicated it would take forward, and to ensuring that this did indeed happen given the serious nature of what had occurred at the Ancients Debating Championship in April, David Newall confirmed the matter would be followed up through regular meetings which senior management had with GUU representatives. Court requested that the Student Finance Committee also maintain a watching brief on progress and let Court know if there were any concerns following the Committee’s meeting in April 2014, with a view to further discussion at a future meeting of Court if necessary.

CRT/2013/18.4 Employee Representative on Court
Susan Ashworth’s term on Court would end in January 2014. Three nominations including a Joint Union Liaison Committee (JULC) nominee had been received by the closing date of 6 December. An election would be held in the new year.

CRT/2013/18.5 Student Representative on Court
Donald Mackay had been reappointed as SRC Assessor on Court until 31 October 2014.
**CRT/2013/18.6 Director of Human Resources**
Christine Barr had been appointed Director of Human Resources with effect from 1 December.

**CRT/2013/18.7 Estates Strategy Day**
Court agreed that a half-day session should be arranged for April 2014, to discuss the Campus Strategy ahead of formal presentation of the strategy for approval later in the year.

**CRT/2013/18.8 SRC Constitution**
David Newall had approved a minor change to the constitution, relating to study abroad students being able to submit nominations in absentia to positions on the SRC Council.

**CRT/2013/19. People and Organisational Development Strategy**
At the pre-Court briefing, Court had received details about the People and Organisational Development Strategy. The finalised Strategy had been approved by the Principal’s Advisory Group and the Human Resources Committee in November, following earlier consultation with SMG, the HR Committee and the Campus Trade Unions. At November’s HR Committee, it had been agreed that the Strategy should be presented to Court in December for its approval.

The Strategy laid out the vision, mission and strategic HR objectives comprising seven key themes. In addition to the Strategy, a draft Delivery Action Plan and a number of Key Performance Indicators, of which more were also planned, had been developed. The Action Plan was intended to be a working document, subject to amendment as appropriate, as the Strategy was rolled out and implemented. This would involve Human Resource management teams and others across the University, with aspects of the Strategy being integrated into operational plans at a local level within Colleges and University Services.

The identification and development of KPIs for HR was potentially more challenging than for other areas such as Finance and Estates. Feedback and comments from Court on the proposed KPIs and inclusion of additional KPIs was welcomed. Many of the KPIs previously considered by Court had been incorporated within the new analysis.

Margaret Anne McParland asked if the University was willing to be an accredited Living wage employer. In response, Christine Barr noted that this was a matter that the University was happy to discuss with the trade unions.

Court had been invited to provide any comments on the draft Delivery Action Plan and the proposed KPIs. Court endorsed the implementation of the Strategy aligned to the University’s Strategic Plan.

**CRT/2013/20. Reports of Court Committees**

**CRT/2013/20.1 Finance Committee**

**CRT/2013/20.1.1 University Financial Statements as at 31 July 2013**

The Director of Finance, Robert Fraser, gave a presentation on the University’s financial statements for the year to 31 July 2013.

The operating surplus was £11.0m (£11.1m after exceptional items), which was the eighth consecutive operating surplus after a decade of operating deficits. This was £4.5m better than original budget, with £5.5m from operational movements (including staff savings of £3.9m and increased income of £1.7m offset by higher consumables of £1.6m), movements in endowments, FRS 17 and subsidiaries total -£0.8m. Cash and deposit
balances had closed at £152.5m, which was an increase of £35.6m in the year, mainly due to operating cashflows. Capital expenditure for the year was £27.2m, which was an increase of £4.4m compared to 2012. There had been an 18.8% increase in the value of endowment assets due to a higher return on investments in the year.

The net pension liability for the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme and Strathclyde Pension Fund had decreased by £62.8m due to greater than expected asset returns and changes in actuarial assumptions.

Court approved the University Financial Statements for the year to 31 July 2013. Court thanked Robert Fraser and his team for their work. Court’s thanks to the Colleges, for their efforts in ensuring the positive end of year outcome, were recorded.

Ken Brown, chair of the Finance Committee, highlighted the success of the Singapore Institution of Technology activity, reflected in the financial statements, and extended congratulations to those involved.

**CRT/2013/20.1.2 Universities Subsidiaries and Trust Financial Statements as at 31 July 2013**

Court approved the financial statements of the subsidiary companies and Trust.

**CRT/2013/20.1.3 US GAAP**

Court noted that the Finance Committee had received consolidated financial statements prepared in accordance with the United States Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (US GAAP) for submission to the US Higher Education Department. Finance Committee had agreed to recommend the accounts to Court.

**CRT/2013/20.1.4 Stevenson Building Extension Update**

All five tenders returned for the project had been substantially over budget. The project team had therefore sought to achieve savings through value engineering, while still retaining the functionality and features required in the development. At Estates Committee, it had been reported that, following the value engineering exercise, the project was an estimated £440k plus VAT over budget. Estates Committee had agreed on the importance of delivering the capital project, but had asked that further work be committed to reviewing costs so that, before Finance Committee was asked to approve a revised budget, there would be a greater degree of confidence regarding the likely cost of the project. Finance Committee had supported this approach and had asked to be updated at its next meeting, in January 2014, when it should receive a revised business case for the project. The Sport & Recreation Service and the GUU had each been asked to consider fully the impact these changes would have on their income projections.

**CRT/2013/20.1.5 Clydesdale Bank Facilities Letter**

Finance Committee had discussed the position with regard to the Clydesdale Bank, noting that Audit Committee had raised the issue of the Bank’s credit rating. Although the holding company, National Australia Bank, was rated AA, the Clydesdale Bank itself was not. The Committee had agreed that the risk/exposure was significant, given the substantial funds which could be deposited overnight.

The Committee had agreed that banking services should be put out to tender.
CRT/2013/20.1.6 Endowments Investment Report
Court noted the Endowments Investment Report.

CRT/2013/20.1.7 Financial Overview
Court noted the Period 2 2013/14 Overview of Performance.

CRT/2013/20.2 Audit Committee
Kevin Sweeney would present the annual report from the Audit Committee to Court in February 2014, since he had tendered apologies for the current meeting.

The Audit Committee had received the 2012/13 financial statements for the University and subsidiaries, together with the external auditors’ report and the draft management representations. The Committee had also received the annual report from the internal auditors.

The Committee had asked to be kept updated with regard to IT Resource and Management matters, where the Committee had noted that a report on IT-related matters was being compiled for Information Strategy and Planning Committee, for further discussion at SMG.

Over the summer, a tendering process had taken place for the contract to provide the internal audit service. PricewaterhouseCoopers had been successful in securing the new contract and had replaced Deloittes from 1 November 2013. Their contract was for three years.

CRT/2013/20.3 Human Resources Committee
The HR Committee had received an update report regarding industrial action, progress with the Early Career Development Programme, Performance and Development Review and the HR system implementation. The People and Organisational Development Strategy and the associated Delivery Action Plan and KPIs had also been discussed and approved, and had now been presented to Court. The revised Flexible Working Policy had been approved by the HR Committee on behalf of Court.

The equal pay report had been discussed and it had been agreed that this would be reviewed on an annual basis by the HR Committee as one of the future HR KPIs.

CRT/2013/20.4 Estates Committee
CRT/2013/20.4.1 Estates Committee Remit
Court endorsed Estates Committee’s approval of a revised remit, amending it from:

“Develop and maintain strategic estates plans for consideration by Court, taking into account academic need, resource implications and the importance of environmental sustainability”

to:

“Develop and maintain strategic estates plans for consideration by Court which support the delivery of the University’s Strategic Plan taking into account resource implications and the importance of environmental sustainability”.

The remit has been reviewed in the context of ensuring that the future business of the Committee was focused on delivery of the University’s Strategic Plan.

CRT/2013/20.4.2 Estates Committee Business
Court noted the progress made in respect of the Estates Strategy, the successful award of
HLF funding and in respect of the Kelvin Hall project, and the current position in respect of the GUU/Stevenson project which had been referred to in more detail under the Finance Committee report.

CRT/2013/20.5 Remuneration Committee

This item had been considered at the beginning of the meeting, and in the absence of the Principal and Court attenders, with the exception of the clerk and the Director of HR, Christine Barr.

The report was noted, including details of the Committee’s annual review of the salaries of the Professoriate and of members of the Senior Management Group, where for the latter group salaries had been uplifted on a scale of 0% to 2%, depending on performance in the previous year. Court agreed that as a matter of retention of high performing senior staff, pay awards were desirable. Court noted Margaret Anne McParland’s comment that all categories of staff should be offered the same percentage uplift, in accordance with the Remuneration Committee's own statement about pay constraints. Court also noted that with the inclusion of increments, the average increase for staff in general was expected to be approximately 2.5% and that many staff also had the opportunity to apply for awards through the reward and recognition process. Court further noted a comment that a large proportion of staff on lower pay did not get these latter awards nor did they have the opportunity to apply for them.

CRT/2013/21. University of Glasgow Pension Scheme UGPS

At the October meeting, Court had confirmed its earlier decision that benefits under the existing UGPS scheme should be brought into line with those under USS, and that the existing scheme should be continued for existing members but closed to new entrants, with a new Defined Contribution Scheme offered to new entrants.

Court had also been advised that the addressing of the ongoing deficit within UGPS was a separate matter and was being discussed with the Trustees and their actuary, with a view to a shared set of assumptions on the discount rates and the deficit level which would inform the recovery plan. The expert working group set up earlier in the year, with a remit to consider proposals from SMG, had therefore continued to exist, given that these matters had not concluded.

Court noted that significant progress had been made recently, with coalescence between the University and the Trustees on the assumptions used and therefore the level of deficit. Court noted a written report on the updated position and a further update from Robert Fraser, Director of Finance at the meeting, noting in particular that volatility of markets remained a key factor.

Court was asked to consider recommendations relating to: creating a security to the benefit of UGPS, to be restricted to a named asset or building; paying an additional annual contribution into the past service deficit until the scheme was fully funded on the currently agreed technical provisions; the introduction by the Trustees of a dynamic de-risking strategy (to involve a move away from equities to a more stable vehicle), aimed at reducing the inherent investment risk in the scheme - this strategy would be determined by the Trustee’s Investment Advisory Committee for the scheme based on an open tender exercise; increasing the deficit funding if a collapse in asset values drove the funding level below a level that was as yet to be agreed; and authorising SMG to agree increases in the current benefit accrual costs up to the budgeted level approved by Court. These matters, including the proposed use of current cash balances, would require to be verified by the Covenant Assessment team in the accountancy firm engaged for the exercise.

Court noted from Ken Brown, the chair of the subgroup, that in the context of the Pensions
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Regulator pursuing the matter vigorously, the group considered that the proposals were sensible and pragmatic, and that, with regard to the security, did not impinge on the University’s ability to fund major projects such as the Western Infirmary development.

Brian McBride questioned in particular the need for such a long-term proposed solution at such an early stage, in the context of recent market drops having being extreme, the more recent upturn being significant, and a lack of evidence that matters would revert to the previous very negative position. Robert Fraser referred to the need nevertheless to manage the risk, in a practical way over a number of years, which the present recommendations sought to do. If it transpired that the sums required to meet the UGPS deficit were able to be covered in a shorter timeframe, or reduced to zero, then under any arrangement agreed with the Regulator, payments would be able to cease.

Court noted that the Regulator was currently demanding that measures be taken, with all other affected institutions in a similar position, therefore a proposal agreed by all parties connected to UGPS would be required within the timeframe of June 2014 set by the Regulator, otherwise the latter could impose a solution, a situation which the University wished to avoid. Court noted also that the University remained ultimately liable for the deficit and therefore a cash contribution of some kind, made in a managed way, was going to be essential.

With regard to the de-risking strategy, it was noted that, if approved, this would involve an individual fund manager who would be involved in a much more detailed way than was currently possible with the investment managers, and who would be looking at assets and liabilities on a much more frequent basis to make appropriate adjustments.

Following further discussion, Court agreed that members with particular concerns would contact Robert Fraser with the details, ahead of Mr Fraser providing an update to the February 2014 Court meeting, the update to include further details about the context of the situation leading to the proposals; more information about the flexibility of the solution, for example if payments would be able to be reduced, or a re-negotiation of terms be possible, if markets improved; and more information on the form, terms and potential impact of the security. A final decision would be made at the February 2014 meeting. It was also agreed that, in the circumstances, the subgroup would continue to exist.

CRT/2013/22. Report from the Rector

The Rector had highlighted a clear theme running through much student interaction, relating to problems and pressures generated by the large numbers on campus. With regard to disability provision on campus, in the current session the Rector had heard more specific and general expressions of concern, possibly as a consequence of larger number of students. One particular point raised had been that there was not a designated autism expert within the professional campus provision.

Court noted that the matter of Wednesday afternoons being set aside for sporting interests, and other possible options that might be considered to permit flexibility, was being discussed

The Rector had also noted that the GU Climate Action Society was running an online petition relating to investments in companies associated with fossil fuels and might formally seek University disinvestment based upon ethical considerations. The matter would be dealt with via the Policy on Socially Responsible Investment, with representations to be made in the first instance to the Secretary of Court. The key criterion against which specific cases would be considered would be whether the activity complained of and substantiated by the concerned group, was wholly contrary to the University’s value systems.

Court noted details of a House of Commons Questions relating to a recent Home Department (Immigration) debate, in particular a point on international student figures and disparities.
between the UK university sector’s view about potential loss of income and international goodwill, and figures published recently showed an increase on the previous statistics for numbers of such students going to UK universities.

**CRT/2013/23. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**CRT/2013/24. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 12 February 2014 in the Senate Room
Court - Wednesday 12 February 2014

Principal’s Report

Items A : For Discussion

1. Universities Superannuation Scheme USS

Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) is the main national pension scheme provided by Universities, Higher Education and other associated institutions for their employees. Membership is more concentrated within pre-1992 institutions, whereas staff in many post-1992 institutions are members of the Teachers and Local Authority Pension Schemes.

USS has recently started a process of engagement with employers as it approaches a triennial valuation in March 2014. At the time of the 2011 valuation the scheme showed a substantial deficit of £2.9bn and a recovery plan and a package of benefit changes was approved by the Trustees. Court will be aware from press reports that the estimated deficit has grown over the last 3 years. Universities UK is the designated body which represents all approx. 400 employers (not all HE institutions) in discussions with the USS Trustees. In turn, Universities UK, with their pensions advisers are consulting individual universities through public meetings and a web survey. We will keep Court informed as the discussions evolve between the USS Trustees and Universities UK.

There will be a separate update report on the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme (UGPS) on the Court agenda.

2. Outcome Agreement 2014/15 to 2016/17

Court members have been kept updated since 2012 on the background to and content of our Outcome Agreements which is now required to be submitted to the SFC as a condition of funding. These Agreements set out what Colleges and Universities plan to deliver in return for Government funding, with a focus on the contribution made towards improving life chances, supporting world-class research and creating sustainable economic growth for Scotland. There have been changes to the process for 2014-15, following SFC engagement with the sector, including an evaluation of the 2013-14 process. The most significant change is the introduction of 3 year outcome agreements. The SFC has been working with institutions on the transition to this, taking account of the University’s planning cycle. The 3 year agreements will be subject to annual adjustment in discussion with the SFC and there will remain a requirement for Universities to account for the funding received in the preceding year and to submit an annual self-assessment. A draft of the University’s Outcome Agreement for 2104-15 to 2016-17 has been discussed with the SFC during late 2013 and early 2014, ahead of indicative funding allocation decisions in January 2014. The final sign-off of Agreements will be before the end of March 2014. Ahead of this, Court is being provided with the final draft [see http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_329814_en.pdf]
Professor Neal Juster will be able to respond to any questions that Court members may have. The large majority of SFC funding will continue to be formula based, through allocations for teaching, research and knowledge exchange funding. Specific sums may be linked to the achievement of specific outcomes.

**Items B: For Information**

3. **Appointment of Vice-Principal Internationalisation**

Professor James (Jim) Conroy has been appointed as Vice-Principal Internationalisation, and took up his appointment at the beginning of January. This is a key role, given the critical importance of internationalisation to the University's overall strategy.

Professor Conroy was until recently based at the School of Education, within the University’s College of Social Sciences and was Dean for European Strategy and Engagement and Professor of Religious and Philosophical Education. His new appointment as Vice-Principal will be for a period of five years in the first instance.

4. **Key activities**

Below is a summary of some of the main activities I have been involved in since the last meeting of Court, divided into the usual 4 themes: Academic Development and Strategy; Internationalisation activities; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events. In order to cut the length of this report I have provided brief headings and can expand on any items of interest to Court.

4.1 **Academic Development and Strategy**

**Staff Appointments**

- I continued to pursue options for appointing a new VP – Head of College Science and Engineering to replace Professor John Chapman when he retires in the summer. A date has not been fixed for the VP - Head of College Arts appointment, but is likely to be at the end of February or in early March.

- I also participated in interviews for Head of School Medicine/Director of Institute of Health and Wellbeing,

- I will be involved in interviews (10 & 11 February) for the VP Research and VP Innovation and Knowledge Exchange.

**Launches**

- I attended and spoke at the launch of the International Max Planck Partnership at the Royal Society of Edinburgh. The University, and college of Science & Engineering in particular, are delighted to be a key and leading member of this prestigious group.

- I attended the official launch of the new Innovation Centre: Sensor & Imaging Systems (CENSIS) in Glasgow. The University of Glasgow is the lead co-ordinator of CENSIS, as it is with the Innovation Centre, Stratified Medicine Scotland (SMS-IC). The Minister for Energy, Enterprise and Tourism spoke and formally launched the Centre.
Building partnerships

- I hosted a lunch, as a prelude to a meeting organized by the Head of College and colleagues in the College of Science & Engineering, for Professor Sir Peter Knight, Senior Research Investigator in the Physics Department at Imperial College and Senior Fellow in Residence at the Kavli Royal Society International Centre at Chicheley Hall. It was an opportunity to discuss the University’s plans around quantum technologies and the International Max Planck Partnership.

- I hosted a dinner in the Lodging for SMS-IC on 20 January which preceded an important visit the next day of representatives from the Technology Strategy Board (TSB). The TSB was visiting to discuss and explore the theme of *UK Activities in Stratified Medicine* and Catapult Centre. The TSB’s aim is to ‘accelerate economic growth by stimulating and supporting business-led innovation’.

- I met with representatives from the Pears Foundation to discuss the Olive Tree Initiative in the School of Social and Political Sciences (22 January).

- The Head of College, MVLS, the Secretary of Court, and I attended GU/NHS Joint strategy Group meeting (28 January)

Strategy

- We will hold a Future Scoping Strategy Workshop (10 February), which is aimed at bringing together a number of academics across the Colleges to think creatively about the future direction of the University in terms of identifying areas of research development which will underpin our academic and estates strategy.

4.2 International Activities

- I welcomed Friedrich Lueth, President of the European Association of Archaeologists to the University on the 4 February.

4.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

Speaking engagements

- On 12 December I attended and spoke at the Royal Medico-Chirurgical Society of Glasgow Dinner in Trades House. It was an opportunity to update the Society and its guests on developments within the Medical School and college of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences.

- I was invited to speak at a project event run by the ESRC as part of its *Future of the UK and Scotland Programme* (29 January). I was asked to speak on: *The Future of higher education in Scotland and the UK* in my capacity as Convener of the Universities Scotland Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee.

External meetings

- I attended the Scottish Funding Council Board meeting (13 December); the Glasgow City Marketing Bureau Board meeting (17 December); and USS-EPF meeting in London (13 January).
As Chair of the Universities UK Employers Pension Forum (EPF), I have chaired two employer briefing and consultation meetings on USS’ engagement with the sector and employers views – one in Edinburgh (27 January) and a second in London (30 January).

I chaired the Universities Scotland Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee (RKEC) meeting (14 January).

I attended the Russell Group Board meeting on 30 January. As requested I provided members with an update on issues affecting the Scottish HE sector.

I attended the joint Skills Development Scotland/SFC Skills Committee Meeting (5 February). The Skills Committee aims to contribute to creating a learning system that is accessible to all, enhances employability of learners and increases the demand for skills among employers and individuals.

The University will host its SFC Strategic Dialogue meeting on 7 February.

Key Stakeholders

The Chief Executive of NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, the Head of College MVLS and I met with the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Well-being in Edinburgh (17 December) to follow up on proposals regarding our South Glasgow developments in imaging and clinical research and on 15 January, Professor Dominiczak and I returned for a follow up meeting with the Cabinet Secretary and the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning to discuss Medical education.

I, along with Professors Neal Juster and Marian Scott met with the Chief Executive and the Leader of Glasgow City Council at the City Chambers to discuss collaborations between GCC and the University, including Future Cities and potential new collaborations around Urban Data (22 January).

I attended the Lord Provost’s Burns supper (24 January).

Lodging Dinners

I hosted a dinner in the Lodging for the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (28 January) and the Chancellor hosted, on my behalf, a dinner for Archbishop Tartaglia on 2 February. Both presided over services in the Chapel prior to dinner, with the Archbishop celebrating Choral Mass. These two events have now become an annual tradition.

On 29 January I hosted a dinner in the Lodging for Head Teachers, another annual event and an opportunity to hear and share views on current issues affecting education in schools and Universities.

4.4. Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

On 17 January I attended the London Burns Supper for Alumni and friends.

I attended and spoke at a reception to mark the Save a Child’s Heart Exhibition currently showing in the University Chapel.

I attended and welcomed the speaker, Professor Paul Weindling (Oxford Brookes University) to the University’s annual, public, Holocaust Memorial Lecture.
• I continued my monthly meetings with the SRC President and sabbatical officers.
• I attended the General Council Half yearly meeting on Saturday 1 February and provided a University update report.
• I hosted the annual Lodging reception for staff and student officers on 3 February.

5. Senior Management Group business

In addition to standing and regular items the following issues were discussed:

*SMG Meeting of 18 December, 2013*
- Sport and Recreation Service
- Deloitte Review: *Student recruitment to Support growth*
- Complaint Procedure Update
- ‘Transforming Research Management’ Project
- Distance Learning

*SMG Meeting of 15 January, 2014*
- Pensions update
- Update on Entry Targets for Undergraduates 2014-15
- Student Residential Accommodation 2014/15
- Communications Report
SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Ordinance on Court composition

Court agreed at its October 2013 meeting that it would take forward changes to the membership of Court, as set out in Draft Ordinance 206 and as originally agreed by Court in February 2011. More recently Court was advised that the Scottish Government's advice is that a fresh round of consultation is required, and that such consultation should include Senate and the General Council.

There is an urgency about taking forward the new Ordinance, because of the need to:-

• comply with provisions of the new Scottish Code of HE Governance, particularly those regarding a clear lay majority and the appointment of Court members on the basis of their skills and experience. It is expected that the Code will come into effect later this year and compliance with it will become a condition of grant funding; and

• clarify the position regarding the future number of General Council members, given that two GC assessor positions will fall vacant in July 2014.

Court has the power to initiate consultation of one month's duration, rather than the standard 8 weeks’, on the grounds of urgency, but Court would not want to leave itself open to the criticism that it had not allowed a sufficient period for consultation. Indeed, it would be prudent to ensure that the consultation period is such as to include the dates of the next regular meetings of the General Council Business Committee (GCBC, on 27 February) and of Senate (17 April).

Court is therefore asked to initiate a fresh consultation on the draft Ordinance, starting on Monday 17 February and concluding on Monday 21 April. This period, 9 weeks in total, will allow formal submissions to be made by the GCBC and Senate, as well as allowing sufficient time for individual submissions. The proposed consultation material is annexed. It will be adapted as appropriate for the General Council.

Court next meets on 16 April, at which point the consultation exercise will not have concluded. In order to expedite this business without delay, Court is asked to approve the establishment of a short-term Governance working group, chaired by the Convener of Court, and including lay, Senate, staff and student members. The working group would provide April Court with an interim report on the consultation process, and would then consider submissions received after that date, including from the Senate meeting on 17 April. The working group would then recommend to Court either that the Ordinance should be submitted to the Privy Council as drafted, or that amendments should be made in the light of matters raised
through the consultation process. In view of the need to avoid delay in progressing this business, Court members will be asked if they are willing to approve the working group’s recommendations by email. If they are not, then the matter will be discussed further at the June meeting of Court.

Given that advice was first sought by the University on this matter in July 2013, the Scottish Government has been asked for an assurance that, upon completion of the consultation exercise, and assuming Court decides to re-submit a draft Ordinance, it will progress its consideration of this matter and provide advice to the Privy Council without delay. The Scottish Government have responded positively to this request, confirming that it will help ensure an early and positive result once a new draft ordinance has been submitted.

A.2 SFC Strategic Dialogue meeting

Court members will have seen the update on Outcome Agreements, contained in the Principal’s Report. The SFC recognises the complementary nature of Strategic Dialogue meetings and the Outcome Agreement process. From February 2014 the SFC has introduced a new three-year cycle of dialogue meetings. The University’s meeting will be on 7 February. The previous such meeting was in June 2010.

The dialogue meetings involve discussion between representatives of the University (governors and senior managers) and of the SFC (board members and the Outcome Agreement manager). The dialogue aims to help the SFC’s understanding of our mission and progress in meeting Scottish Government priorities, and to assist the University’s understanding of the SFC’s strategic aims. It also provides an opportunity for institutions to demonstrate their impact and highlight their ambitions.

The schedule for the dialogue meeting on 7 February includes sessions on the Campus Estates strategy, Widening Participation, and Knowledge Exchange, as well as a staff engagement session and a student session. Court will be updated at its 12 February meeting.

A.3 Socially Responsible Investment Policy

Court may remember that the above policy was approved in 2009 and contains a provision whereby groups from within the University may make representations in respect of an investment or investments held by the University, where those groups have concerns.

Following the last meeting of SRC Council, a request has been made that the University of Glasgow divest from fossil fuel industry companies in accordance with the University’s Policy on Socially Responsible Investment.

A summary of the motion passed at the SRC Council meeting is:-

“The SRC notes that the University of Glasgow has signed up to the Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges initiative entitled ‘Universities and Colleges Climate Change Commitment for Scotland’ which is a public declaration of the University’s intent to address climate change, and that the University intends to reduce its carbon emissions by 80% by the year 2050.

The SRC believe that these commitments are undermined by the fact that the University has investments in fossil fuel companies including Shell, BP, Chevron, Billiton and Centrica currently totalling nearly £19million. The fossil fuel industry, by extracting, processing, promoting and facilitating the use of, selling and profiting from
fossil fuels, is complicit in causing climate change and its catastrophic impacts. Our University should be a role model in society and take the lead amongst UK universities by acting responsibly and helping to create a safer and cleaner future.

Therefore the SRC urge that the University extend its commitment to tackling climate change to its investment portfolio and divest from the fossil fuel companies named above within a reasonable time frame to be agreed between SRC and the University.”

In accordance with the Socially Responsible Investment Policy [annexed] a working group will be established to consider this representation and advise Court. The working group will comprise: two lay members of Court, one Senate assessor, one SRC representative on Court and the Secretary of Court.

A.4 Nominations Committee Business

i) Court membership

At the June meeting, Court approved a recommendation that an advertisement seeking co-opted members of Court be drawn up, with the aim of recruiting three suitably qualified members with expertise in, respectively, financial, estates and academic management. At the December meeting, Court approved the appointment of Graeme Bissett, as a member of Court and of Finance Committee for a period of 4 years from 1 January 2014.

With regard to the ‘estates vacancy’, Nominations Committee agreed on a shortlist of five suitable candidates for this position. Interviews took place in November and December and following a recommendation from Nominations Committee which was agreed by Court by email, David Milloy has assumed membership of Court for a period of 4 years from 1 January 2014. David was already a lay member of the Estates Committee and will continue with this role in his capacity as a Court member.

Nominations Committee also recommended that Alan Seabourne be appointed to Estates Committee, for 4 years from 1 February 2014 as a co-opted lay member, effectively replacing David Milloy as the co-opted member. Court has approved this via email.

With regard to the ‘academic management vacancy’, Court has been advised that a recommendation is not being made from the Nominations Committee, since no-one with suitable experience was identified. However, following the interviews for the other positions, Nominations Committee is recommending that Heather Cousins be appointed to Court as a Co-opted member with effect from 1 April 2014 for four years, and also as a member of the Audit Committee from that date. Heather is a senior civil servant with responsibility for higher education, and has substantial Audit Committee experience. Court will recall that there is a vacancy on the Audit Committee. Court’s approval of this recommendation is sought.

When recruiting additional lay members later this year Nominations Committee intends to seek to attract someone with academic management experience, to replace the skills gap created by Michael Scott Morton leaving Court.

ii) Committee membership

There remains a vacant external position on the Remuneration Committee. In addition, as previously advised, once the new Co-opted members of Court are
appointed, Court will be invited to appoint two new members to the Nominations Committee, to fill the vacancy that arose at the end of Robin Easton’s term of office on 31 December, and to increase by one the number of lay members on Nominations Committee, as agreed by Court in June 2013.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Rectorial Election

The Rectorial nominations are:
Alan Bissett
Kelvin Holdsworth
Graeme Obree
Edward Snowden

The election will be conducted electronically over two days from Monday 17 February until 4 pm on Tuesday 18 February 2014.

B.2 Employee Representative on Court

David Anderson has been elected as Employee Representative on Court and will serve a 4-year term from 30 January 2014.

B.3 Appointments of Heads of Research Institute/School

College of MVLS
Institute of Health and Wellbeing
Professor Jill Pell has been appointed as Director of Institute of the Health and Wellbeing for 5 years from 1 March 2014, in succession to Professor Sally Macintyre.
School of Medicine
Professor Alan Jardine has been appointed as Head of the School of Medicine for 4 years from 1 February 2014. Professor Jardine was Acting Head for 3 months following Professor Massimo Pignatelli’s departure from the University.

B.4 Estates and IT Strategies

On the morning of the April Court meeting, 16 April, there is a workshop on the Campus Estate Strategy, for Court members. The programme and more detailed timings will follow.

The business for the April Court agenda will also include the University IT Strategy.
Consultation Material for further consultation on Draft Ordinance 206

Subject Draft Ordinance 206: AMENDMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. 182 (COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT)

Under section 4 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966:

In 2010, the general guide for HE Governance was the Code issued by the Committee of University Chairs, which was approved by HEFCE (CUC Code). It recommended regular reviews of the effectiveness of governing bodies and so in 2010 Court set up a sub-committee comprising members of Court elected by the Senate (Senate members) along with members appointed or elected by the students and the staff and lay members, to review our governance. That sub-committee made two recommendations which related to the composition of Court, and which were unanimously agreed by Court in 2010.

The first was designed to achieve a clear lay majority on Court as was called for in the CUC Code. Court already comprised the maximum number recommended by that Code, namely 25, being:-

- The Principal;
- three, including the Rector, elected or appointed by the students;
- two elected by the academic and non-academic staff,
- seven elected by the Senate; and
- twelve lay members including 5 elected by the General Council of alumni (Alumni members) and 5 who are appointed by Court for their particular skills and experience following a process of advertisement and interview (Co-opted members).

As a result, the only practical way to create that clear lay majority was to reduce the number elected or appointed by the students, staff or Senate. In these circumstances, and as the number of Senate members was greater than at any other Ancient University in Scotland, the sub-committee’s recommendation was that the number of Senate members should be reduced from 7 to 4 - the same number as on the Court of Edinburgh University - and that the number of Co-opted members should be increased to 8. That would have created a Court with 10 non lay and 15 lay members.

The second recommendation was to reduce the number of Alumni members from 5 to 2 and to further increase the number of Co-opted members by 3 to a total of 11. This was recommended for a number of reasons including that:-

- the CUC Code specified that there should be a balance of skills and experience among members of the Court sufficient to enable the governing body to meet its primary responsibilities and to ensure stakeholder confidence. In 2010 the only members of Court who were appointed for their skills and experience were the 5 co-opted members;

- governing bodies of this size need to delegate the detailed examination of many items proposed by the senior management to smaller committees who then report to Court. While at some Universities several topics are considered by a single committee, at Glasgow each of the main topics - namely Estates, Finance, Audit, HR and Health & Safety - is considered by a separate committee. While that may be more resource intensive, it does mean that more members of Court - staff, student and lay - are engaged in the detailed scrutiny of, and decision-making in relation to, these major topics;

- a realistic workload for a lay member of Court was membership of Court and of one of the major committees, being a workload of 12 days a year affected by meetings plus reading time; and
• the skills and experience required for each such committee are different and, as each is chaired by a lay member, most need at least one other lay member to cover sickness and absence of the chair, allow for succession planning and give Court access to a second view on matters discussed at that committee. That means that Court requires 10 Court members chosen for their skills and experience.

Following Court’s decision, the draft Ordinance was sent to the Senate and the General Council for consultation. The Business Committee of the General Council agreed to the proposed Ordinance on the understanding that the Court would try to ensure that there were always at least 3 co-opted members of Court who were alumni, thereby ensuring that there were at least 5 alumni on Court - as was currently the case. However, members of the Senate were concerned at the proposed reduction in the number of Senate members.

In February 2011, in fulfilment of its obligations under Section 4 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966 (1966 Act), Court took the representations from the General Council and Senate into account and decided that the draft Ordinance should reduce the number of Senate members from 7 to 5 rather than 4, reduce the number of Alumni members from 5 to 2 as originally proposed; and confirmed that in recommending individuals to Court for co-option, Nominations Committee should identify at least one member suitably experienced in the management of high quality academic research.

As a result, the attached draft Ordinance, with the above reference number and title, was submitted to the Privy Council in March 2011. The Privy Council also received details of comments made during the consultation period. The University was informed in September 2011 that their ‘Advisers’ (which we take to mean the Scottish Government) were content for the University to proceed with changes to the lay members but that they wanted the reduction in Senate member numbers to be revisited by the University after further consultation with its Senate and after the HE Governance Review reported. This was reported in the Court minute of its meeting of 12 October 2011 (appended).

Clearly it was impractical to consult again with the Senate until the Senate and Court knew the outcome of that Review, and it was not clear how it would be possible to proceed with only that part of the Ordinance dealing with changes to the lay membership. It was therefore necessary to await the outcome that Review.

As a result, the draft Ordinance was on hold at the Privy Council while the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland (von Prondzynski review) finally reported in January 2012, and more during the drafting and subsequent publication of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, called for by that Review, which was published in July 2013.

Taken together, that Review and Code are wholly supportive of the draft Ordinance in that between them they recommend that:-

• each governing body should have no more than 25 members and have a clear majority of independent members;
• the governing body should ensure an appropriate balance of skills and expertise in its membership;
• governing bodies should have up to two alumni representatives; and
• positions on governing bodies for lay members should be advertised externally and all appointments should be handled by the nominations committee of the governing body.

In June last year, the post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013 was passed. It provides that Scottish Ministers may impose a condition that the Scottish Funding
Council may, when making a payment to a higher education institution, require that institution to comply with any principles of governance which appear to the Council to constitute good practice in relation to higher education institutions. It is expected that that Section will come into effect in the next few months and before the end of the current University year.

Quite separately, in 2012/3 an external review of the effectiveness of Court had been carried out - consistent with the recommendations of the Scottish Code. Court set up a sub-committee which, as in 2010, comprised members of Court appointed or elected by Senate, students and staff, together with lay members, to make recommendations on inter alia the composition of Court in the light of that effectiveness review and the Scottish Code. That sub-committee recommended that:-

- the Ordinance should be implemented as soon as possible; and
- the commencement of the Ordinance should be structured so as to allow the reduction in the number of Court members to be phased in as vacancies in these positions occurred rather than simply remove two sitting Senate members from Court. This approach would secure a clear lay majority by the 31 July 2014 when it was expected the SFC would be making compliance with the Scottish Code a condition of the University's Financial memorandum. It would require that, for a period of up to July 2015, Court's membership would increase to 27, before then reverting to 25.

At its meeting in October 2013, Court unanimously accepted these recommendations and determined that that it wished to proceed with the draft Ordinance. The draft Ordinance as submitted to the Privy Council in March 2011 is therefore attached for further consultation. [Senate's][The General Council's] comments on the draft are sought.

A tracked version of the current text of Ordinance (Ordinance 182), which currently governs the composition of Court, is also attached, to show how the proposed changes would affect that Ordinance. Please note that this copy of Ordinance 182 includes amendments already authorised through the Privy Council in 1983 and 1996.

Court's objectives in proposing draft Ordinance 206 are, as in 2010, to improve University governance by establishing a clear independent lay majority on Court and increasing the number of lay members appointed to Court on the basis of their skills and experience; while maintaining the size of Court at 25 members, which is a benchmark of good practice in both the previous CUC and the new Scottish Code of Good HE governance.

Court would intend that while the reduction in the number of Senate members from 7 to 5 should take place as vacancies for Senate members arise, or if later on 31 July 2015, the corresponding increase in the number of co-opted members by 2 should take place on the approval of the Ordinance. As a result, the number of Court members would temporarily rise to 27, more than the recommended maximum, but would revert to 25 by 31 July 2015 at the latest. Court would intend that the number of Alumni members should be reduced by 2 on the expiry of the existing term of those who retire on 31 July and that the final reduction should take place on 31 July 2016 or earlier if any of the remaining 3 Alumni positions becomes vacant.

For [Senate's][the General Council's] reference, details of Court's discussions and decisions regarding the draft Ordinance appear in minutes of its meetings, which are appended separately, in date order.

The further consultation period is nine weeks, with the deadline for comments being 21 April 2014.
ORDINANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW NO.206 - AMENDMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. 182 (COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT)

AT GLASGOW the 16th day of February Two Thousand and Eleven

WHEREAS the University Court of the University of Glasgow (the University Court) deems it expedient to amend the composition of the University Court in light of its wish to modernise the configuration and nomenclature of the University Court membership in line with good governance practice:

THEREFORE the University Court, in exercise of its powers under section 3 of and paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966 and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf, and having sent a draft of this Ordinance to the Senatus Academicus and the General Council, displayed notices and taken into account any representations, all as required by section 4 of that Act, hereby statutes and ordains as follows, with reference to the University of Glasgow:

1 Paragraph 1 of Ordinance of the University Court No. 182 (Composition of the University Court) is hereby amended as follows:
   (a) in (c) for “an assessor”, “a representative” is substituted; and
   (b) in (d) for “an assessor”, “a representative” is substituted; and
   (c) in (e) for “five assessors”, “two members” is substituted; and
   (d) in (f) for “seven assessors”, “five members” is substituted; and
   (e) in (f) the words “of whom at least three shall be readers or lecturers” are omitted; and
   (f) in (h) for “an assessor”, “a member” is substituted; and
   (g) in (j) for “five”, “ten” is substituted; and
   (h) after (j) and before Section 2 for “an assessor”, “a representative or member” is substituted; and
   (i) after (j) and before Section 2 “or she” is added between the words “he” and “is a matriculated student”.

2 This Ordinance shall come into force from and after 1 October 2011 provided that it has been approved by Her Majesty in Council prior to that date, which failing it shall come into force from and after the date of its approval by Her Majesty in Council.

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 University Court as required by Ordinance of the University Court No. 177

Member of the University Court
Secretary of the University Court
ORDINANCE NO 182
COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT
At Glasgow, the Twenty-third day of May, Nineteen Hundred and Seventy-nine
(Preamble)

1. The University Court of the University of Glasgow shall consist of:
   (a) the rector;
   (b) the principal;
   (c) an assessor a representative nominated by the City of Glasgow Council;
   (d) an assessor a representative nominated by the chancellor;
   (e) five assessorstwo members nominated by the General Council;
   (f) seven assessorsfive members, elected from among its members by the Senatus Academicus, of whom at least three shall be readers or lecturers;
   (g) the president of the Students' Representative Council for the time being;
   (h) an assessor a member nominated by the Students' Representative Council who shall be a matriculated student and whose term of office shall be one year;
   (i) two representatives of the employees of the University of Glasgow; to be selected by such methods as the University Court may approve, who shall themselves be employees of the University of Glasgow;
   (j) such persons, not exceeding fifteen in number, none of whom may be a matriculated student or an employee of the University of Glasgow, as may be co-opted by the University Court;

2. The provisions contained in Part II of Schedule I to the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966 are hereby revoked.

3. This Ordinance shall come into force from and after the date on which it is approved by Her Majesty in Council.

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 University Court as required by Ordinance of the University Court No. 177. ALWYN WILLIAMS, Member of the University Court.

JAMES McCARGOW, Secretary of the University Court.
Approved by Order in Council, dated 19th December 1979.
13 October 2010

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

CRT/2010/5.1 Review of Governance Arrangements

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

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

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

1. In relation to membership and attendance:
   1.1 that the membership of Court should be revisited, such as to:
       - increase the number of Co-opted Members from 5 to 11;
       - reduce the number of General Council Assessors from 5 to 2; and
       - reduce the number of Senate Assessors from 7 to 4.
   1.2 that the role of Senate Assessor should no longer carry a portfolio of HR management responsibilities.
   1.3 that all Vice-Principals, including Heads of College, should be invited to attend meetings of Court, allowing Court to communicate more directly with senior executives. It was recognised that there may on occasion be a need for the agenda to include items of reserved business, which would be discussed by Court members only; and
   1.4 that positions on Court should be re-styled as follows:
       - ‘General Council Assessor’ to ‘General Council Member’
       - ‘Senate Assessor’ to ‘Senate Member’
       - ‘SRC Assessor’ to ‘SRC Member’
       - ‘Chancellor’s Assessor’ to ‘Chancellor's representative’

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

15 December 2010

CRT/2010/17. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2010/17.5 Ordinance Relating to Court membership
A formal 8-week consultation exercise on a proposed revised Ordinance on Court membership had commenced. The February 2011 meeting of Court would be informed of the full outcome of the consultation exercise, which included consultation with members of Senate and with the General Council. Senate itself had already discussed the matter at its December meeting, and a summary of its discussion appeared in the Communications from Senate.

16 February 2011
CRT/2010/27. Report from the Secretary of Court
CRT/2010/27.2 Ordinance Relating to Court membership

The Rector chaired the item, given that the convener of Court, David Ross, would speak to the paper.

At the meeting on 13 October, Court had approved the recommendations contained in a report on Governance, including a proposal to amend the composition of Court, such that the Co-opted members would increase from 5 to 11, the Senate members would decrease from 7 to 4 and the General Council members would decrease from 5 to 2. The key drivers for the proposal to amend the composition of Court had been the desire to have a clear lay (external) majority in line with good governance practice and to increase Court’s ability to co-opt a range of relevant expertise to help it address its work effectively. A draft ordinance on Court membership had been the subject of a formal 8-week consultation exercise that had concluded on 28 January. At the December meeting of Court, a summary of the discussion on the matter at December’s Senate meeting had been provided in the Court papers. Email replies from Senate members to the consultation exercise had also been made available in full to Court members for the present meeting.

David Ross explained that the working group on Governance had met on 3 February to consider the inputs received through the consultation exercise on Court membership. The feedback from the General Council had generally been positive; that from Senate had not been, in particular on the matter of the proposed reduction in the number of Senate Assessors on Court. The working group had considered carefully the points raised by Senate. A number of the concerns appeared to reflect misconceptions, and the working group felt, in particular, that it was important for Senate to be assured that Court fully recognised the authority of Senate in setting academic standards and that it would continue, through the input of Senate Assessors and others, to give due weight to academic matters in its deliberations. Mr Ross commented also that some of the comments from Senate members had referred to the University management as the source of the proposed changes; this was not the case, since the review of Court’s composition had been the initiative of himself as convener of Court and of other Court members. Having considered the issues raised through the consultation process, and the importance of recognising the depth of feeling expressed by Senate at its meeting in December, the working group had decided to recommend to Court that it modify its proposals, such that the future number of Senate Assessors should be 5 rather than 4, with the number of co-opted members correspondingly reduced from 11 to 10. The working group had suggested also that the Nominations Committee should ensure that, in recommending individuals to Court for co-option, it should identify at least one member suitably experienced in the management of high quality academic research.

Professor Scullion suggested that the proposed increase in the number of Senate Assessors did not go far enough, given Senate’s strongly held views on the matter, and expressed concern that the timing of the proposed changes could be very damaging in the current context of cost reduction. In addition, the changes were not strictly necessary in the context of governance. Dr Owen referred to a recent Green Paper on options for the future of higher education in Scotland and to a concern that Senate would not be content that its views had been listened to. Mr Ross explained that the guidance was clear and that a lay majority was required as a matter of good governance; in this respect Glasgow stood out among other peer institutions in Scotland as having a lack of external representation. It was of considerable importance that the institution was aligned with good practice. The Green Paper had been considered by the
Working Group. Professor Scullion commented that it was the decrease in Senate representatives not the increase in lay members that was being questioned.

Mr Anderson and Professor Scott Morton expressed support for the paper and its recommendations. It was commented that consultation had occurred, and that, in such a process, not all viewpoints would prevail. Mr Macfarlane commented that the General Council through its business committee supported the proposed modifications to Court membership.

A vote was taken and by a majority of 13 in favour to 7 against, Court approved the working group’s recommendations:

1. that the draft Ordinance as submitted to Senate and the General Council be confirmed by Court, with the alteration that the number of Senate members be reduced to 5, not 4, and that the number of Co-opted members be increased to 10, not 11.

2. that Court should ask Nominations Committee to ensure that, in recommending individuals to Court for co-option, the Committee should bear in mind the desirability of having: one co-opted member of Court who was suitably experienced in the management of high quality academic research; and at least three co-opted members who, as graduates of the University, were members of the General Council.

Court noted that the priority in any individual co-option process would be to seek to secure a sustainable balance of the necessary skills and experience on Court which complied with the requirements of good governance, given the available candidates of the appropriate quality. As a result in seeking out, and ultimately recommending, any particular candidate for co-option to the Court, Nominations Committee would take into account the skills and experience of the existing members of Court and thus what skills and experience it was in the best interests of Court to secure at that time in order to achieve or maintain that balance.

13 April 2011

CRT/2010/36. Matters Arising

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

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

22 June 2011

CRT/2010/51. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2010/51.6 Ordinance on Composition of Court
Court noted that the Ordinance on the composition of Court was now with the Privy Council for consideration. David Ross had attended Senate on 28 April to discuss with Senate members the reasons for Court's decision to make a new ordinance. The meeting had concluded with a request, reflected in the Communications from Senate, that Court should not progress with the Ordinance at this time. This question had been raised at the April meeting of Court, when Court's decision was that it did not wish to delay the approval process and this remained Court’s position. In the meantime the Scottish Government had announced a review of Higher Education governance and it was possible that, as a result, the Ordinance process would be put in abeyance by the Privy Council.

Court noted that Senate had agreed to establish a short-life Working Group to make recommendations on communications between Senate and Court. The remit also included the terms of the draft Ordinances concerning Senate's own composition, which Court had considered and approved for consultation at its February 2011 meeting. The Group was to report its recommendations to Senate at its October meeting and details would be provided to Court thereafter.

**12 October 2011**

CRT/2011/5. Report from the Secretary of Court

*CRT/2011/5.5 Ordinance on Composition of Court*

The Privy Council had provided interim feedback on the Ordinance. It had suggested that changes to the lay membership could proceed but that the number of Senate Assessors on Court should remain unchanged at this stage, to be revisited by the University after further consultation with Senate and after the HE Governance Review report. Court agreed that rather than seek partially to implement the draft Ordinance, the outcome of the Governance Review should be awaited before taking further action.

**9 October 2013**

CRT/2013/5. Report from the Secretary of Court

*CRT/2013/5.3 Court Governance Working Group*

As part of its review of governance arrangements, Court had agreed in June 2013 that a Working Group should look further at the composition of Court and report to the present meeting of Court. Court approved the Working Group’s recommendation to proceed with the Ordinance relating to Court’s Composition, with the primary aim of ensuring a clear lay majority on Court, such that the number of General Council Assessors would reduce from 5 to 2, the number of Senate Assessors would reduce from 7 to 5 and the number of Co-opted members would increase from 5 to 10. The Privy Council would be contacted by the Secretary of Court to request that the Ordinance be progressed as soon as possible. The Ordinance had been on hold for 2 years at the Privy Council, because of the Review of HE Governance.

Court also approved transitional arrangements (if the Privy Council approved the Ordinance) to the effect that 2 additional Co-opted members of Court be recruited as soon as possible, with the possibility therefore that there might be 27 members of Court on a temporary basis until July 2015, when two Senate Assessors would demit office.

Arrangements suggested by the Working Group - relating to the Chancellor’s Assessor title and that of Convener possibly being combined so that a further member of Court could be termed ‘Co-opted’ - would be discussed in more detail and a report made to Court at a future meeting. Following this, Standing Orders would be amended, if necessary, to provide a suitable mechanism for a member of Court to raise any matter that s/he did not wish to raise directly with the Convener of Court.
11 December 2013 (Draft)
CRT/2013/18. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2013/18.1 Review of Governance Arrangements

Court had agreed in June 2013 that a Working Group should consider the composition of Court and report to the October meeting. In October, Court had approved the Working Group’s recommendation to proceed with Draft Ordinance 206, as originally approved by Court in February 2011. The draft Ordinance was intended to ensure a clear lay majority, and to assist Court in achieving a suitable balance of skills and experience. If the Ordinance were approved, the number of Co-opted members would increase from 5 to 10, the number of General Council Assessors would fall from 5 to 2, and the number of Senate Assessors would fall from 7 to 5.

The Ordinance had been on hold at the Privy Council since March 2011, on the advice of the Scottish Government and pending the outcome of the Review of HE Governance in Scotland. David Ross and David Newall had recently visited the Scottish Government to explain Court’s desire to proceed with the new Ordinance in order to comply with the terms of the new Scottish Code of HE Governance. They had asked that the Government confirm its support for the new Ordinance as soon as possible, or alternately that it clarify any concerns it may have regarding it. A response was awaited from the Scottish Government. Advice was also being sought on whether the Scottish Government or the Privy Council would require the University to undertake further consultation before finalising the text of the Ordinance.

Court agreed that, given the urgency arising from the timing of upcoming vacancies on Court in 2014, David Ross, the Principal and David Newall should brief Court by email if a response from the government was received before the next meeting. Court noted a request from Don Spaeth that Senate’s interest in this matter should be borne in mind also.
NOTICE OF DRAFT ORDINANCE

Under section 4 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966
DRAFT ORDINANCE 206 - AMENDMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. 182
(COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT)

The Court of the University of Glasgow is consulting further with the Senate and General Council on the above Draft Ordinance, which has therefore been sent to the Senate and General Council for comment.

The Draft Ordinance has been placed in the Court Office on the first floor of the Gilbert Scott Building, Gilmorehill Campus for a period of 9 weeks, from 17 February 2014, where it may be viewed between 10:00 and 16:00 Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays).

Court shall take into consideration any representations from the Senate, the General Council or any other body or person having an interest, concerning the Draft Ordinance, received during the period referred to above. Persons wishing to make representations should address them in writing to the Secretary of Court.

DISPLAY UNTIL 21 APRIL 2014

David Newall
Secretary of Court
Policy on Socially Responsible Investment

The University Court is committed to socially responsible investment and will via its Investment Advisory Committee and Pension Scheme Trustees actively encourage its fund managers:

(i) to continue to commit to SRI within their investment policies; and
(ii) to continue to use the Ethical Investment Research Service (EIRIS) (or a similar service) to monitor the behaviour of companies in SRI

When a fund manager does not follow this line, the University should consider whether or not to change the manager at an appropriate and cost-effective point in time.

The one business activity in which the University should continue to instruct its fund managers not to invest is the tobacco industry as such an investment runs entirely counter to the University's direct interests in research.

Fund managers should be asked to supply copies of their voting records in relation to companies where concerns may have been expressed about lack of attention to social, ethical or environmental matters.

Groups from within the University may make representations in respect of an investment or investments held by the University, where those groups have concerns. Representations should be made in writing to the Secretary of Court. Such representations will be considered on the following basis:

1. The key criterion against which specific cases would be considered would be whether the activity complained of and substantiated by the concerned group, was wholly contrary to the University’s value systems either as reflected in the Mission Statement or the Strategic Plan or in regard to wider issues of social, environmental and humanitarian concern.
2. Expressions of concern should be related to specific companies whose activities or values appear, on the basis of clear evidence, to be so far removed from the University's core values as to give grounds for serious concern. Cases would only be considered if brought forward by the SRC as the recognised student body, or a recognised trade union, or via the University's committee structure.
3. Cases would be considered by a Court group in the first instance. The group will comprise 2 lay members of Court, a Senate Assessor, an SRC representative from Court and the Secretary of Court. The group would be expected to take into account the current extent of the fund managers’ engagement with the company with respect to the concerns raised. It would be for the group to decide whether there were sufficiently strong grounds to warrant engagement with the company through the mechanisms established by the fund managers where this was not already in hand, or to request strengthening of that engagement if already active. The group would ask the Investment Advisory Committee or the Pension Scheme Trustees to communicate with the fund managers about these issues.
4. If a situation arose in which such engagement did not assuage serious concerns raised about a particular company, it might be concluded by the Court on the recommendation of the Court group that it should disinvest in the company. The Investment Advisory Committee or Pension Scheme Trustees would be requested to make the financial consequences of such a decision clear to the group during the course of its deliberations.

The University will publish annually on its website a list of companies and other funds in which investments are held.

An annual report will be made to Court via the Finance Committee in respect of the investment funds.

October 2009
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Welcome to our Annual Report and thank you for taking the time to pick it up and have a look. 2012/13 was yet another transformational year for GUSRC as we continue to expand and enhance our services.

After a long period of consultation with students, the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club opened its doors in October 2012. The space is managed by GUSRC and represents considerable investment by the University in ensuring postgraduates have a unique and dedicated space on campus in which they can study, socialise and relax. The club forms a central part in GUSRC’s aspirations to develop and engage with the postgraduate community at Glasgow.

The opening of the new Welcome Point in November 2012 represented the culmination of several years planning and has provided GUSRC with an opportunity to heighten its profile through a more prominent and prestigious reception area. Students, visitors and staff all benefit from the information services offered by the Welcome Point by a knowledgeable team of student employees.

On the theme of spaces, 2012/13 saw the beginning of the consultation process on extending the Glasgow University campus to the Western Infirmary site. GUSRC officers regularly met with the Head of Estates to discuss the consultation strategy and were able to secure a place on the new Advisory Board for the campus development. The year saw a campus wide survey take place, allowing students to make their views heard, as well as a consultation and information event taking place in the Welcome Point. GUSRC will continue to work closely with the university as the Western Infirmary site plans are developed.

This year also saw significant changes to the operational structure of GUSRC, with the biggest change being made to the roles of the sabbatical officers. Following an independent review into the sabbatical roles, GUSRC created the new post of Vice-President (Student Activities) to increase our focus on graduate attributes development and oversee such activities as student volunteering, Freshers’ week, student media and fundraising. This was also the second year with a new GUSRC Council structure reflecting the University’s own change from faculties to colleges and schools. The new GUSRC structure has ‘bedded in’ and enabled considerable improvement in our internal communications and representation activity.

GUSRC is most of all, a representative campaigning organisation and we are proud of our work in this area over the year. Our year started with a successful, high profile campaign to save the Wolfson Medical Library from a proposed 64% cut in its opening hours, and ended with the announcement by Scottish Water that they were backing down on their proposals to begin charging student halls of residence for their water use; an issue on which we had campaigned vigorously, enlisting the support of MSPs across Scotland.

This is only a small taste of the many things that took place over 2012/13. We hope you enjoy finding out more in these pages and appreciate the central role that GUSRC plays at the University of Glasgow.

James Harrison
President 2012/13

Bob Hay
Permanent Secretary
HIGHLIGHTS

WOLFSON LIBRARY
A major success of GUSRC in 2012/13 was the campaign to oppose the University’s plans to drastically reduce the opening hours of the Wolfson Medical Library. Following the proposal that there would be a 64% cut in the hours the library would be available from the start of the 2012/13 academic year, GUSRC launched a pressure campaign to force the University to reconsider. Tactics included student petitions and appeals to the Scottish media. Success came when plans were withdrawn ahead of Freshers’ Week 2012 and the opening hours reinstated.

WATER CHARGES
GUSRC spearheaded a national campaign, involving a large number of Scottish universities, against Scottish Water’s proposals to introduce direct water service charges to university halls of accommodation. With potentially severe financial significations for students, GUSRC sought to combat a high-profile media and pressure campaign against the plans, calling on MSPs to support the cause where appropriate. To date, the campaign opposing Scottish Water’s plans continues, and GUSRC continue to lead the movement against the proposed changes.

MENTAL HEALTH
GUSRC also created and chaired the Student Mental Health Agreements Working Group as a subgroup of the Disability Equality Group to bring together expertise from across the University and work towards achieving the Mental Health Agreements. Finally, GUSRC’s Welfare Week included a range of events centred on mental health wellbeing and awareness. GUSRC also participated in the national ‘Think Positive’ scheme to promote good mental health on campus.

WELCOME POINT
The opening of the University and GUSRC Welcome Point served as the culmination of many years of collaborative planning between the University and GUSRC. Fulfilling the University’s need for a central reception point for visitors to campus and GUSRC’s desire for a higher-profile, more accessible services hub, the Welcome Point is a modern, vibrant space that provides a vast array of services to visitors, staff and students. Staffed by GUSRC’s student employees, the Welcome Point is the ideal space for those in need to be greeted and advised.

GILCHRIST PG CLUB
In response to research showing the need for a dedicated informal study and social space for postgraduate students, the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club had been planned as a joint venture between the University’s Hospitality Services and GUSRC. The new facility opened this year, allowing postgraduate students to have a space of their own on campus and GUSRC to further engage the postgraduate community with a programme of events including social, academic and introductory sessions. The space has helped the University’s success in the annual PRES survey.

THE CULTURE CLUB
The Culture Club is an offshoot from the Student Volunteer Support Service’s Conversational English programme, fulfilling a more social role for student volunteers. The club was formed following a massively successful string of themed events in 2012/13, each designed to help international students socialise and understand different cultures, as well as give experience in devising and planning events. GUSRC collaborated with the University’s Confucius Institute for an extremely popular Chinese New Year celebration.
YEAR IN NUMBERS

400+ STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN STUDENT MEDIA ACTIVITIES
PAGE 24

5081 UNIQUE VOTERS IN GUSRC’S ANNUAL ELECTIONS
PAGE 13

240 REGISTERED GUSRC CLUBS & SOCIETIES
PAGE 40

102,147 MINIBUS JOURNEYS MADE IN 2012/13
BY GUSRC’S HALLS TO CAMPUS MINIBUS SERVICE
PAGE 32

£21,612 FINANCIAL GAINS TO STUDENTS THROUGH GUSRC ADVICE CENTRE WORK
PAGE 28

£53,827 TOTAL SAVINGS MADE BY STUDENTS USING THE GUSRC SECONDHAND BOOKSHOP
PAGE 32

+387% UNIQUE VISITORS TO GLASGOWSTUDENT.NET, GUSRC’S WEBSITE
PAGE 23

+129% INCREASE IN NUMBER OF GLASGOW UNIVERSITY TOUR PARTICIPANTS
PAGE 39

95% SATISFACTION WITH GUSRC (INTERNATIONAL STUDENT BAROMETER)
PAGE 9

668 STUDENTS VOLUNTEERING THROUGH GUSRC’S STUDENT VOLUNTEER SUPPORT SERVICE
PAGE 37

767 NOMINATIONS IN THE 2012/13 STUDENT TEACHING AWARDS, RUN BY GUSRC
PAGE 15
MISSION

“TO PROVIDE EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION, SUPPORT, OPPORTUNITIES AND SERVICES FOR AND ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.”

AIMS

REPRESENTATION & ENGAGEMENT
ENSURE THE INTERESTS AND VIEWS OF OUR MEMBERS ARE REPRESENTED AND ADDRESSED THROUGHOUT THE UNIVERSITY AND EXTERNALLY.

STUDENT WELLBEING
PROMOTE THE WELLBEING OF EXISTING STUDENTS AND POTENTIAL STUDENTS BY PROVIDING INDEPENDENT PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES WHICH REFLECT THE DIVERSITY OF THE STUDENT BODY.

VOLUNTEERING & GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES
CONTRIBUTE TO A THRIVING CAMPUS LIFE AND INDIVIDUAL PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PROVISION OF OPPORTUNITIES AND ACTIVITIES WHICH MEET THE INTELLECTUAL, CULTURAL AND SOCIAL NEEDS OF OUR MEMBERS.
All students registered at the University of Glasgow are automatically members of University of Glasgow Students’ Representative Council (GUSRC). Students can opt out once per academic session. Membership entitles students to vote and stand for election. Where students opt out they can still use GUSRC facilities and services.

Glasgow University Students’ Representative Council (GUSRC) is a non-incorporated organisation and is a registered Charity (Charity No SC006970).

**OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of GUSRC as set out in the constitution are:

- To represent and promote the general interests of students of the University.
- To advance civic responsibility by providing a recognised means of communication between students and the Court and Senate of the University.
- To prevent and relieve poverty and advance health by providing welfare services for students and potential students.
- To advance the arts, culture, education, heritage, science and sport by providing amenities and supporting activities for students.
- To promote equality of opportunity amongst students and challenge all forms of discrimination whether based on sex, age, race, ethnicity, sexuality, disability, religion, cultural background or other such status.

**PARTNERSHIPS**

GUSRC has a close relationship with the University of Glasgow from whom it receives the vast bulk of its annual funding, allocated by the Student Finance Sub-Committee. There is considerable collaborative work undertaken between the two parties with a particular focus on student involvement in quality assurance, welfare, employability, inclusion and enhancing graduate attributes.

Partnership is a theme which cuts across all GUSRC activities and has been a significant factor in the organisation’s success in 2012/13 and throughout recent years. Whilst GUSRC operates as an independent organisation, its joint working with the University has been an important aspect in ensuring an enhanced student experience for all students of the University of Glasgow.

“It is evident that the partnership approach between the University and GUSRC has been productive in delivering a range of enhancements to provision and practice...Examples of the successful outcomes of this partnership approach include: work on a Code of Practice on Student Representation and Guidance for the operation of staff: student liaison committees; the review of the Advisers of Studies system; the development of policies on a range of matters, including late submission of coursework and a text messaging service for students; a Harassment Policy and Maternity, Paternity and Carer Policy for students; and a Student Diary. Students confirmed that...GUSRC was accessible and ‘easy to get to know’, and that they could bring matters of concern to GUSRC, including issues raised through the class representative system.”


**GUSRC COUNCIL**

Council is the governing body of GUSRC. Members of Council are elected through secret ballot of all students. The constitution makes provision for a Council of not more than 42 members, as well as a GUSRC Executive of four council members (President and three Vice President and Permanent Secretary). One of the three Vice Presidents also serves as Depute President.

Council elections take place biannually. A candidate can stand for one position at one election. Members can only vote and nominate candidates in academic constituencies (i.e. the School or College) to which they belong. Votes are cast online. There is also provision for five ex-officio members of council. Council meet monthly to discuss GUSRC business and items raised by students and all Council members have one vote.
STRATEGY

To ensure fulfilment of GUSRC’s constitutional aims, the Trustees have agreed a mission and high level strategic aims which complement those of the constitution, detailed above, and are consolidated into a strategic plan. The organisation seeks, where possible, to evaluate and improve the quality of its work by regularly reviewing its activities against the stated aims contained in each strategic plan.

GUSRC adopted its first ever strategic plan in 2008, covering the period up to 2011. During 2011 consultation exercises were carried out with a range of stakeholders; including senior University staff, students and student officers, as well as senior GUSRC staff to review the aims set out in the pre-existing strategy and agree the way forward for the next three to four years. This process resulted in the GUSRC Strategic Plan: 2011 to 2015.

The current strategic plan came into operation in late 2011. Formed around the organisation’s three strategic aims, the plan serves as a broad operating and development framework to guide student officers and senior staff in their own objective setting and activities. Both formal and informal reviews of GUSRC’s progression against the aims of the strategic plan take place each academic year.

While GUSRC’s next strategic plan won’t be adopted and actionable until the academic year 2015/2016, GUSRC have begun preliminary discussions surrounding the preparation of the plan and its aims. Current thinking includes plans for a consultation process to consider new goals for the organisation and set its course for the period covering 2015 to 2020.

BENCHMARKING: STUDENT BAROMETER

From Freshers’ Week onwards GUSRC seeks to complement University services in engaging with international students. As well as a range of social activities offered, international students make considerable use of GUSRC’s own services such as Student Volunteer Support Service, Clubs and Societies or the Advice Centre. The latest International Student Barometer offered extremely positive feedback about international students’ views of GUSRC and clubs and societies.

Within the category of Student Support Services, clubs and societies were rated 1st with 96.7% satisfaction and GUSRC itself was rated 2nd within the University and second of all Russell Group Institutions with a score of 95%.

Given the comparatively limited resources of GUSRC relative to other Russell Group student associations, this is a satisfying outcome. Targets, as stated in GUSRC’s Strategic Plan 2011-2015 were to retain a minimum ISB rating of 95% and to support clubs and societies in retaining a minimum ISB rating of 94%.

In order to ensure feedback through the ISB is GUSRC specific, the wording of the survey is altered for Glasgow students, substituting the term ‘Student Representative Council’ in place of Student Association or Student Union.
2.1 REPRESENTATION & ENGAGEMENT

GUSRC is committed to its representational role, continually ensuring that it engages with students, University stakeholders and external partners. This section highlights and summarises some of the main aspects of GUSRC’s work over the year. It incorporates the processes whereby GUSRC seeks to ensure its representation function is legitimate and relevant as well as to highlight some of the activities and achievements in this context.
COUNCIL & REPRESENTATION

COUNCIL STRUCTURE
GUSRC’s constitution makes for a provision of up to 42 Council members, including elected officers in the following positions:

- Four sabbatical officers
- 21 academic officers (including five postgraduate representatives)
- Eight welfare officers
- Six general representatives (two constituencies exclusively contested by first year students)

Last year the structure of GUSRC’s Council changed in order to reflect the recent restructure at the University from faculties to colleges and schools. The changes allowed for a slightly larger Council, with the addition of School Representatives, providing another tier to drill further into the University decision-making structure and establish closer links with class representatives as well as developing links ‘upwards’ with College convenors.

The change in structure was also intended to facilitate greater postgraduate engagement with GUSRC which acknowledged the difficulties in being identified, in the main, with the undergraduate student population.

The new Council structure has allowed for more direct communication between class reps and GUSRC Council members, facilitating an enhanced collaborative culture amongst student representatives. This new dialogue has also led to a greater amount of students putting themselves forward for election to Council.

Formal Council meetings are held once per month in the Williams Room of the John McIntyre Building. Meetings serve as forums for formal decisions to be discussed and ratified, as well as the opportunity for Council members to bring issues to the attention of the sabbatical officers. Informal meetings between members of Council happen more regularly; Council members are actively encouraged to raise issues with relevant parties as soon as possible.

GUSRC’S STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2015 states an intention to “review the function and role of sabbatical officers”.

During the year an independent review was commissioned and concluded: “We believe there is a compelling case for the functions delivered currently through the Vice President (Media and Communications) role to be redistributed across a revised set of sabbatical positions, with some more operational elements being taken on by the staff team”.

The following recommendations were accepted in full by GUSRC Council:

- Continuation of the president’s role, largely as is, but with a more clearly defined role to coordinate and facilitate engagement with the student body and others.
- Re-definition of the Vice President (learning and development) role as Vice President (Education) with the ‘development’ elements, largely relating to graduate attributes and volunteering, being transferred to the proposed new post of Vice President (Student Activities).
- Retention of the Vice President (Student Support) post but with the element of the role relating to support to clubs and societies being transferred to the proposed new post of Vice President (Student Activities).
- A new post of Vice President (Student Activities) whose role would encompass support to student media, support to clubs and societies, graduate attributes and development including volunteering and overall coordination of cross-campus Freshers’ Week.

With much of the Vice President (Media and Communications)’s previous role now allocated across the staff team, a more effective, efficient and coordinated approach to marketing and publicity activity is anticipated.

The creation of the role of VP Student Activities reflects the greater focus and priority given by GUSRC to graduate attributes activity.

GUSRC COUNCIL MEETINGS HELD MONTHLY IN THE WILLIAMS ROOM OF THE JOHN MCINTYRE BUILDING
COUNCIL SUPPORT

All student officers are elected on an annual basis. The officers are supported by a staff team who fulfill a combination of secretariat, advisory, support and developmental functions. Throughout the year the strong, positive working relationship between staff and student officers contributed to the organisation’s successes.

GUSRC officers sit on a variety of committees and working parties within the University, currently over sixty with a campus wide remit, plus a significant number of college and school level committees. GUSRC staff members are allocated specific committees and will meet with the nominated student officers prior to any such meetings and prepare briefing materials as and when required. This ensures a degree of continuity as well as informed, empowered student involvement.

GUSRC’s structure ensures that its campaigning priorities and policy formulation are evidence based and informed by the current issues affecting students. The Advice Centre, through its casework, is often able to identify issues and trends at an early stage and brief officers accordingly.

Matters emerging as a result of senior officers’ participation in University committees are communicated back to GUSRC Council in the required council report for discussion and, where appropriate, agreement on future action.

There is a comprehensive training and induction programme provided for the trustees with a particular focus on the sabbatical officers. A rolling training programme is delivered for sabbatical officers throughout the summer period and beyond. A training needs analysis is undertaken and the effectiveness of the training is evaluated, based on progress against set indicators. Council members are required to attend a full introductory training event plus additional sessions throughout the year. The training programme incorporates a range of areas in order to ensure effective governance and an inclusive, informed approach to organisational development. The following areas are included in the basic training offered to all council members:

- Introduction to internal policies and procedures (including financial controls)
- Governance (roles and responsibilities)
- Financial management and budgeting skills
- Managing professional relationships
- Planning and objective setting
- Managing professional relationships (roles of officers/staff)
- Creating/managing change
- Equal opportunities

In addition to sabbatical officers, GUSRC works to ensure that all members of its governing body (GUSRC Council) receive adequate support to fulfill their roles.

ELECTIONS

Historically the numbers voting and participating in GUSRC’s autumn elections are comparatively low. This year GUSRC sought to remedy matters with a strong publicity campaign, targeting schools with vacant representative positions. This resulted in a heavily contested election with the highest ever recorded turnout for an autumn election – 1731 unique votes cast.

Elected Council Members continue to engage with students across campus, e.g. GUSRC’s First Year Representatives have established surgeries at the Welcome Point and at halls to hear the concerns of first years, and to inform them about the work of GUSRC.

The spring elections in 2013 saw 35 candidates contesting 22 positions, though disappointingly just seven candidates contested the four Sabbatical positions (President and three Vice Presidents) a drop from 15 from the previous year. The number of votes cast, however, held up at 3350, very close to the 3581 in March 2012. Over one hundred students attended the Heckling Meeting, similar to 2012.
CLASS & PGR REP TRAINING

GUSRC and the University have joint responsibility for the organisation and operation of the class and PGR representation system.

GUSRC and the University jointly promote the representative role to students and staff. GUSRC takes responsibility for the organisation and delivery of class and PGR representative training as well as the verification of training being satisfactorily completed. The Senate Office manages the recording of class and PGR representative roles in student academic records. The current system has been operating for six years, following the introduction of the Code of Practice on Student Representation in Session 2006-07, and is reviewed annually.

GUSRC continue to develop training materials specific to the University of Glasgow. Responsibility for the delivery of training transferred from Student Participation in Quality Scotland (sparqs) to GUSRC in 2011. This includes responsibility for funding, recruiting, training and managing class representative student trainers. This has enabled a greater focus on University and GUSRC specific representation and engagement structures and methods of working. GUSRC continues to enjoy a positive working relationship with sparqs, and participates in sparqs “Training The Trainers” events – both as delivery agents and training partners. The withdrawal of sparqs in 2011 and the move by GUSRC towards internally developed bespoke training resulted in a funding gap which GUSRC has overcome through additional revenue generation, ensuring the longer-term future of class representative training at the University of Glasgow.

Class or PGR representatives who have fulfilled the following criteria are eligible to have the role recorded on their Higher Education Achievement Report, facilitated via MyCampus in 2012/2013, provided they have:

- Attended class and PGR representative training
- Completed the term of office as a class or PGR representative to the satisfaction of their School or Graduate School.

The management of the class representative system is underpinned by effective communication between the partners and a shared approach to problem solving. Current workings on the new student voice system will aid the managing, planning and recording process, although the requirement for some fine-tuning is anticipated.

STRENGTHENING LINKS

Following the restructure of GUSRC Council, class representatives have been able to play a more significant role in informing discussions within GUSRC. Each elected school representative is encouraged to communicate with the class representatives within their school via email and in face-to-face meetings, as well as through more informal means such as groups on Facebook. This has led to more issues being brought to the attention of GUSRC Council, sabbatical officers and staff, enabling a more comprehensive overview of activities at the University and allowing GUSRC to make a more speedy response when necessary.

The development of Student Voice will provide greater opportunities than ever before to share information amongst the student population, course representatives and Council members. Student Voice has been added to the course representative training programme and both the University and GUSRC will seek to heavily promote it in the coming year with the long-term aim of establishing Student Voice as the standard way of communicating and discussing issues raised by student members.
ELIR

The previous ELIR set a high benchmark for both GUSRC and the University. The quality of student engagement between the two organisations was highly acclaimed. The development of the reflective analysis for ELIR is underway and, once again, mechanisms are in place to ensure that GUSRC is fully engaged in the process. GUSRC works closely with the University across all areas of student engagement related activity. In addition to these regular and periodic interactions, there will be provisions made for specific and dedicated student engagement in the ELIR process. The reflective analysis is not due to be completed until December 2013, but considerable work has already been undertaken including:

- An open focus group session to seek initial comments on student support, student feedback and graduate attributes titled ‘Pizza and Points of View’, facilitated by GUSRC staff and officers attended by approximately fifty students in April 2013.
- A subsequent focus group involving GUSRC Council members to review the feedback from the broad open session.
- Council members who have experience in Periodic Subject Reviews are engaged with reviewing the text of GUSRC’s reflective analysis at various stages.

Ongoing input from GUSRC is provided through sabbatical officers who act as sounding boards for students throughout the process. Sabbatical officers are also members of the ELIR Steering Committee and the ELIR Core Group ensuring a GUSRC presence and involvement in all levels of the ELIR process.

WOLFSON MEDICAL LIBRARY

In August GUSRC became aware of a decision to severely reduce the opening hours at the Wolfson Medical School Library from September 2012 onwards. The library was to have its opening hours reduced by 64% from 168 hours a week to sixty; restricting access to 8am-8pm on weekdays only. The proposal was a substantial move away from the 24 hour access previously offered to medical students, many of whom require access at all hours of the day due to variable and wide-ranging shift hours on placements. Following unproductive informal discussions with senior staff, GUSRC launched a high-profile campaign against the proposal. The campaign was successful, with student representatives meeting with senior MVLS staff to discuss the proposal, which was ultimately abandoned in favour of retaining the status quo.

COURT WORKING GROUP

The University of Glasgow Court established a working group charged with updating its governance in the context of the new code and the GUSRC President was a full participant in this group. In addition, the GUSRC President, Court Assessor and President-Elect participated in a day-long workshop with Court members to build a common understanding of what changes were required.

Participation in the working group assisted GUSRC secure representation on the University’s Court Nominations Committee for the first time, giving the organisation a say in which University staff members should be permitted to be members of Court. GUSRC also took a strong line on Court’s consideration of equality and diversity issues when selecting new members, particularly with regards to the gender balance as well as arguing that expenses should be paid when necessary in order not to restrict participation to better-off groups. The GUSRC President also successfully defended the position of the University Rector on court.

Also through the working group, GUSRC gained assurances that the organisation will be officially represented on the panel that helps to select future University Principals (GUSRC was represented on the panel that re-appointed the Principal in 2012- although at that time not an official stated requirement). Although the new higher education code could have been more progressive in many areas, GUSRC and the University have reached agreement on several matters well above the baseline set by the new code.

SENATE REFORM

The Senate Operations Working Group was established by Senate in October 2012. Its primary task was to address the lack of quorate meetings as well as to identify operational improvements which will improve Senate’s effectiveness. GUSRC were represented on this working group by the President who consulted with the Executive and Council members on the proposed reforms into which he had considerable input. The current proposal to establish a ‘Council of Senate’ is supported by GUSRC. Council of Senate will validate the position of students on this body enshrining full membership status on the elected student members. Although, under this proposal, the number of GUSRC representatives on Senate would be reduced from 16 to 12, student representatives will still constitute ~10% of the membership given that Council of Senate will incorporate 128 members compared with a current Senate membership of over 500.

THE WOLFSON MEDICAL LIBRARY’S EXTENDED OPENING HOURS WERE PRESERVED FOLLOWING A GUSRC CAMPAIGN
In 2012/13 a new Campus Estates Strategy Board was set up ahead of the expected expansion of the University into the Western Infirmary site. GUSRC secured representation on this board and have been involved in developing aspects of the student consultation process. GUSRC enjoys an extremely positive working relationship with the University’s Head of Estates, who meets with GUSRC representatives regularly and attended a meeting of GUSRC Council to give a presentation and answer questions on the masterplan development. The University’s Estates and Buildings office held their first full consultation event over a period of several weeks in the GUSRC Welcome Point with a view to more such events being held as the project develops. GUSRC values its close partnership with Estates and Buildings and looks forward to continuing to work together as the campus development progresses.

Mental Health Agreement

GUSRC took the decision to participate in the national ‘Think Positive’ scheme with a view to promoting good mental health on campus while tackling negative attitudes that exist surrounding mental health in general. GUSRC created and chaired the Student Mental Health Agreements Working Group as a subgroup of the Disability Equality Group to bring together expertise from across the University and work towards achieving the Mental Health Agreements as agreed by the Group. Several meetings of the Student Mental Health Agreements Working Group have been held and progress on the agreements continues.

These Agreements include:

- Creating a new Student Mental Health Policy and guidelines for staff supporting students with a mental health condition or illness. This policy has been completed by GUSRC and will go to the Student Support and Development Committee early in 2013 session.
- Developing a range of support activities throughout the year to support student wellbeing, including SRC Welfare Week and other activities identified from the Counselling and Psychology Service survey.
- Promoting mental health awareness campaigns such as the Scottish Mental Health Arts and Film Festival, Mental Health Week and the See Me pledge.
- Identifying training opportunities for staff who could benefit from Mental Health First Aid Training; Residential Wardens, Janitorial and Security staff have been suggested initially.

STAS

For the third year of the Student Teaching Awards, marketing activity was reviewed and refocused with a heavy emphasis on electronic media, particularly Twitter and Facebook. The numbers of students participating increased considerably to 767, against 376 in the previous year. Student involvement lends a particular validity to this scheme, the premise being that students are encouraged to reflect upon the different elements of the learning experience at Glasgow. By recognising the impact of excellent tutors, lecturers, support staff and individual contributors to this experience, they will assist GUSRC and the University in shaping the learning experience of the future.

GUSRC will continue to host STAs, working with the University, in particular Professor Frank Coton, to build on the work of previous years, heightening awareness of, and participation in, the STAs even further while considering how they might best be used to enhance the student learning experience.

CAMPUS VISION

In 2012/13 a new Campus Estates Strategy Board was set up ahead of the expected expansion of the University into the Western Infirmary site. GUSRC secured representation on this board and have been involved in developing aspects of the student consultation process.
The University implemented a number of methods for attendance monitoring Tier 4 students. GUSRC (in conjunction with the Tier 4 Compliance Officer) conducted a series of focus groups with Tier 4 students from across the University to review their experience as well as their awareness and knowledge of their rights when a University sponsored Tier 4. Students’ feedback was positive although some inconsistencies across colleges regarding attendance monitoring emerged. There were also a number of students who appeared to be unaware of their rights (e.g. whether they were able to go away for the weekend without informing the University). GUSRC will work with the University where assistance is required in ensuring such important information is effectively communicated.

Through participation in the Chief Advisors Sub Committee, GUSRC continue to work with the University in developing and supporting a new student advisors system, created in response to the University-wide review of Student Advisory Needs (including a GUSRC commissioned survey and report). Working with University Student Services, GUSRC has developed an information pack for advisers, as well as developing training materials intended to be part of an induction/information session for new advisers.

GUSRC’s Advice Centre continues to experience a small but significant year-on-year increase in casework associated with students charged with plagiarism. Senate Assessors for the Student Conduct Annual Report to Senate advised: “The total number of plagiarism cases considered by the Senate Assessors and the Senate Student Conduct Committee was 37, almost double the 20 considered last year”.

Experience suggests, however, that many students do not have any clear understanding of plagiarism and proper referencing procedures. Despite the University currently having a number of measures to ensure that students have an understanding of what may constitute plagiarism, GUSRC is of the view that additional measures to augment current practices would prove useful. Research by GUSRC has highlighted a number of institutions that provide compulsory plagiarism tutorials for all newly registered students. A proposal is currently being developed by GUSRC to establish a Plagiarism Working Group, which may consider such proposals, in the next academic session.

In February, GUSRC’s Vice President (Learning & Development) presented a paper to the University’s Learning & Teaching Committee proposing an “Exam Feedback Policy”. The policy was agreed in principle and GUSRC will be working with the Convener of the Committee and the Deans of Learning & Teaching on refining the policy before it is fully adopted, which will most likely be in the beginning of the 2013-14 academic year.

GUSRC continues to experience a small but significant year-on-year increase in casework associated with students charged with plagiarism. Senate Assessors for the Student Conduct Annual Report to Senate advised: “The total number of plagiarism cases considered by the Senate Assessors and the Senate Student Conduct Committee was 37, almost double the 20 considered last year”.

Experience suggests, however, that many students do not have any clear understanding of plagiarism and proper referencing procedures. Despite the University currently having a number of measures to ensure that students have an understanding of what may constitute plagiarism, GUSRC is of the view that additional measures to augment current practices would prove useful. Research by GUSRC has highlighted a number of institutions that provide compulsory plagiarism tutorials for all newly registered students. A proposal is currently being developed by GUSRC to establish a Plagiarism Working Group, which may consider such proposals, in the next academic session.

Following last year’s ‘trial period’, the University Academic Standards Committee confirmed that students will continue to be members of the Programme Approval Groups for the years ahead, and noted that they often provided valuable contributions to the discussions.

In early 2013 Scottish Water outlined proposals to apply direct water service charges to student accommodation from the 1st April 2013. The financial implications of the proposals will be significant for students and the University, who would be forced to pass the charges onto students staying in its halls of residence with an anticipated further upsurge in rental charges of around 2%. GUSRC have mounted a vigorous campaign opposing the proposals; contacting MSPs and advising of the implications, as well as launching a high profile press campaign against the proposals. GUSRC contacted student organisations across Scotland seeking to build a campaign of opposition. Opposition to the proposals continues to grow and GUSRC are working with others to sustain the current momentum of opposition in the hope that Scottish Water can be forced to back down.

Similar to many higher education institutions, feedback continues to be identified as a cause for concern for University of Glasgow students responding to the National Student Survey. In February, GUSRC’s Vice President (Learning & Development) presented a paper to the University’s Learning & Teaching Committee proposing an “Exam Feedback Policy”. The policy was agreed in principle and GUSRC will be working with the Convener of the Committee and the Deans of Learning & Teaching on refining the policy before it is fully adopted, which will most likely be in the beginning of the 2013-14 academic year.

Through participation in the Chief Advisors Sub Committee, GUSRC continue to work with the University in developing and supporting a new student advisors system, created in response to the University-wide review of Student Advisory Needs (including a GUSRC commissioned survey and report). Working with University Student Services, GUSRC has developed an information pack for advisers, as well as developing training materials intended to be part of an induction/information session for new advisers.

The University implemented a number of methods for attendance monitoring Tier 4 students. GUSRC (in conjunction with the Tier 4 Compliance Officer) conducted a series of focus groups with Tier 4 students from across the University to review their experience as well as their awareness and knowledge of their rights when a University sponsored Tier 4. Students’ feedback was positive although some inconsistencies across colleges regarding attendance monitoring emerged. There were also a number of students who appeared to be unaware of their rights (e.g. whether they were able to go away for the weekend without informing the University). GUSRC will work with the University where assistance is required in ensuring such important information is effectively communicated.

In February, GUSRC’s Vice President (Learning & Development) presented a paper to the University’s Learning & Teaching Committee proposing an “Exam Feedback Policy”. The policy was agreed in principle and GUSRC will be working with the Convener of the Committee and the Deans of Learning & Teaching on refining the policy before it is fully adopted, which will most likely be in the beginning of the 2013-14 academic year.

Similar to many higher education institutions, feedback continues to be identified as a cause for concern for University of Glasgow students responding to the National Student Survey. In February, GUSRC’s Vice President (Learning & Development) presented a paper to the University’s Learning & Teaching Committee proposing an “Exam Feedback Policy”. The policy was agreed in principle and GUSRC will be working with the Convener of the Committee and the Deans of Learning & Teaching on refining the policy before it is fully adopted, which will most likely be in the beginning of the 2013-14 academic year.
GUSRC once more had considerable success with the promotion of the NSS around the University, improving on the previous year’s response rate and again achieving a response rate well above the sector average. This was particularly pleasing as it reversed a trend - albeit very slight - of declining responses since 2010. Once again a student designer was employed to produce an innovative marketing campaign and a student co-ordinator was employed to manage the distribution of promotional material. In addition, student helpers gave over one hundred lecture and lab call-outs in the first three weeks of term to encourage completion of the survey, while the co-ordinator worked with subject areas to increase awareness of the survey among lecturers and support staff.

2012 was the second year in which students were asked their opinion on their Student Unions (SU) in the survey (Question 24). The University of Glasgow’s system of four student bodies rather than one single SU poses a number of problems in this regard; as a result, special effort was given for the first time in our promotion to minimise any potential confusion. Bespoke material to encourage responses to this question was created and distributed around the ‘Student Union’ buildings as well as the Stevenson Building. The response to the questions was 76% (up from 73%) against a sector average of 67%.

GUSRC recognises the importance of the survey in informing the student experience. This joint working partnership is mutually beneficial; the University and GUSRC both use the information gathered to inform their own work and priorities in improving the student experience.

GUSRC and the University continue to review NSS response promotion. A number of suggested improvements and refinements in the existing organisational structure for promotion have been agreed for 2013/4, as we seek to build on past successes and remain amongst the top universities in Scotland and the UK for NSS response rates and student satisfaction.

HEAR

In cooperation with the University, from 2011/12, GUSRC volunteers, council members, class representatives, and presidents, secretaries and treasurers of a GUSRC affiliated club or society can have these extra-curricular activities verified by GUSRC and accredited on their university transcript, now known as the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR).

Students are circulated reflective log forms to complete and return to GUSRC for verification. This encourages students to identify and articulate the skills and graduate attributes they have developed while undertaking their extra-curricular activities. Such an inclusion is a positive and pro-active way for students to have these activities verified for future employers and serves as a record alongside their academic achievements.

GUSRC have been closely involved with the development of the HEAR throughout the past few academic years and are now working with the University on its implementation.

LECTURE RECORDING

The proposals for a policy on lecture recording for students has been under discussion for some time. GUSRC has been pivotal in this initiative from the outset, and contributed to the development of the draft policy. Work this year on fine-tuning the proposal has been productive and it appears that the policy is close to being adopted.
GUSRC took an active role in the newly established Personal Safety Coordinating Group, a working group set up to monitor crime around campus, halls of residence and the local area, as well as consider mechanisms to reduce instances of crime and personal safety awareness amongst students. GUSRC took the lead on a campaign design to ensure maximum student engagement in the group’s work. Further information about the group’s work in 2012/13 can be found in the Student Wellbeing section of this report (page 31).

In September 2012 the University Hospitality Services were subjected to a review. The GUSRC President was interviewed as part of this review and raised some concerns in a number of areas on behalf of the student body. Feedback was provided in areas including pricing, the portion sizes, the attitudes of staff and the variety of food on offer. Following the review, changes were brought in including a new variety of sandwiches with cheaper pricing. The review took place before the opening of the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club, so did not cover GUSRC’s partnership with hospitality in the Gilchrist.

GUSRC took an active role in the newly established Personal Safety Coordinating Group, a working group set up to monitor crime around campus, halls of residence and the local area, as well as consider mechanisms to reduce instances of crime and personal safety awareness amongst students. GUSRC took the lead on a campaign design to ensure maximum student engagement in the group’s work. Further information about the group’s work in 2012/13 can be found in the Student Wellbeing section of this report (page 31).

In 2011/12 an independent University governance review, commissioned by Scottish Ministers, took place (the von Prondzynski Review). Following the von Prondzynski Review, the Committee of Scottish Chairs, the group representing all the Chairs of Scotland’s University Courts established a steering committee to draft a new Code of Higher Education Governance. The draft Code and final Code produced in July 2013 differed markedly from the von Prondzynski recommendations causing NUS Scotland to comment “The proposed code has ignored outright many recommendations from the independent review of higher education governance led by Professor Ferdinand von Prondzynski, and significantly watered down others”. (Scottish Code of Good HE Governance NUS Scotland written evidence Education and Culture Committee, April 2013)

The Senate Office, in collaboration with GUSRC and the University’s Academic Development Unit, Learning and Teaching Centre, developed a one and a half day ‘mini-review’ training event (including pre-course preparation) for student panel members, which was piloted in November 2012. The enhanced training features more tailored and extensive course content and utilises interactive sessions to prepare student panel members for PSR.

This work proved invaluable with feedback from student participants being extremely positive, particularly in relation to confidence and knowledge development. Feedback received from convener panel members post-review, suggested that student panel members had clearly benefitted from the new training provision.

LGBT CAMPAIGNS

GUSRC continued to support LGBT campaigns including the marking of International Day Against Homophobia and LGBT History Month with events on campus including flag raising at the University flag pole. GUSRC’s Sexual Orientation Equality Officer continues to work closely with the sabbatical officers on issues of equality.

HOSPITALITY REVIEW

In September 2012 the University Hospitality Services were subjected to a review. The GUSRC President was interviewed as part of this review and raised some concerns in a number of areas on behalf of the student body. Feedback was provided in areas including pricing, the portion sizes, the attitudes of staff and the variety of food on offer. Following the review, changes were brought in including a new variety of sandwiches with cheaper pricing. The review took place before the opening of the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club, so did not cover GUSRC’s partnership with hospitality in the Gilchrist.

PERIODIC SUBJECT REVIEWS

The University continues to involve GUSRC as a partner in quality enhancement by ensuring that each Periodic Subject Review (PSR) panel includes a GUSRC student representative. The reviews result in a report which highlights the strengths and achievements of the subject(s) and includes recommendations for changes aimed at strengthening and further enhancing the teaching provision and the student experience. GUSRC’s participation is now a requirement on every panel and the student representatives are very much seen as a positive force, with both University staff and external examiners, once again, praising the contributions and insight into the student perspective provided by student panellists.

Over the year GUSRC participated in the following reviews (which addressed both UG and PG provision)

› Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences Graduate School: Postgraduate Taught Programmes
› Veterinary Medicine
› Engineering
› Modern Languages and Cultures
› Celtic and Gaelic
› Centre for Open Studies

GOVERNANCE REVIEW

In 2011/12 an independent University governance review, commissioned by Scottish Ministers, took place (the von Prondzynski Review). Following the von Prondzynski Review, the Committee of Scottish Chairs, the group representing all the Chairs of Scotland’s University Courts established a steering committee to draft a new Code of Higher Education Governance. The draft Code and final Code produced in July 2013 differed markedly from the von Prondzynski recommendations causing NUS Scotland to comment “The proposed code has ignored outright many recommendations from the independent review of higher education governance led by Professor Ferdinand von Prondzynski, and significantly watered down others”. (Scottish Code of Good HE Governance NUS Scotland written evidence Education and Culture Committee, April 2013)
The Gilchrist Postgraduate Club was formally launched on 26th October. The club represents a joint venture between the University and GUSRC aimed at providing a social and learning space for postgraduate students. An investment of £0.9 million was agreed by the University following a range of postgraduate consultation exercises coordinated by GUSRC, with a business plan then agreed by a University/GUSRC joint working group. The management of the Gilchrist space rests with GUSRC while Hospitality Services manage the business of the cafe/bar, in consultation with GUSRC.

The Gilchrist reflects the University’s strategy in building a campus environment which will foster a cohesive postgraduate community. It is a dedicated space for all postgraduate students at the University of Glasgow. The club provides social and study space for postgraduates and staff of the University, allowing them to meet in a collegiate environment, which is unique on campus in maintaining a character which is distinct from other social spaces like the student unions, which research suggests are not popular with postgraduate students.

A large seminar room and a series of study booths capable of hosting small seminars, equipped with integrated monitors, complement the social bar café and have helped the Gilchirst begin to establish itself as one of the focal points of postgraduate life on campus.
COLLABORATIVE WORK & EVENTS

Through the Gilchrist, GUSRC has built new working links with University departments across campus. The following are examples of these important and ongoing relationships:

› Working with the Research Strategy and Innovation Office, GUSRC delivers events aimed at enabling postgraduate students to gain the necessary skills that will better prepare them for life after the PhD. The hosting of numerous programs, such as the ‘Presenting With Impact’ series, and a series of project management workshops and initiatives such as ‘Risky Business’ and ‘Making Conversations Count’ – both are programs designed to challenge students into thinking about their research in a wider context while also encouraging engagement across a variety of academic concentrations.

“Glasgow has always been recognised for encouraging and supporting researchers to take the lead on their own innovative career development initiatives. The Gilchrist has given researchers ownership of a space which allows them to do exactly that and it’s been really exciting to see how its use has developed over the past year. We’re now being approached by other universities who are keen to replicate this model for their own researcher community building initiatives.”

- Dr. Elizabeth Adams Researcher Development Officer

› Throughout the year, GUSRC has also cooperated in hosting numerous career related events at The Gilchrist in conjunction with the Careers Service, including the launch of their brand new ‘Careers Service Guide 2013-14’, and the ‘An Hour at Lunchtime With...’ series. The Gilchrist club is also home to the PG and Alumni career networking group, iGnite.

GUSRC are also working with the Careers Service in developing ideas for the coming year. Plans have already been formed for Global Entrepreneurships Week, which will provide workshops and opportunities for postgraduates to gain a better understanding and knowledge of what is necessary to become a successful entrepreneur.

GUSRC works with numerous student-led initiatives including supporting a group of PhD Students in the organisation of what has become a widely popular ‘Three Minute Thesis’ competition, as well as assisting with the ‘Assembling Identities’ Arts Conference which was attended by postgraduate students from across Europe. GUSRC also collaborated with the Glasgow tier of ‘Science Grrl’- a broad-based, grassroots organisation celebrating and supporting women in science. Plans are currently under way for the Gilchrist to host an Ada Lovelace day celebration, including talks from notable women in Science, as well as a ‘Girl Geek’ event which will promote the importance of women staying in academia in Science-based roles.

The Gilchrist is also home to many PG networks, including; e-Sharp and The Kelvingrove Review, Postgraduate Business Club, OBR Glasgow, Bright Club, PG Sexualities Reading Group, School of Humanities PG Reading Group, GRAMNet, and the Glasgow Human Rights Network Cluster.
POSTGRADUATES ON COUNCIL

Following the University restructuring exercise, GUSRC amended the shape of its Council. In doing so, the number of positions for PG students was increased from two to five; this included the introduction of a postgraduate convener position for each College. Although these positions were advertised widely, GUSRC has been unable, as of yet, to fill them. At this early stage, however, a slow uptake should not be considered wholly disappointing or necessarily unusual and it is anticipated that, through the engagement process which has now been implemented, the traditional barriers to PG student representation can be overcome.

PRES

In conjunction with the University’s Research, Strategy and Innovation Office (RSIO) GUSRC hosted focus groups for postgraduates to gauge the views of current PG students in order to inform the ‘Institutional questions’ section of the survey. This mechanism was developed by GUSRC four years ago and continues to be used as a tool to maximise the value of PRES by including, where possible, questions which reflect current concerns.

For GUSRC the most significant PRES question related to satisfaction was with social space. The research highlighted that 53% of students ‘Agreed’ or ‘Strongly Agreed’ with the statement “There is adequate provision made for postgraduate social space at my institution” up from 34.6% the previous year. This response is considered an endorsement of the work and investment undertaken to establish the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club. Also worth noting is that only 13.4% ‘Disagreed’ or ‘Strongly Disagreed’ with the statement – down from 35.6% in 2012.

POSTGRADUATE REP TRAINING

Since 2011, GUSRC have delivered specific student representative training for postgraduate research students. The standard training presentation was adapted and then reviewed further in 2012 based on feedback from trainees.

The postgraduate sessions more closely reflect the nature of the research student experience through, for example, the removal of references to ‘classes’, focusing instead on the PGR Code of Practice while highlighting Graduate School SSLCs and the role of the Supervisory Team in resolving student issues. These targeted adjustments have helped shape a training session which clearly provides more relevant guidance and support for GUSRC PGR student representatives.

PG MATERNITY POLICY

In early 2012 GUSRC submitted a paper to the Deans of Graduate Schools outlining some issues as presented to the Advice Centre which highlighted inconsistencies in the treatment of Postgraduate Research Students who would come under the remit of the Maternity, Maternity Support and Adoption Policy.

The key aim of the proposal was to ensure equal and consistent treatment by standardising entitlement to Maternity, Maternity Support and Adoption (MMSA) leave for all PGR students, regardless of funding source, and taking into consideration new legislation (e.g. additional paternity (maternity support) leave).

The policy was agreed in August 2012 and now forms an appendix to the existing MMSA policy, as well as being referenced in the 2012/13 version of the PGR Code of Practice.

BARRIERS TO PG ENGAGEMENT

Below we highlight key issues identified over the year as having impacted on GUSRC work to engage the University’s community of Postgraduate students:

- Resistance to change: Some graduate schools have already established their own internal structures for representation. The ‘representatives’ within these structures may be unfamiliar with the accepted nature of representative roles and will likely also lack the support network and experience provided by the GUSRC structure. It is possible that some may also be naturally reluctant to have their positions or standing within the School scrutinised or open to wider competition, thus limiting the effectiveness of engagement in the democratic process.
- Lack of awareness of GUSRC’s role: GUSRC is the only student representative organisation on campus, with a statutory requirement to fulfill this role. As previously mentioned, GUSRC is perceived by many, including past student officers, as an undergraduate organisation with little relevance to postgraduate life.
- Delayed opening of Gilchrist: GUSRC’s intention was to utilise the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club as an engagement vehicle, a physical manifestation of GUSRC’s eagerness to work and engage with postgraduate students. The delay in completion of works meant the Gilchrist did not open until virtually the beginning of November by which time most students had identified spaces and venues for meetings, studying and socialising.

None of the issues outlined above represent insurmountable barriers and work is underway to ensure GUSRC has maximum impact on new postgraduate students early in the next academic year and in subsequent years to increase the number of postgraduates competing in its annual elections.
SUPPORT FOR CARERS ADVISORY GROUP

Following GUSRC’s pioneering work in developing and establishing the first Carers Support Policy of any higher education institution in the UK and the subsequent policy launch by Michael Matheson the minister for Public Health, GUSRC were invited, through membership of the an Advisory Group, to contribute to a new government/further education initiative relating to support for carers in further education.

Scotland’s College Development Network are working with the Scottish Government, through the Support for Carers Strategy Advisory Group, on a new initiative to raise awareness of the ways in which caring responsibility can impact on learner success and to ensure that college staff have information and resources which support them in working effectively with learners, both adults and young people, who have responsibilities outside of their college commitments.

The project is due to be completed in mid-2014, although the work relates particularly to FE institutions there may be potential to develop a similar initiative focused around access and retention in HE institutions.

IN THE MEDIA

Traditionally, GUSRC have maintained a positive working relationship with both local and national media outlets. Independence from the National Union of Students ensures GUSRC have freedom to comment on matters independently, thus reflecting the interests of the particular students it represents. Some of the media in which GUSRC featured include The Times, The Scotsman, The Herald, BBC Scotland, The Journal, Evening Times, Radio Scotland, Real Radio, The Guardian, and Daily Record.

CPAG

GUSRC sits on the panel of Child Poverty Action Group’s (CPAG) ‘Students and Benefits Project’. This project aims to increase the number of low income students who are able to access further and higher education. It also aims to reduce the impact of poverty on students who access such educational opportunities.

The membership of this group is wide-ranging; the project has a Scotland wide remit and includes representatives from the Scottish Funding Council. GUSRC’s participation provides an opportunity to input into CPAG’s national campaigning and information activities as well as keeping up to date with national policy developments which may impact on students.

SAAS PAYMENTS

At the start of the academic year, GUSRC participated in a national campaign to urge students to submit their SAAS funding applications on time. However, the organisation once again experienced significant administrative difficulties resulting in many students being without their loans in time for starting their studies. The GUSRC Vice President (Media and Communications) discussed the issue on BBC TV and Radio, and also met with representatives from SAAS including David Wallace, leader of the independent review commissioned by the Scottish Government, to outline the serious impact of the delays on students.

The findings of the review facilitated an extra £2m government funding allocation to SAAS who increased staff levels considerably, increased opening hours and made a range of systemic improvements to ensure a reduction in future late payments and an improved overall service to students.
ONLINE & DIGITAL

GUSRC’s website (www.glasgowstudent.net) was regularly updated with news and information regarding GUSRC services throughout the year, while new images were added to the masthead reflecting the latest graphics and posters from GUSRC events, campaigns and services. Due to a greatly improved presence on the University’s website, and more abundant social media linking from both GUSRC and the University, the traffic to glasgowstudent.net rose significantly, with a 328% upsurge in visits and 387% increase in unique visitors compared to the previous academic year. Traffic to the website was spread throughout the site’s various sections, though, with around 28% visiting for information about GUSRC’s services (minibus, printing, flatshare etc) it could be speculated that the website has increased as a source of information for prospective students. Over 30% of traffic to the website was directed to the various pages providing information on GUSRC supported clubs and societies.

GUSRC’s Facebook once again served as one of its two main social media channels. In addition to allowing GUSRC to advertise news, events and updates on a platform used highly by students, Facebook also allowed GUSRC to engage in dialogues with students about current issues or any of the posted updates. Once again, popular posts from the year included photo galleries of GUSRC events and election content and updates. In 2012/13, the number of subscribers (those who have ‘liked’ the page) to GUSRC’s Facebook increased 2350 to over 4500, though the reach of the page (those seeing and interacting with GUSRC’s posts) decreased by around 20%. In addition to the reach through stories in users’ own feeds, the page was visited over 13,000 times during the academic year.

GUSRC also continued to maintain accounts and upload content to other online sites such as Youtube and Issuu. These outlets serve as convenient hubs for students to to find GUSRC documents and videos, as alternatives to the glasgowstudent.net website which also hosts content for students to access. Statistics are available to view on all social media profiles and this enables GUSRC to monitor how people interact with the organisation’s online content. Google Analytics also provides us with a wealth of information about visitors to www.glasgowstudent.net. Through these statistics we can see how popular certain services and events are in comparison to others.

WEBSITE REDEVELOPMENT

Following a lengthy period in which redevelopment of the GUSRC website had been discussed, 2012/13 saw the process of creating an entirely new glasgowstudent.net begin. GUSRC’s previous website was created using a custom content management system in 2005, which in addition to being outmoded, was becoming more and more cumbersome to use for both GUSRC staff and students visiting the site due to it being unable to be updated without extensive time and cost to GUSRC.

In the second half of the academic year the Permanent Secretary, Vice President (Media & Communications) and GUSRC’s IT specialist collaborated to produce a website development brief which was sent to six website building companies. From the tender process, a company was selected to create a new website using Wordpress, a content management system that is flexible, updatable and easy to learn how to customise for GUSRC staff and student officers working in the website back end. Work began on the structure of the website at the very end of the academic year, with plans to consult GUSRC Council members early in 2013/14 regarding design and navigation choices for the website. It is hoped that the new site should be completed by the end of the next academic year, and that the new website will fully operational in time for the incoming 2014 new students.
Glasgow University’s student media plays two key roles for students of the University. The first is to provide students with an opportunity to meet new people, learn new skills and share in common experiences. In this respect the media organisations are similar to clubs and societies. The second function of the media is to provide engaging, informative and entertaining content for students and the wider Glasgow community. This dual role played by the student media highlights its importance to GUSRC, the University and the students. GUSRC Vice Presidents work with the media organisations as GUSRC continues to support them both with funding and with administrative assistance. Below is a summary of the achievements of each of GUSRC’s supported media bodies in the academic year 2012/13.

STUDENT MEDIA

Subcity experienced a year of many changes in 2012/2013. Perhaps the most obvious change came in the form of the new station logo, launched back in August 2012. The logo was designed by station contributor Craig Gallacher, with consultancy from both past and present team members. The new logo is based on moiré patterns, in which two sets of parallel lines come together to create a secondary pattern - conceptually, this represents the multiple styles of content that are brought together under the platform of Subcity Radio. The moiré logo replaces the old graffiti style logo (which carried irrelevant and out-of-date hip-hop connotations) in all its iterations.

The new logo was part of a wider visual identity overhaul, which included a re-design of the front end website. This was not implemented by the end of the 2012/2013 term, but all design elements and style guides are in place. The new website design features improved navigation, cleaner presentation, and is more easily maintained than the current website.

A new structure within the management team was trialled in 2012/2013, fundamentally a move away from the top-heavy hierarchy of years gone by and a move towards a small, close-knit team of contributors. This proved successful, and growth was seen in many departments. The new ‘Press’ team successfully communicated all events, key station news and many individual episodes over social media and traditional press methods, and the Facebook page grew by over 1000 likes (25%) to break the ‘5000’ milestone. The Features role, created in 2011/2012 with limited success, grew immeasurably, and overseen the production of some diverse and popular content. features content included (but was not limited to) comedies, dramas, coverage of festivals (Edinburgh Fringe, Record Store Day, International Women’s Day), and one off broadcasts of classical music. The Events Team saw production of three events throughout the year in Glasgow venues Chambre 69, Nice ‘n’ Sleazy and The Berkeley Suite. All of these events were financially successful and featured diverse lineups composed entirely of station contributors.

The number of contributors to the station grew to approximately 150, with a larger percentage of students than in previous years. This was in part due to an extremely positive relationship with GUSRC Sabbatical Team, particularly with Vice President (Media and Communications) (who presented a show on the station).

A noticeable buzz was present in the station for the year 2012/2013, with many contributors interacting with both the team and other contributors in a way that had been absent while the station trialled a hierarchical management structure. This was acknowledged by the wider creative community in Glasgow and beyond with extremely high numbers of incoming show applications and a full page interview with station manager Niall Morris in the December 2012 print issue of The Skinny, a culture and entertainment magazine distributed through Scotland.
GUST

GUST produced more Freshers' Week coverage than ever before, covering events across the week in both student unions and, for the first time, producing a "Getting to Know..." series in the lead up to Freshers Week, to provide information and build up interest before new students arrived on campus. Highlighted events included a screening of GUST’s best videos from last year and a studio tour. There was a GUST stall at the Freshers' Fair complemented by an interactive display, allowing curious freshers to try out some of the TV recording equipment and experience presenting in front of a green screen.

GUST has continued to produce a range of programmes for students. New programmes developed included Pulse (News) and The Beat (Music). GUST also produced a lot of new videos outside of their regular programming. GUST’s promo videos have been particularly successful this year. "Fangnam Style" - a Halloween promo with a zombie take on the popular craze – has been one of their most popular videos.

This year following Freshers’ Week, GUST organised a new event called ‘Glasgow Showcase’ a variety show with a range of talent from across the University. This was the first attempt at an event of this kind; it was conceived with the aim of raising additional funds for the organisation, promoting the work done by GUST and helping to train new GUST members. The event was well attended, with over £600 raised for new equipment and around 30 new full time members were recruited. Due to the success in achieving all of the stated aims, this event is set to become an annual fixture of the GUST calendar. During the year, GUST organised several other fundraising events including the annual ceilidh organised jointly with CUT film society.

GUSRC continually encourages student media groups to work together, cooperate and share resources where applicable. This year, GUST clearly benefited through working alongside other student media groups more regularly. For example, in collaborating with Glasgow University Magazine to film their fashion and dance display at their relaunch for arts programme G-Spot. Subcity loaned sound equipment, and the Guardian newspaper regularly included GUST promotion in its publications.

During Glasgow University Media Week 2013, GUST helped to organise several events which included a Question Time style programme, filmed and streamed online to a wide audience. GUST also produced videos throughout the year for GUSRC including a video to promote Movember, and another that was screened at a Stonewall Scotland conference, addressing LGBT in the workplace.

GUST was commissioned to produce videos for different University departments, including promotional videos for the Department of Social Sciences website and a promotional video for developing graduate attributes. The University Careers Service described the final video in the series as "a real credit to the abilities of GUST".

In 2012-2013 GUST were once again affiliated with the National Student Television Association (NaSTA). This affiliation provides contact and support from other student television stations throughout the country. GUST regularly participates in NaSTA programming and attends its conference and awards event every year.

In October 2012 GUST participated in ‘Freshers TV’, a NaSTA-run live link up with other student television stations across the UK, displaying the best of Freshers’ Week coverage. This year an online vote rendered GUST the winners of ‘Best Freshers TV segment’ for NaSTA Freshers TV.

The NaSTA 40 Conference and Awards was GUST’s most successful for over 5 years. Awards included Winner: Best Video-to-Music and Highly Commended Broadcaster 2013.

GUARDIAN

Guardian published six issues in 2012/13, including a special election edition. 4,000 copies of each paper were printed resulting in an estimated readership figure of 15,000 per issue. Over the year, the editorial team first reported three stories which were later picked up by local and national news media. In addition to the six ‘standard’ issues of Guardian published over the year, RIO funded an additional edition of Guardian’s ‘best bits’. This publication was distributed around campus on the 4th June Open Day. Students were employed to distribute the paper around campus throughout the day.

Work on the new Guardian website continues, while social media outlets such as facebook and twitter have further assisted in extending the newspaper’s readership.

Content continues to be a balance of campus-specific and student-related news, along with in-depth feature articles, high-profile interviews, reviews and sports coverage. The newspaper continues to train a number of contributors and editors in writing, editing and design. A new session, open to all, focussing on effective newswriting was also added to the training programme.

GUM

The glossy student magazine is the oldest student publication in Scotland. GUM continues its success in offering a blend of fashion, art and politics in a high quality publication. GUM is also increasing its online presence with a website that continues to attract around 4,000 visitors per month. Facebook traffic on their newly established channel is also considerable. Each issue of GUM involves around 75 contributors, most of whom are students at the University or Glasgow School of Art.

GUM continues to offer personal development opportunities to students through training sessions alongside the encouragement of ongoing peer support and editorial coaching from experienced contributors. In addition, GUM has continued to work with a variety of businesses around Glasgow to further the links between the University and the local community. Art galleries, clothing stores and local cafes all helped to contribute to the magazine.
GUSRC aims to contribute to and promote the wellbeing of all students. The organisation delivers a number of services to support the range of students it represents. This section covers some of the work undertaken throughout the year under this heading.
GUSRC and the University have been working together in recent years to develop an appropriate solution to the relative isolation and inaccessibility of GUSRC’s reception area upstairs in the John McIntyre Building. In addition, the University has sought to address the lack of an attractive, prestigious focal point for visitors to make first contact.

The Welcome Point opened in November 2012. The key aims of the project include enhancing visitor perception of the University and increasing the visibility and accessibility of GUSRC on campus. The core function of the Welcome Point, on a day to day basis, is to provide a welcoming and knowledgeable information and signposting service to visitors, staff and students of the University. The Welcome Point is staffed by GUSRC student employees who are part of the administration or general office team.

The Welcome Point is gradually becoming a focal point for University enquiries. With enquiries in the ‘Campus Information’ category rising from 251 on 2011/2012 to 1264 in 2012/2013, just under 1200 of these enquiries have occurred since the opening of the Welcome Point. ‘Campus Information’ enquiries is the term used for recording any non-student visitor enquiry. Such enquiries would have been regarded as atypical for GUSRC’s reception desk but now comprises a considerably more significant proportion of enquiries. Given that the Welcome Point is a fairly recent development and, as yet has no suitable signage, we have no doubt that the number of such enquiries will increase significantly.

The University had a vision of the Welcome Point as a showpiece area which would present a positive image of the University to visitors. Through the development period there was an understandable view, from Estates and Buildings that the presence of photocopiers in the main welcome area would do little to contribute to this vision and, consequently, an additional reception and service area was developed.
GUSRC’s Advice Centre employs four FTE staff members and provides high quality, impartial advice and advocacy on a range of welfare and academic issues to students and prospective students of the University. The Advice Centre also plays a key role in informing and legitimising our policy development and campaigns. This section focuses on the casework element of the Advice Centre. The rest of the work is subsumed within other elements of this report.

CASEWORK ACTIVITY

During the last year the advice team dealt with 1087 cases (a small increase against 1036 last year) and 1330 anonymous enquiries (previous year 1054). The number of casework items (e.g. interviews, phone calls, research, emails), was 13,504. This is a reduction against 15,086 the previous year. The overall trend continues upwards, however, with increases in cases and anonymous enquiries.

Approximately 76% of the Advice Centre’s client group are undergraduates. Postgraduates are the next biggest group at 10%. The rest of our enquiries come from prospective students, students’ parents, University staff members, former students, non-Glasgow students, DACE students, external agencies and members of the public. 9% of clients were not identified with any particular group.

ISSUES

The Advice Centre’s recording system enables GUSRC to break down the casework under different headings. The database recording system was revised during the previous year in order to simplify recording and better reflect the type of work the Advice Centre deals with.

By far, University/Academic issues continue to make up the largest number of enquiries dealt with - 7,187 (8,036) casework entries followed by accommodation problems - 3,578 (3,880) casework entries and financial issues, 1494 (1538) casework entries.

ADVICE CENTRE CASEWORK AREAS 2012/13

OVER THIRTEEN THOUSAND PIECES OF CASEWORK WERE UNDERTAKEN BY GUSRC’S ADVICE CENTRE TEAM IN 2012/13
OUTCOMES

In many cases the client is empowered with the information to act for themselves and will not revert to the Advice Centre unless further assistance is required. GUSRC is able to provide some detail on the benefits that students have derived through assistance from the Advice Centre. Details of the outcomes are on the following page.

ACADEMIC

› There were 64 completed appeal cases during the year, and increase of 11 from 53 in 2011/12.
› There were 32 completed student conduct outcomes, up from 24 in 2011/12.
› There were 7 completed complaint outcomes (11 in 2011/12)

PERCENTAGE OF SUCCESSFUL ADVICE CENTRE ACADEMIC CASES

FINANCIAL GAINS

Our confirmed financial gains for clients give a total figure of £21,612. This figure is down approximately 40% from last year. However, the Tenancy Deposit Scheme came into operation at the beginning of October 2012. This system makes it easier for tenants to recover their deposits without requiring our assistance in court action. However, there are still many landlords who ignore the law in terms of rent deposits and a considerable amount of students still seek our assistance.

Financial gains come from a variety of sources including:

› Recovery of accommodation deposits
› Payment of wages or holiday pay previously withheld
› Successful challenging of student support overpayment decisions
› Direct results of advice on eligibility for student funding.
› Successful benefit claims/appeals

The financial gains figure is always a significant underestimate of the true financial gain. GUSRC only records gains which are confirmed. In the majority of cases where there is a potential financial gain, clients do not return to advise of the outcome.

NON-FINANCIAL GAINS

In 21 cases, either through negotiation, appeals or student conduct processes, re-submission of an assignment or re-sit of an exam was granted. Grades were reviewed in seven cases. Students were accepted back onto their course in 27 cases and nine students were granted uncapped resits. The Advice Centre was able to sort out problems with council tax exemption in two cases. Our intervention also helped to prevent homelessness in two cases. In 12 further cases our intervention helped to ensure housing repairs were carried out after the landlord had previously delayed doing so.

CASE STUDIES

Student A had difficulties in getting their deposit back due to a change of letting agent after the end of their tenancy. The student had not been able to get any information on what steps they could take to claim the money back. The Advice Centre was able to obtain the landlord details and contact them directly to outline their responsibilities to the tenant which resulted in full payment of the deposit back to the student.

Student B had been the victim of an assault. A member of the Advice Centre team assisted them in completing an application to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority. The application was slow to progress but the Advice Centre contacted CICA regularly for updates. When the award was confirmed it transpired that there would be difficulty making the payment to the student’s bank account. The Advice Worker contacted CICA to see if special arrangements could be made in these circumstances and payment was made to GUSRC who were then able to transfer the money to the student.

Student C had been called in front of Senate Assessors accused of plagiarism in a piece of work. The Advice Centre assisted the student writing a statement and accompanied them to the hearing where the student was able to demonstrate that there had been no intention to “pass off other work as their own”. The Senate Assessors permitted a resubmission of the work which would be capped at the pass mark. There was some difficulty in relaying this information back to the School so Advice Centre staff assisted the student in liaising with their School and Senate to ensure that this cap was appropriately applied.

Student D was an international student who used an agent to assist with his application for a postgraduate place at the University. He was unaware that the agent had also reserved accommodation with the University’s Residential Services on Campus until he received a bill for the full year’s accommodation, by which time he had taken up a tenancy of a private rented flat elsewhere. Following negotiation with Residential Services a compromise was reached whereby the student was obliged to pay one month’s rent. Residential Services have offered to work with GUSRC in reviewing procedures for international students applying through agents to ensure such anomalies are not repeated.

Students E, F, G and H all contacted the Advice Centre separately regarding exams where arrangements relating to disabilities that should be made for them were not applied appropriately. Advice Centre staff assisted the students in drafting appeal letters under the unfair/defective procedure ground of appeal. These were upheld by the various Appeals Committees and the outcomes were that the students would be allowed to sit an uncapped resit with appropriate arrangements in place. Due to the frequency of the issue, Advice Centre staff also fed this back to the GUSRC Sabbatical Officers as a general issue which they were able to raise at appropriate levels in the University.

Student H had been charged a holding deposit by a letting agent, when the tenancy did not proceed this was not refunded. An Advice Worker wrote to the letting agent highlighting that this was in fact, an illegal premium and could not be retained. The letting agent persisted in their view that they were under no obligation to return the money. Further representations by the Advice Worker outlining the legislation in detail and demonstrating where the letting agency were acting unlawfully resulted in the letting agency changing its position and refunding the monies in full.
STUDENT SAFETY

MINIBUS SERVICE

This free service, run during mornings and evenings throughout term time, continues to fulfil an important role in ensuring students feel safe when travelling between their residence and campus; particularly after studying late at the library on dark nights. It ensures that students can spend extra hours in the library without having to consider the costs of a late night bus ride (where available) or a taxi journey. Students are also more likely to use campus study facilities if they know they don’t face a long walk home in the dark through areas which at times can be dangerous and where students have, in the past, been targeted.

Evening Service

GUSRC currently runs three minibuses on differing routes. During 2011/2012 total journeys for the evening were 64,557, a rise of 12% on the previous year.

Morning Service

This was the third full year of the morning minibus service. Once again the service was in high demand with 37,590 student journeys made. This figure represents a rise 35% against last year’s figure and was achieved through the addition of another bus to the morning service.

Analysis

Usage figures continue an upward pattern with 102,147 student journeys being made in total, marking a significant increase against 85,423 in 2011/2012 and 66,437 during 2010/2011. Student feedback, in terms of courtesy of individual drivers continues to be very positive. There is however a low background noise of discontent around what is perceived as an inadequate level of service provision (e.g. number of bus runs and lack of spaces on buses).

Future

Feedback suggests that students’ expectations of GUSRC’s minibus service are extremely high; in many cases so high as that they might be considered unrealistic. Despite continual review of the routes and times and an increase in student journeys of 400% over the last five years, demand continues to outstrip supply at particular times of the evening. However, the service is appreciated by those who use it and clearly valued as indicated by the high demand. The reduction in public bus service provision to Wolfson Halls in particular is contributing to higher levels of complaints.
SAFETY CAMPAIGNS

As mentioned previously, GUSRC took an active role in the newly established Personal Safety Coordinating Group which focused on campaigns to promote safety to students. GUSRC took the lead on campaign design to ensure maximum student engagement in the group’s work. Key safety campaigns for the year included:

- Freshers’ Week Stay Safe
- Winter Stay Safe
- Shut It (halls of residence safety campaign)
- West End housebreaking awareness campaign work
- Assault Poster Campaign
- Theft Campaign

Following a series of assaults on students in Glasgow’s West End, February saw GUSRC coordinate a publicity campaign in consultation with Central Services and Strathclyde police on ways to limit the risk of becoming a victim of crime. In addition GUSRC procured additional personal attack alarms (partly funded by Central Services) to offer to students free of charge, with almost 1000 alarms distributed in a one month period.

SAFE ACCOMODATION

GUSRC undertook a survey of approximately 180 students living in non-University accommodation to establish security levels in privately rented houses and flats in response to a number of break-ins in the area around the University. The survey compiled worrying data on the types and number of locks on properties, number of participants with working door-entry systems and the number of locks on windows in student properties. GUSRC intends to use these findings in order to lobby the HMO licensing board to enforce a minimum level of security on properties as part of the HMO compliance process.
**STUDENT SERVICES**

### 2ND HAND BOOKSHOP

GUSRC continues to operate its second hand book trading facility. This facility contributes to the alleviation of student poverty through providing a source of cheap course texts whilst affording an opportunity for other students to gain some financial return on texts which they no longer require. GUSRC continues to operate this service on a break-even basis with greater efficiencies achieved through the use of web based reminder and reserving facilities.

Bookshop Sales increased slightly during 2012 to 2013. A total of 5334 (5164) books were sold over the year. Calculations indicate the total savings to students buying the second hand books would be £25,575 against full price whilst those students selling books made £28,252 additional income from the sales. Total financial benefit to students using the service over the period is £53,827.

![Graph showing total secondhand books sold in SRC bookshop](image)

### PRINT SERVICES

Through its frontline office, GUSRC continues to offer high quality printing and photocopying facilities to all students at a considerably lower rate than commercial high street agencies. These services remain popular; the upward trend continued with unit sales jumping by over 15,000 copies from 281,581 to 296,591. The binding service continues to be well used with an ongoing struggle to meet demand and an additional 6% increase in usage compared to 2011/12. University guidelines for binding, introduced in 2011, have assisted in ensuring the service meets the requirement of all students.

![Image of a photocopier](image)

### JOB SHOP

Unlike recruitment agencies, Jobshop is a free ‘job and skills’ matching service, provided to all students and employers. Employers contact GUSRC with employment opportunities which are then advertised to students through GUSRC’s website. GUSRC also produce information for students about their employment rights and joining trade unions in order to prevent/minimise employer exploitation. GUSRC have recently revised and updated their employment rights booklet, ‘Wage Slave or Winner’ found on the GUSRC website.

![Image of a Jobshop](image)
GUSRC continues to carry the responsibility of co-ordinating and administering Freshers’ Week, working with the University and facilitating linkages with student bodies. GUSRC has responsibility for the marketing and administration of the Freshers’ Pass programme. This year’s Freshers’ Pass sales totalled 2966, approximately 300 passes down on the previous year, but within a reasonable degree of variation.

GUSRC has developed online sales facilities over the last couple of years and this has proved to be worthwhile, easing the Freshers’ Pass purchase process for new students, in particular international students who often have to deal with obstacles around money transfer issues. It has also provided the benefit of slightly reducing the administrative work undertaken in processing passes. The sales of the Freshers’ Passes are a significant contribution to the finances of the Unions, with each receiving £26,500 from GUSRC as a contribution from the sales, with GUSA and GUSRC each receiving £15,500.

As always, the majority of the events that GUSRC organises during Freshers’ Week are focused on non-alcohol related activity and are in some cases also targeted to specific groups of students, e.g. international students and students who are parents. The events are designed to be attractive to ‘traditional’ and ‘non traditional’ students alike. In addition to taking part in most orientation events across the colleges, and providing campus tours and welcome talks in halls of residence, we continue to organise a host of daytime and early evening events, including: Cultural Carnival, International Céilidh, LGBT Tea, Toddlers in The Tent and Freshers’ Week The Culture Club – all the aforementioned were free and packed with enthusiastic participants.

GUSRC is keenly aware of concerns that Freshers’ Week may be too narrowly focused and actually reinforce the marginalisation of some demographics on campus. To this end, GUSRC commissioned independent research in order to evaluate the success of Freshers’ Week in the context of the organisation’s own aims. The following of key issues have been identified through the research for further discussion and action.

- Engaging students that live at home.
- Engaging postgraduate students.
- Building the perceived value for money of the Freshers’ Pass and being clear about the added value that the Pass brings to users.
- Looking at the mix of events and, where possible, giving greater emphasis to live music, clubs and societies events and theatre/comedy.
- Ensuring effective circulation of the Events Guide.
- Developing the role of Freshers’ Helpers and providing suitable training and support to helpers.

Taken together, these are the issues to be addressed to turn a “good” Freshers’ week into a “great” one that meets the needs of, and engages with, the maximum number of new students.

Although GUSRC may be able to address some of the above, at least in part, the issue of Freshers’ Pass ‘value for money’ is perhaps beyond this organisation’s capacity to influence more than slightly.

GUSRC are currently preparing plans to use the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club to facilitate a ‘Welcome Month’ in the new semester, specifically focussed on developing activities which will attract and involve postgraduates students.

GUSRC are currently in dialogue with Alison Browitt, Research Associate, Recruitment and International Office (RIO) and Neil Croll, Acting Head of Widening Participation, RIO, regarding an LTDF Research Project: “Enhancing engagement of local ‘commuter’ students at induction to support transition and promote student retention and success”. The LTDF project is looking at all ‘local commuting students’, which will include the majority of the University’s WP students. The aim of the project is to contribute to the retention of this group at the University.

GUSRC has provided the researchers with a copy of its own research findings and agreed to assist where possible in applying any recommendations emerging from RIO’s work to continue to develop a Freshers’ Week as a positive and welcoming experience for all new students.
WELFARE WEEK

GUSRC’s Welfare Week was held during November. Constituting a range of events, activities and promotions, the aims of the week were focused around encouraging students to take care of and value their own welfare, as well as raising awareness of options and access in terms of support services. A Welfare Week information stall was staffed all week in the University’s main cafeteria area of the Fraser Building. Different groups were able to access the stall to conduct their awareness-raising activity. Amongst others, the stall was used by:

- GUSRC Nightline
- GU Boob-Team who promoted women’s health and their ‘Coppa Feel in the Shower’ campaign
- GU Environmental and Sustainability Team who were informing students on how to become more energy efficient and reduce energy bills, also gave out free energy saving light bulbs
- Action on Hearing Loss who promoted their ‘Loud Music’ campaign, warning students about the dangers of loud music and provided hearing checks

Workshops held during the week included; ‘The Happiest Day of Your Life’ Workshop and ‘The Education Appreciation Experiment’. The aim of these workshops was to offer students an alternative or additional support to that offered by University Counselling services. The first workshop focussed on step-by-step approaches over a typical day and included learning how to develop and maintain self-esteem, the ability to deal with stress, using affirmations, intentional positive thinking, stress management and self-acceptance techniques. The second workshop laid out the top 10 most common challenges students face and worked through each one to suggest ways of working through these practically by teaching skills to improve confidence and enthusiasm. Both workshops were limited to 20 attendees and were oversubscribed.

In addition to the above, a range of other activities comprised Welfare Week including; Mental Health Drop-In Sessions, Free Gym Access and Classes, Hillhead Pharmacy Discount, ‘Recharge your Brain’ Meditation Session, Advice seminar ‘Your Home - Your Money – Your Rights’, Yoga and Free Condom Distribution.

THIRD PARTY REPORTING

GUSRC has an integral role in developing and supporting the University’s Equality and Diversity agenda and therefore opted to become a Third Party Reporting Centre (the only such centre on campus). Any student who wishes to report a hate crime but does not want to report the matter to the police can now report it anonymously and more comfortably than previously. Staff from the GUSRC’s Advice Centre, the permanent secretary and the Vice President (Student Support), have undertaken Third Party Reporting training. GUSRC intend to extend the training next year to all GUSRC Welfare and Equal Opportunities Officers to maximise the number of people that students can report to.

ACCOMODATION FORUM

GUSRC were, once again, invited to participate in the Accommodation Options Forum event which is run annually, in February, by Residential Services. GUSRC staff talked directly to 138 students and many more collected information. This event is clearly a useful vehicle for promotion of the Advice Centre as a source of information and advice on housing as well as serving as a good source of information for students seeking Private Sector accommodation.
The Guide, produced by GUSRC, has long been seen as the key introductory document to life in Glasgow in general, and the University of Glasgow in particular for new students. The Guide contains information ranging from social life in the city through to library processes and in-depth guides to GUSRC services. Produced to high quality print and design standards, 6,000 copies of The Guide are distributed directly to new undergraduate and postgraduate students as part of the registration process each year. The Guide is not produced as a “throwaway” document. The high standard of presentation, quality of writing and range of information ensure that The Guide is kept and used as a reference book throughout the year. As with last year, we reviewed all aspects of The Guide, including design, content and structure in order to produce a stylish and up to date document which will hopefully serve as a useful introduction to life at the University and in the city itself.

GUSRC again produced a diary developed for use by first year students, with the aim of enhancing learning and contributing to student retention through:

- Encouraging time management, good learning practices and organisational skills.
- Assisting integration and participation in a range of activities.
- Highlighting the range of Support Services offered by the University and GUSRC, to ensure that students know who can help them with any issues.
- Assisting the process of students settling into the city and settling into the University environment.
- Encouraging a sense of belonging at the University.

Although the diary undergoes an annual redesign, it retains basically the same format and includes similar (but updated) information.

GUSRC continues to assist the University in the planning and activities associated with both University Open Days and Applicants Visit Days. In addition to co-ordination and preparation of the cross-campus talk on “life as a student at the University of Glasgow” which is held at both events, GUSRC’s role in both is developing further as the Welcome Point becomes an established fixture on campus for those who need information or to find their way around Gilmorehill.

The Welcome Point was agreed as the initial contact point for University Applicants’ Day in April and the Open Day in June. During these events GUSRC staff engaged with hundreds of potential students, providing information on a wide range of enquiries. Feedback from the University’s Recruitment and International Office (RIO) has been positive with discussions underway as to how this function can be enhanced and expanded in the coming year.

GUSRC also contributes to the ‘Student Life Fair’ at each open day event, with both the Advice Centre and GUSRC itself represented for potential students to enquire about the facilities, services and representation offered by GUSRC. The stalls are manned by Advice Centre staff and by GUSRC Council Members who can provide first hand experiences of working with GUSRC and the services available to students.

The Guide

The WELCOME POINT WAS USED AS A HUB FOR STUDENTS VISITING AT OPEN DAY IN JUNE 2013
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STUDENT DIARY
In keeping with the organisation’s strategic aims and the University’s Graduate Attributes agenda, GUSRC continues to provide a dedicated service that facilitates volunteering opportunities for students as well as acting as the central campus hub for University clubs and societies – all of this helps contribute to a thriving campus life and individual personal development through the provision of opportunities which meet the intellectual, cultural and social needs of our members.
The Student Volunteer Support Service (SVSS) currently supports nearly 30 different volunteering projects. In addition to directly managing 17 of these projects, SVSS provides administrative support, advice and assistance for student-led projects and also helps recruit students for outside stakeholders.

SVSS has built strong working links with several services and departments across the University. The Careers Service has been particularly supportive of the work of SVSS. The partnership with the Confucius Institute continues to strengthen and SVSS also works with the School of Psychology and the College of Arts ‘Humanities in the Classroom’ project.

Most importantly, SVSS continues to act as a source of volunteers for third party organisations across Glasgow. Students are offered an exciting range of personal development opportunities and the chance to earn ‘more than a degree’ through involvement in socially useful activities in the local community. Through our volunteering projects, SVSS promotes the University through its students across Glasgow and around the world.

Over the course of the academic year 2012/13, a total of 668 student volunteers were registered as a direct result of SVSS support and recruitment. This is a significant increase over the previous academic year’s total of 497 and is the highest number of student volunteers registered in a single year to date. Despite the increase in numbers and subsequent placements, demand continues to outstrip capacity for most projects. Employers’ growing interest in extracurricular activities is well documented and with participation in volunteering now officially recognised on University of Glasgow transcripts, it is likely that interest in volunteering will continue to grow in popularity among our students.

As demand continues to escalate and pressure on SVSS increases, there are concerns that, while an increase in applicants will reflect positively on the service, the capacity to develop new projects and placements will eventually ‘plateau’ as the service continues to run at full capacity. There are some concerns as to how expectations are managed and reputational damage limited as a growing number of applicants will be left disappointed through the inability to secure a placement.

Disclosure Scotland is now in its third year of the PVG scheme, which was implemented in 2010/11. All volunteers wishing to take part in projects which involve volunteering with children or vulnerable adults are required to join this scheme and update their membership each time they take on a new project which also requires disclosure.

From late 2012 until January 2013, Disclosure Scotland placed a cap on applications from GUSRC, severely limiting the capacity of SVSS to process Disclosure applications and restricting students across a number of volunteering projects. After lengthy discussions, GUSRC were able to resume the service. Despite initial difficulties in 2012/13 a total of 303 applications were processed compared with 231 the previous year.

What follows are some examples of SVSS projects and how they benefit students and the wider community. SVSS continues to form new partnerships with projects whenever possible in order to offer a selection of options to our students. Such varied opportunities not only allow students to gain experience which can be invaluable to their degree, but it may also open doors for careers in the third sector.
GUSH

GUSH is one of the most ‘in demand’ projects which SVSS offers to students at Glasgow. The project has slightly revised its weekly schedule over the past year to allow for a more streamlined service which offers consistent and regular volunteering opportunities. Partners in delivery include Emmaus Glasgow and Glasgow Central Mosque.

SVSS have worked with GUSH to assist it in establishing a management structure and the group is now coordinated by two senior volunteers who work with the SVSS Coordinator to manage and administer the entire group which, in 2012/13, was made up of 148 student volunteers, a considerable increase against 109 the previous year. As part of the group management review, SVSS also introduced a ‘shift leader’ role to the group to ensure that every shift has an experienced volunteer to lead the group and keep communication open between the rest of the team and other stakeholders who rely on GUSH to arrive with supplies at the service on time. This has reduced the number of shift cancellations dramatically to virtually zero.

With the large increase in volunteer numbers this year, the limitations of GUSH’s current operating environment have become increasingly evident, and the current partnership arrangements require GUSH to limit student volunteering opportunities to 10 shifts per week for the entire group.

As a consequence of the aforementioned limitations, GUSRC will work with GUSH in the coming year to review how it currently delivers its service and how it may best be able to accommodate the increasing demand for volunteering opportunities. Both parties are keen to find a way to translate the clear enthusiasm of the many volunteers into an increased level of service delivery, which will reach out to more homeless people than is currently possible.

CONVERSATIONAL ENGLISH & THE CULTURE CLUB

The Conversational English project is one of GUSRC’s most popular and is in constant demand throughout the year. The premise is simple, but very effective. International students apply through SVSS for a ‘tutor’ and are paired with student volunteers who speak fluent English. Once paired, the students meet at least once or twice a week, often more, and engage in informal conversation in order to help develop a more natural fluency in English. In total, 215 students took part in the project in 2012/13, compared with 162 the previous year. Of these students, a total of 197 students were paired, an increase of 65 students from the previous year. A particularly encouraging trend during 2012/13 was noted when all students who applied during the academic year were allocated tutors.

As a development from the popularity of the Conversational English programme, it was decided to create a partner project, with more of a social focus, to help encourage interaction and integration among students of all nationalities. After a series of culturally-themed events during 2012/13, including a sell-out Burns Supper in January and a Chinese New Year celebration in cooperation with the Confucius Institute at the University of Glasgow (complete with an authentic Dragon Dance), it was decided to promote ‘The Culture Club’ as a volunteering opportunity for those keen to take the lead in devising further social events aimed at students over the coming year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS VOLUNTEERING AS PART OF CONVERSATIONAL ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A performer taking part in the Chinese New Year celebrations on campus organised by SVSS and the Confucius Institute.
NIGHTLINE

Nightline is GUSRC’s confidential listening and signposting service, run by students, for students. As a signposting service, Nightline operates from the hours of 7pm and 7am and does not overlap with the services provided by the Advice Centre, The Welcome Point or the Student Enquiries Desk.

SVSS has worked with lead members of Nightline to shape a structure that now gives students a greater role and more responsibility in the running of the service. A reshaping of the Nightline Coordinator roles, including the delegation of some duties, such as publicity, to other senior team members has appeared to be successful. A ‘coordinator mentoring’ scheme was also implemented, to ensure that incoming leaders are able to pick up and develop the service immediately without repeating work already undertaken. It is believed that the benefits of this will continue to be apparent in 2013/14.

For the period 2012/13, Nightline saw a 157% increase in phone calls from the previous year – a total of 49 calls were received in the first two months alone, compared with a total of 46 calls for the whole of the previous year. Over 2012/13 the service also expanded its internet contact service by adding instant messaging in January 2013, which attracted a further 31 enquiries. Overall, a total of 216 calls, emails and IMs were received in 2012/13, compared with 57 in 2011/12.

Another notable development was affiliation with Nightline UK. This has allowed Nightline Coordinators to attend nationwide conferences in Scotland and England, which helps facilitate learning from practice in other institutions – the implementation of the ‘three rings’ rota system was as a direct result of this affiliation, which in turn saw shift coverage rise from 44.94% in semester 1 of 2012/13 to 81.00% in semester 2. It is notable that in the final month of the academic year 2012/13, shift coverage was 90.91%. With coverage having been a severely detrimental issue in previous years, it can be seen that the efforts made in improving the structure of the project has allowed the Nightline group more time to promote the service and develop through a continually active group of volunteers, whose roles are more clearly defined and who feel a real sense of ownership and pride in the development of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASES LOGGED BY NIGHTLINE VOLUNTEERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+279%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER VOLUNTEERING PROJECTS

Throughout 2012/13, SVSS continued its work with outside parties such as Macmillan Cancer and Alzheimer Scotland. These are two of the more challenging projects on offer by SVSS and require a greater time-commitment and training than is generally required for other projects. Macmillan requires a 6-month commitment, for example. Nevertheless, 11 students applied and 10 were taken on to work with these projects. This success has resulted in GUSRC agreeing to increase promotional activity around such projects in order emphasise the personal rewards of a more intense and longer term volunteering commitment.

Sense Scotland, Cornerstone and Bield also continued as third party projects in 2012/13 with 8 students recruited for Bield, 5 for Cornerstone and 3 for Sense Scotland. The ‘Buddy a Granny’ scheme was, overall, down somewhat at 29 volunteers participating (a drop from 42 last year) – however, it should be noted that the PVG cap placed on SVSS by Disclosure Scotland during one of the busiest recruitment periods, at the end of 2012/ beginning of 2013, severely restricted its ability to provide volunteers for projects requiring disclosures.

GU TOURS

GUSRC runs historical campus tours led by professionally accredited student guides, on Thursdays, Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays. Private tours for groups are also available for booking.

Positive word of mouth, general feedback and a review of our promotion and marketing activity (particularly our work in reaching out to international student tour groups) saw GU tours grow again for the year 2012/13, with a total of 1048 participating in tours, an increase of 129% against the 448 in 2011/12.

GU Historical Campus Tours are currently Trip Advisor’s second most popular tourist attraction in Glasgow. Our guides are regularly praised for their professionalism, knowledge, courtesy and good nature. Over the coming year, GUSRC anticipates a further increase in tours uptake as the brand becomes even more established in the city and we continue to develop our marketing links, (e.g. partnership formed with Visit Scotland during June 2013).
CLUBS & SOCIETIES

Clubs and societies are a key element of the University of Glasgow’s student experience. 240 clubs affiliated to GUSRC in 2012/2013, an increase of 70 over the previous year, with a total membership around 6,000 students. Affiliates are eligible to receive administrative and developmental support from GUSRC. This year they received funding and support worth almost £24,000, a 30% increase against the previous year. Affiliated clubs and societies continued to benefit from advice and support on issues as diverse as governance, risk assessments, publicity, and event management. GUSRC continues to provide free minibuses to facilitate trips in the UK and travel to conferences and meetings, as well as free room hire, photocopying and IT access. In addition, this year, GUSRC supported a range of mixer events which were organised with clubs and societies hosted by groups such as STAR and Amnesty.

The induction system introduced last year has been continued with some fine-tuning. This process strengthens the links between clubs and societies and GUSRC, encouraging dialogues and mutual support throughout the year.

Clubs and societies were also an integral part of GUSRC Freshers’ Week with over 60 stalls allocated solely for this purpose. As well as taking part in the Freshers’ Fair, other clubs and society events included cultural fairs, sword fighting displays and meet and greets with society members.

GUSRC’s grant allocation system seeks to balance accountability with ease of access. Clubs and societies are required to advise on potential outcomes that grant funding will enable them to achieve and are invited to make a presentation to the members of the C&S committee. The system is one tier and straightforward and there has been a continuing upsurge in applications from clubs.

GUSRC FUNDING TO CLUBS/SOCIETIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£25K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£0K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VCS AWARDS

Now in its fifth year, the VCS Awards continues to recognise the great work of volunteers, clubs and societies from across campus. Each category was, once again, heavily contested ensuring the judges had difficult decisions, and also highlighting the extraordinary range of work undertaken by students for students at Glasgow University.

- Innovation Award: Philanthrobeats
- Best New Society: Sign Language Society
- Exceptional Club/Society Event: G-Gnomes
- Working in Partnership Award: Glasgow University Food Co-op
- Publicity Award: Hispanic Society
- Students & the Community Award: Cecilian Society
- Most Dedicated Member: Fiona McKeown (GUSH)
- SRC RAG Award: Hester Gartrell (GUSH)
- Student Volunteer of the Year: Nadia Bailey & Csenge Lantos (Nightline)
FUNDRAISING & CHARITY

GUSRC develops an array of fundraising events throughout the year. Movember (Prostate Cancer) continues to be one of the organisation’s high profile on campus campaigns. Poppy Scotland’s ‘Rag Raid’, also enjoys ongoing support from GUSRC with Council Members heavily involved in the Edinburgh ‘Raid’. GUSRC also co-ordinates Raising and Giving (RAG) Week, which raised over £5,000 for various charities over the year.

The campaigns generally have a double purpose where the message is as important as the money. For example, two of GUSRC’S most prolific fundraising events of the year, One Dress One Month (raised over £1,800) and Vagina Monologues (raised over £700 in one evening) were accompanied by publicity regarding issues of womens’ rights, in this particular case, domestic abuse. The awareness-raising element of student campaigning will be developed over the coming years, having proved to be a successful approach. The newly created Communications Officer position and the new website currently under construction will assist in ensuring new communication channels are developed and effectively utilised.

Further to this, GUSRC continues to provide for student charity groups working in the local area by completing their Disclosure checks and supporting them in fundraising work.

MEDIA WEEK

University of Glasgow Media Week is the only event of its kind in the country. Media Week enables students to gain a greater understanding of the requirements, demands and expectations of a career in media. The week gives GUSRC an opportunity to cement and develop its relationship with contacts in the media.

Media Week aims to not only provide students with the opportunity to learn about different industries within the media, but to also energise students into engaging with Glasgow’s own student media, each of whom ran an event as part of the week. The overall aim of the week is to inspire students to look beyond their degree and see what else is possible, and what activities they can undertake during their studies to help forge a career path in the media.

Media Week 2013 provided a variety of events from a range of media professionals with different backgrounds and experiences. Media Week traditionally brings together Q&A sessions, presentations and panel events with experts from different fields of the media and 2013 was no exception.

Still Game and Chewin the Fat director Michael Hines provided insight into working with scripted TV, while Alison Walker, the first female presenter of Sportscene, talked about live TV and its pressures. A topical talk for the 2013 Media Week was a presentation and discussion on Scottish Independence, hosted by Yes Scotland’s Director of Communications, Susan Stewart. A representative from Better Together also spoke at an event during the week. Other sessions included radio plays and DJing, how to be a successful photographer and other sports broadcasting events.

Media Week 2013 was deemed a sucess, once again providing students with access to professionals to inspire them in being part of the media.
GUSRC provides support and training to registered University of Glasgow students based on the Crichton Campus in Dumfries. The Permanent Secretary manages two part time events and administrative staff who are funded equally by University of Glasgow and the University of The West of Scotland. The small team has responsibility for supporting Crichton students in developing extracurricular activities for the local student populace in order to enhance and enrich the cultural and educational experience at the Dumfries Campus.

CUCSA

Crichton University Campus Students’ Association (CUCSA) is the formally constituted student body at Dumfries. Its structure provides for elected student officer membership from both Glasgow and UWS students. Its role is to organise events and support local clubs and societies. Its function as a body of representation is complemented by the parent University Student Organisations. The staff members, although accountable to GUSRC’s Permanent Secretary, receive ‘day to day’ support from local University management and work to CUCSA’s elected student team.

CUCSA CLUBS & SOCIETIES

The Crichton University Campus Boat Club (CUCBC): The Boat Club is a new club, affiliated to Scottish Rowing through Nithsdale Amateur Rowing Club (NARC), to whom our students pay their membership, the team reached a competitive level very quickly. Training hard alongside NARC members, the team also purchased their own racing licenses and had CUCBC team kit designed and produced. They have been competing in Scottish Rowing regattas regionally and nationally, achieving consistently good results. CUCBC were represented at the Scottish Rowing Championships 2013, where the crews came back with excellent results: the Women’s Novice 4+ crossed fourth, the Women’s Novice 8+ came third and the Men’s Novice 4+ collected silver medals. They were also represented in the Men’s Novice 2x, reaching the semi-finals, and in the Women’s Novice 4x+, which just missed out on a place in the final.

Film Society: Now Dumfries Campus’ longest running society, the film society continues to meet regularly. The club also began to branch out from watching films and has been organising trips to other film-related events in the local area, such as talks from visiting actors; the highlight of the year was a visit to hear Brian Cox speak.

The Netball Club: The “Crichton Ravens”, were new for this academic year. The netball team trained twice a week in council premises in Dumfries. Both universities are represented on the team. The netball team have purchased their own match kit, bibs, balls and whistles. From September the netball team will have access to training in Dumfries and Galloway college sports hall, which will considerably reduce costs.

Sailing Club: This was the sailing team’s second year. CUCSA funded free taster sessions at the start of the academic year which were reasonably well attended. The team boasts membership from both University of Glasgow and University of the West of Scotland. During the season the sailing club go out on Saturdays to Lochmaben and have been working with Annandale boat club. The team captain entered the Scottish Team Racing Championship and reached the quarter finals of Gold fleet. Members are working towards sailing RYA level 1 and or 2.

EVENTS

A “Freshers’ Fortnight” was organised to welcome new students to campus (essentially a fortnight as University of Glasgow and University of the West of Scotland academic sessions started a week apart). A sponsorship agreement was reached with a local establishment “The Granary” in facilitating a CUSA produced guide, serving as an introduction to CUCSA and Freshers’ events. The guide was posted out to all Freshers’ prior to their arrival on campus. The Freshers’ fair was successful with several hundred attending and positive feedback received from the stallholders. Events such as the comedy night at the Granary were well attended with over one hundred tickets being sold.

A range of events were held in the Granary over the year as part of the sponsorship agreement. A series of Thursday club nights took place during the first semester, including the Halloween Drag show, which was very well attended. Generally however, these nights did not prove popular with the students and following review, were discontinued after Christmas.

In February CUCSA held their first ever “sports and societies ball”. It was held at the prestigious Easterbrook Hall and included dinner, speeches from the team captains and dancing. The event was successful in bringing clubs and teams together and encouraging reflection on successes during the year.
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ANY OTHER BUSINESS
INCOMING RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOMING RESOURCES FROM GENERATING FUNDS</th>
<th>RESTRICTED FUNDS ($)</th>
<th>UNRESTRICTED FUNDS ($)</th>
<th>2013 TOTAL ($)</th>
<th>2012 TOTAL ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTARY INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td>499,000</td>
<td>499,000</td>
<td>490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES GENERATING FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,325</td>
<td>44,325</td>
<td>36,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,581</td>
<td>8,581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOMING RESOURCES FROM CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>295,448</td>
<td>299,603</td>
<td>233,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCOMING RESOURCES</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>849,437</td>
<td>853,592</td>
<td>769,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOURCES EXPENDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST OF GENERATING FUNDS</th>
<th>RESTRICTED FUNDS ($)</th>
<th>UNRESTRICTED FUNDS ($)</th>
<th>2013 TOTAL ($)</th>
<th>2012 TOTAL ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COST OF GENERATING VOLUNTARY INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING TRADING COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>3,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>790,607</td>
<td>794,607</td>
<td>707,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE COSTS</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>41,269</td>
<td>41,269</td>
<td>45,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RESOURCES EXPENDED</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>844,156</td>
<td>848,510</td>
<td>763,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NET MOVEMENT IN FUNDS</th>
<th>RESTRICTED FUNDS ($)</th>
<th>UNRESTRICTED FUNDS ($)</th>
<th>2013 TOTAL ($)</th>
<th>2012 TOTAL ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(199)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,281</td>
<td>5,082</td>
<td>(2,522)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE BROUGHT FORWARDS AT JULY 1ST 2012</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>385,620</td>
<td>388,855</td>
<td>391,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD AT JUNE 30TH 2013</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>390,901</td>
<td>393,937</td>
<td>388,855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

GUSRC recorded a surplus this year of £5,082 (2012 Deficit of £2, 542). GUSRC continues to seek to maintain or increase its performance across and increasingly broad range of activities whilst operating in a challenging financial environment.

Major new projects coming on stream over the year include the Welcome Point and the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club. The university have allocated GUSRC additional funding towards the management of the Gilchrist and associated postgraduate engagement activity. The University have agreed to consider any representations from GUSRC with regard to additional costs associated with management of the Welcome Point.

Total reserves at 30th June 2013 stand at £390,901 (2012 - £393,937). Full reserves policy detailed in audited annual accounts.

GUSRC is dependent on an annual block grant from the University which amounts to 70% of its required annual income. Ongoing dependence on grant funding from the University is a reality acknowledged by the Trustees. In order to minimise the risk to the organisation, the Trustees have agreed a policy whereby GUSRC seeks to maintain reserves at a level sufficient costs to cover contractual liabilities should the organisation have to close. This includes redundancy pay, amounts due to creditors and commitments under leases.
POSTWORD

The great work undertaken by GUSRC in 2012/13 highlights the value of getting involved with student representation at Glasgow. Particular highlights of the year have included the completion of the joint GUSRC and University Welcome Point. This development is fundamental to GUSRC continuing to raise its profile on campus and to ensure that more and more students are accessing the organisations indispensable campus facilities and services. Another significant project this year was the opening of the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club to strengthen the relationship between GUSRC and the postgraduate community, a key priority is to continue to develop this relationship moving forward into the next year and encourage postgraduates to get involved with GUSRC at all levels.

My personal highlight of this year as Vice President (Student Support) has been the development of the Student Mental Health Agreements and even though there is still a lot of work to go into completing these Agreements, I am confident that this will continue after I finish this role. I feel very privileged to be a sabbatical officer in GUSRC for another year and will continue to strive to improve the student experience at the University and represent all students.

A big change moving into 2013/14 is the restructure of the sabbatical positions. This new structure should allow the sabbaticals to do more representation work whilst at the same time provide for a much more effective publicity machine to highlight the work we do. I’m excited to work with a new group of interesting individuals who I expect will bring variety and new ideas to the institution. Each sabbatical officer will be expected to set more specific goals in line with our Strategic Plan to further facilitate productivity and accountability of the Executive.

We are heading towards an important time of change for the University with the development of the campus just around the corner, and GUSRC have the opportunity to focus on what is crucial for creating a better experience for students and impacting on how our current students and students of the future will study and socialise.

In the meantime, we look forward to tackling new and existing challenges through 2013/2014. Of real concern, for example, are the pressures that continually rising student numbers are putting on critical student services and classroom space.

Students can also look forward to a new GUSRC website which will offer another crucial interface for communicating and engaging with students radically improve our means for conveying information and also generally keep them up to date with topical issues regarding student representation.

February 2014 will see the next Rectorial election and we hope to receive nominations from a variety of promising candidates who will aid GUSRC to represent students and spark awareness of the present problems students face. The vote on the Council of Senate will also be a very important moment in the upcoming year for securing full student representation on Senate.

It’s going to be another noteworthy year for GUSRC and we are excited about new projects and continuing to campaign and speak out for students on matters that are imperative to maintaining a fantastic experience at the University of Glasgow.

Jessica McGrellis
President 2013/14
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Report from the Finance Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Finance Committee held on Wednesday 15 January 2014 are attached.

Court’s attention is drawn to the following items for noting:

**Social and Public Health Sciences Unit (SPHSU) relocation project: Capex application**

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting £0.625m to cover costs associated with the relocation of the MRC-funded Social and Public Health Sciences Unit from 4 Lilybank Gardens to 200 Renfield Street. Finance Committee approved the application, noting that the costs would be funded by the MRC grant.

**JWNC – Cluster tool and NanoSAM: Capex application**

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting £0.62m in funding to build an extension to the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre (JWNC) cleanroom located in the James Watt Building (South). The extension is to house a cluster tool and nanoSAM for the JWNC. This is the net cost, as £0.273m of the total cost of £0.893m will be funded from the EPSRC equipment grant. Finance Committee approved the application.

**Update on GUU/Stevenson extension**

The Committee received an update on the GUU/Stevenson Building extension. The paper also requested the Committee’s agreement to proceed to re-tender (as agreed by Estates Committee) and to grant delegated authority to a sub group of the Estates and Finance Committees to authorise additional expenditure.

The Committee approved that the revised scheme proceeds to tender and noted the need for additional funding of £516k minimum (incl VAT). The Committee granted delegated authority to a sub group of Estates and Finance Committees (the Conveners of Estates and Finance Committees, the Principal, the Senior Vice-Principal and the Director of Finance) to authorise the actual amount of additional expenditure once the tenders are returned.
University of Glasgow
Finance Committee
Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 15 January 2014
Melville Room, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:
Mr Graeme Bissett, Mr Ken Brown (Convener), Mr Robert Fraser, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Prof Miles Padgett, Mr David Ross, Dr Duncan Ross, Mr Iain Stewart.

In attendance:
Mrs Ann Allen, Mr Nick Holland, Prof Neal Juster, Mr David Newall, Ms Fiona Quinn

Apologies:
Ms Jessica McGrillis, Mr Kevin Sweeney

CA/2013/37. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 13 November 2013

The minutes of Finance Committee held on Wednesday 13 November 2013 were approved with one correction, as follows:

CA/2013/32. Endowments Investment Reports

‘The Convener of the Investment Advisory Committee noted that the appointment of Newton was to be renewed at the May meeting of the Investment Advisory Committee.’

Should be corrected to:

‘The Convener of the Investment Advisory Committee noted that the appointment of Newton was to be reviewed at the May meeting of the Investment Advisory Committee.’

The Convenor welcomed Graeme Bissett to his first meeting of Finance Committee.

CA/2013/38. Matters arising

CA/2013/05. Endowments Change of Use

The Director of Finance noted that the endowment fund which had been transferred to the Postgraduate Scholarship Fund was from the College of Social Sciences. The details of the endowment would be circulated to the Committee after the meeting.

CA/2013/30. Clydesdale Bank Facilities Letter

The Principal had written to the CEO of Clydesdale Bank to inform him that banking services would be put to tender. No response had been received to date.

CA/2013/39. Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were noted.
CA/2013/40. Social and Public Health Sciences Unit (SPHSU) relocation project: Capex application (paper 5.1.1)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting £0.625m of funding to cover removal, construction, furniture IT and telecom costs associated with the relocation of the MRC-funded Social and Public Health Sciences Unit from 4 Lilybank Gardens to 200 Renfield Street. This was based on a sub-lease to March 2020. The costs would be funded by the MRC grant.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Director of Estates and Buildings confirmed that the city centre location had been chosen because of the quality of the space – following thorough property searches, no space of the required quality and specification had been available closer to the University.

There was a question from the Committee on the potential risk of the quinquennial grant funding of the unit not being renewed in 2015. The Director of Estates and Buildings confirmed that the new space may help reduce the risk of funding not being granted, as concerns over the quality of the previous accommodation had been raised and indeed the MRC had judged the Lilybank Gardens premises not fit for purpose.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2013/41. JWNC – Cluster tool and NanoSAM: Capex application (paper 5.1.2)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting £0.62m in funding to build an extension to the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre (JWNC) cleanroom located in the James Watt Building (South). The extension is to house a cluster tool and nanoSAM for the JWNC. This is the net cost, as £0.273m of the total cost of £0.893m will be funded from the EPSRC equipment grant.

The Committee noted that a successful bid had been made to EPSRC for the machine. Included within the £3.0m bid was an estimate of £0.273m for installation of equipment. However when the detailed tender document was received it became apparent that the identified location was unsuitable, and a new location was identified with an increased associated installation cost. Various other potential options had been considered and rejected.

The Director of Finance confirmed that the cashflow/investment programme outlined in the application described a rolling programme of refurbishment and refreshment of facilities. The Senior Vice Principal confirmed that in approving this application there would be no automatic commitment to approve future expenditure identified on the rolling programme – this would come to Capex Committee and Finance Committee in due course as separate applications.

The Director of Finance agreed to bring back to the Committee a paper providing an overview of the complex model used to calculate financing of equipment, associated capital and overall funding. The Committee agreed this would be welcome.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2013/42. Update on GUU/Stevenson extension (paper 5.1.3)

The Committee received an update on the GUU/Stevenson Building extension. The paper also requested the Committee’s agreement to proceed to re-tender (as agreed by Estates Committee) and to grant delegated authority to a sub group of the Estates and Finance Committees to...
authorise additional expenditure only after tender returns are received. This request was partly driven by the timing and programme of the project, and the required timescales for approval of expenditure, set against the timing of Estates and Finance Committee meetings.

The Director of Estates reminded the Committee of the background of this update. Estates Committee had raised concerns that the value engineering exercise may adversely affect the efficiency and specification of the building, however they had been reassured that this was not the case. The strong recommendation was to continue with the project as outlined by the value engineering exercise and with the suggested changes to the specification. Finance Committee noted that the programme had been adjusted to 60 weeks (it had been 54 weeks originally) with a completion date of September 2015.

Finance Committee noted the cost implications of the tender process for the Stevenson Extension and Re-development of the Hive nightclub and the subsequent value engineering exercise. The Committee questioned whether the project should be reinstated with its original specification even though the tender costs were higher due to the incidence of ‘life cycle costs’ in the revised specifications which might add as much as £1.8m over a 20 year life. The Director of Estates responded that life cycle costs also exist in the original specification but had not been costed in the original submission. Some surprise was expressed at this.

The Committee also noted the revisals to the income projections where student numbers were planned to increase by 1200 pa and full associated members fell by 1000. It was explained that the higher number of overseas students has increased demand for facilities and the revisals reflected that market change.

The committee approved that the revised scheme proceeds to tender and noted the need for additional funding of £516k minimum (incl VAT). The Committee granted delegated authority to a sub group of Estates and Finance Committees (the Conveners of Estates and Finance Committees, the Principal, the Senior Vice-Principal and the Director of Finance) to authorise the actual amount of additional expenditure once the tenders are returned.

The committee approved that the revised scheme proceeds to tender and noted the need for additional funding of £516k minimum (incl VAT). The Committee granted delegated authority to a sub group of Estates and Finance Committees (the Conveners of Estates and Finance Committees, the Principal, the Senior Vice-Principal and the Director of Finance) to authorise the actual amount of additional expenditure once the tenders are returned.

CA/2013/43. Finance KPIs (paper 6.1)

Finance Committee received a report on Finance Key Performance Indicators. The Committee noted a year-on-year increase in total revenue in 2012/13 of 6.63% (an increase from £439.8m to £469m). It was noted that the increase in income was largely driven by an increase in SFC income, increased international tuition fees and an increase in research income. The 2013/14 outlook recorded a 4.1% year-on-year growth in total revenue. The 2014/15 budget projected a 3.91% year-on-year growth due to continued expansion in international student recruitment and improved research performance. The University KPI of 2% surplus was achieved in 2011/12 and 2012/13. The 2013/14 outlook projected a surplus of £8.8m or 2%.

The Group Financial Controller noted that a benchmarking exercise was also carried out each year with Higher Education institutions of a similar size and type. These data will come to Finance Committee later in the financial year.

The Committee accepted the KPIs.
CA/2013/44. Investment Managers Report as at 30 November 2013 (paper 6.2)

The Committee noted the Investment Managers Report as at 30 November 2013.

The Convenor of Court reminded the Committee that the appointment of Newton would be reviewed in the spring, however this was being done only as a check.

The Convenor queried the figures in the Schroders column in the single page report and asked if this could be checked.

CA/2013/45. Draft minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee meeting held on 8 November 2013 (paper 6.3)

Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee held on 8 November 2013.

CA/2013/46. Overview of Performance as at 30 November 2013 (paper 7.1)

The Director of Finance provided an overview of performance at 30 November 2013. Finance Committee noted that at Period 4 the operating surplus was £22.5m, £7.6m higher than budget due to £2.6m lower than budget spend on salaries because of the timing of vacancies being filled across the University. Tuition fee income was £1.2m ahead of budget. £3.2m favourable against budget mainly driven by Residential Services income. However, research income across three Colleges (Arts, MVLS and Social Sciences) were lower than budget by £2.4m. The College of Science and Engineering reported income £0.1m ahead of budget. Overall research income was therefore £2.2m lower than budget.

The full year outlook was £8.8m which was £4.8m higher than budget. Tuition fees are forecast to be £3.7m higher than budget. Social Sciences was up £3.2m, all in the Business School, and Science & Engineering was up £1.5m, offset by MVLS down £0.9m mainly on overseas students and Arts down £0.1m. The Committee noted that MVLS international student targets were not being achieved for the third consecutive year.

Salaries were £1.5m lower than budget driven by vacancy savings in MVLS and Arts, offset by increased salaries in Social Sciences.

The full year outlook projected an overspend on consumables of £2.8m, largely driven by investments in Residences offset by increased income.

There was £175.9m in net funds as at end of Period 4. Cash inflow was £26.9m in year.

The procurement scorecard was produced quarterly and would be brought to the next meeting of Finance Committee.

Following a question from the Committee, the Group Financial Controller would check the 9000% figure on p9 which appeared to be in error.

CA/2013/47. Debtors Report as at 30 November 2013 (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received a report of debtors as at 30 November 2013. The Committee noted that overall debt levels had decreased year-on-year from £80.2m at November 2012 to £71.05m at November 2013. Student and sponsor tuition fee debt had decreased from £57.98m at November 2012 to £50.91m at November 2013. It was noted that sponsored student accounts
had been assigned earlier in the cycle, resulting in a decrease in amounts owed through self-funding and a higher sponsor balance. The top ten sponsor balances represent 86% of total sponsor balance outstanding. In response to a question from the Committee, the Group Financial Controller would check what the Universities UK debt of £915k represented and report back to the Committee.

The Committee noted that commercial debt stood at £16.7m at November 2013, a decrease from £19.9m at November 2012.

CA/2013/48. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 26 March 2014, 2pm, Carnegie Room.
Court – Wednesday 12 February 2014

Report from the Audit Committee

The annual report of the Audit Committee is at Annex 1; it was carried forward from the December meeting. As a matter of good governance, the Audit Committee reports annually to Court, the topics including its assessment of the adequacy of the University’s systems of internal control. The Audit Committee chair, Kevin Sweeney, will speak to the report at the Court meeting.

The Committee has not met since the last Court meeting therefore there are no Minutes in the report.

Prepared by Deborah Maddern
3.2.14
Audit Committee
Annual Report to Court, December 2013

1. Introduction
In line with good governance practice, the Audit Committee submits an annual report to Court, giving an overview of the Committee's work during the year. The report reflects the Committee's assessment of the adequacy and effectiveness of the institution's internal control system and the extent to which the governing body can rely on that system. The report below summarises the work of the Committee for the year up to and including its meeting on 5 November 2013.

2 Summary of the Year's Work
2.1 Membership of the Committee
Membership of the Committee was: Kevin Sweeney (chair), Dr Paul Brady, Jo Elliot, Hamish Guthrie and Neil Menzies. There is one vacancy on the Committee. A qualified chartered accountant will be recruited in order to maintain the Committee’s strength and depth of approach. A new chair with appropriate expertise will also be appointed in early 2014, given that Kevin Sweeney’s term on Court is coming to an end in July 2014. Succession planning for future vacancies will be arranged in a timely way to ensure continuity, and will be mindful of the Committee’s continuing need to maintain the good balance of expertise that it currently enjoys and which enables it to cover all aspects of its remit.

2.2 Financial Accounts
The Committee has reviewed the University's accounts for 2012/13 and the commentary on these, together with the audit results report prepared by the external auditor, Ernst & Young. The audit opinion was unqualified and, for the eighth successive year, the accounts reflect an operating surplus. The Committee has also reviewed the accounts for the University’s ‘subsidiaries’ including UGlasgow Singapore Pte Ltd (related to the University’s activities with Singapore Institute of Technology) and the University Trust.

2.3 Internal Audit Activity 2012/13
The Committee has continued to devote a large part of its time to the work of Internal Audit, a service provided by Deloitte LLP for the period of this report. During 2012/13, the Committee has:

- reviewed the outcome of each new internal audit report, noted the main areas requiring attention, the management responses to the related recommendations, and the actions taken;
- required the Director of Finance and the Secretary of Court to report regularly on progress in implementing internal audit recommendations; and
- convened special meetings to look in more depth at a number of areas, including the central and College IT structure; the operation and activities of the College of MVLS; and the work of the Recruitment and International Office.

The number of Priority 1 audit recommendations has reduced in recent years. The Committee welcomes this trend. There were no Priority 1 recommendations in 2012/13 (2 in 2011/12 and the previous year, 5 in 2009/10 and 8 in 2008/09).

At November 2013, 89% of prior year recommendations have either been fully or partially implemented (95% in November 2012, 94% in November 2011 and 95% in November 2010). In the Committee’s view, the University management is, in general, following up audit
recommendations appropriately, or providing reasons where there are delays in implementation. Nevertheless, this area will be kept under regular review by the Committee and the internal auditors, with management regularly challenged to ensure timely implementation of recommendations. The Committee continues to welcome the attendance of the Principal at its meetings, in addition to the Secretary of Court and the Director of Finance, as evidence of the University management’s engagement with the audit process.

The Committee does, however, have some concerns about the approach in Colleges, and, while it accepts that the College structure is relatively new, it will be keeping the level of engagement with audit recommendations under review. The Committee’s opinion is that a culture change is needed in the Colleges, but that this should occur as they gain organisational maturity, and with the ongoing involvement of the internal auditors in follow-ups of audits of College activities.

Particular areas of interest for the Committee, arising from specific audits or reviews, or from wider aspects of the University’s operation, were:

- An audit review of Estates procurement and expenditure, where, overall, the conclusion was that the procurement processes are sufficient to meet the needs of the organisation and are in line with legislation and guidance. There has been a significant improvement in the use of contract suppliers, and the creation of framework agreements. The Committee had maintained a watching brief over this area for a number of years and is pleased to note the improvement.

- An audit review of financial controls in a sample of Schools, where there were some instances of exceptions identified in the operation of the controls for expenses claims, purchasing card processes, password policy and cash handling.

- An audit review of Intellectual Property and Spin Out Management, where there was scope for improvement regarding: the management and controls in relation to commercialisation; clarity of strategy and development of performance measures; and full audit trails to support decisions. The Committee also noted a recommendation for an overarching commercialisation strategy.

- An audit review of IT security, where policies relating to this area required updating and adherence to them was not consistent across all systems and Colleges. More recently there has been an audit of IT resource and management, with an overall conclusion that the current structure of IT management has improved since the restructuring of the University, but there are still some inconsistencies between the corporate IT resources and those used locally in some areas. The Committee is concerned about this practice and about progress in general in this area. The internal auditors have been requested to review the matter in discussion with management and advise the Committee on whether it should receive a detailed briefing.

- An audit review of fee payments, relating to professional work undertaken by University staff in their field of expertise for clients outside the institution. Although this area of the University’s activities is of a relatively low value, significant control weaknesses were identified including controls regarding approval and monitoring of research consultancy, and some instances of non-compliance.

- Updates on a number of misconduct cases relating to expense claims. Given the Committee’s ongoing interest in this area, it requested a report giving an analysis of claims arising during a whole month of 2013. This showed a good level of compliance, with most deficiencies resulting from late claims. The Committee has requested a further analysis report in 2014.

At the very end of the period of this report, the contract for the provision of Internal Audit services by Deloittes terminated. A tender exercise was conducted over the summer, involving the input of the Committee to the process, the outcome of which was the appointment of PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) as the new internal auditors, for three years.
2.4 Risk Management

The Committee’s role includes an active interest in the University’s approach to risk management. During the year, the Committee has again concluded that risk management is well embedded as a regular element in the agenda of the Senior Management Group, with the University’s key business risks identified, risk owners appointed from among SMG members, and risk mitigation strategies clearly defined. However, the Committee has continuing concerns about the risk register relating to the Colleges, which it considers requires more work to embed the risk culture. The Committee will continue to review this area, with the expectation that the new internal auditors will work with the Colleges to address the matter. In particular, the Committee wished to see greater focus on key risks and better engagement by Colleges with risks that are managed locally; and clear identification of those responsible for progressing matters within Colleges.

2.5 Pension Schemes

The Committee has been kept updated about options relating to addressing the deficit in the University of Glasgow Pension (UGPS) fund and the future structure of the scheme. The Committee has also been briefed on the actions being taken in respect of the deficit in USS. The Committee will retain an interest in these areas in the coming year.

2.6 Western Infirmary site

The Committee has maintained its interest in the development of the Western Infirmary site and in the potential risks associated with this.

3 The Committee's plans for 2013/14

As referred to above, PwC were recently successful in securing the contract for internal audit services. While the previous service was sound, the Committee is looking forward to a fresh approach and analysis, with a step change in the internal audit function, to provide new insights into the operation of the institution, and assistance to the Committee in fulfilling its remit. A meeting has recently been held with the new auditors to discuss: the approach to risk management across the institution; the development of the strategic audit plan; the format and follow-up of audit reports; and the approach to IT-related Audits. In 2013/14, the Committee’s focus will include: value for money audits; general assurance audits relating to financial controls including budgetary control, financial management and reporting, School compliance and cash handling; risk-based internal control reviews; business continuity arrangements; and aspects of corporate governance.

The Committee will also retain a strong interest in a number of areas from the past year, in particular the expenses system, risk management within the Colleges, and IT management. Given the major Campus Estates Strategy exercise that is ongoing in the context of the acquisition of the Western Infirmary site, and the developments at Garscube and Kelvin Hall, the Committee will also meet with key University officers to consider the approach to capital expenditure and major projects. Following the 2014 REF, a briefing on Research Management will also be arranged.

4 Adequacy and Effectiveness of Internal Control

On the basis of the internal audit work undertaken in the course of the year, and of the comments of the external auditors on the University's financial statements, the Audit Committee believes that the University generally has an adequate framework of internal control.

KS/DM 12.11.13
Report from the Human Resources Committee

The minute of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Tuesday 21 January 2014 is attached for information.

The HR Director provided an update to the Committee regarding industrial action, Performance and Development Review and the proposed staff attitude survey.

A presentation was given outlining a range of initiatives that have been undertaken and are planned to support the staff theme of the internationalisation strategy.

The new Equality Policy and the revised Dignity at Work and Study policy were approved by the HR Committee on behalf of Court.

Key Performance Indicators for the proportion of women in senior post and related actions were discussed.

**Action required**
Court is asked to note the draft minute from the HR Committee meeting on 21 January 2014.

_Gordon Scott_
HR Policy Development Manager & Clerk to the HR Committee
30 January 2014
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Human Resources Committee

Minute of meeting held in Melville Room on 21 January 2014

Present: Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), Mrs A Allen (AAL), Mrs C Barr (CB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Professor C Forde (CF), Professor N Jonsson (NJ), Mr A Macfarlane (AMcF), Mr D Newall (DN), Dr D Spaeth (DS), Mr G Scott (GS)

Attending: Ms L McKeown (Minute), Mrs Tracey Stirling (TS) (item HR/13/23), Mrs Wendy McAnerney (WM) (item HR/13/23), Ms Helen Spiers (HS) (item HR/13/24)

Apologies: The Principal (AM), Professor A Anderson (AA), Mrs H Durndell (HD).

HR/13/19 Opening Remarks
DA opened the meeting and welcomed LM who will replace GS as Clerk of the Committee in the interim until a replacement has been appointed.

HR/13/20 Minute of the Meeting held on 22 November 2013
CB provided an update on the Early Career Development Programme, highlighting that concerns had been voiced by participants regarding the contractual implications of the programme in particular the contractual obligation to reach Grade 9. CB advised that following meetings with local UCU representatives agreement had been reached on amended wording of the contract and policy. During the transition period individuals may choose not to participate in the programme and initial indications suggest that this will be a small proportion of the group. Going forward the expectation was that all new appointments that fall within the criteria will join the programme. CB advised that updates would be provided on an ongoing basis to the HR Committee.

The minute of the previous meeting held on the 22 November 2013 was agreed as accurate.

HR/13/21 Matters Arising from 22 November 2013
GS advised that an update on plans with regards to leadership development for SMG has been provisionally scheduled for the June meeting of the Committee. 

Action: CB

GS advised that the People and Organisational Development Strategy had been updated following discussion at the last HR Committee meeting and had subsequently been approved by Court in December.

HR/13/22 HR Director’s Report
CB provided an overview of the HR Director’s report, highlighting a number of areas. Strike action had taken place on 3 December. CB acknowledged that the Trade Unions locally had worked with the University to minimise disruption for students and their families attending the graduations that day. CB advised that strike action is to be escalated following notification of a rolling 2 hour strike action on 23 January, 28 January and 10 February. CB explained that the University had elected to deduct two hours pay in the first instance but reserved the right to deduct a full day’s pay, if further escalation continued. DA noted the position on behalf of the HR Committee and acknowledged that the approach was an issue for the University management to decide.
CB provided an update on the recent Board of Review for Performance and Development Review held on Tuesday 7 January. CB advised that P&DR completion rates were 97.7% with feedback generally positive, although improvement in objective setting was required as well as ensuring a consistent and rigorous approach. CB advised that the Board had considered proposals to move to five performance assessment outcomes rather than three going forward, and a phased timetable for effective cascading of objectives. CB advised that a detailed update will be provided to the HR Committee in March.

CB provided a background to the intended shift to single table consultation arrangements with the Campus Trade Unions, and advised that discussions were progressing well and an update would be provided to HR Committee in March.

**Action: CB**

CB provided an update on the Staff Survey, advising that approval had been given by the Principal's Advisory Group to proceed with implementation in March/April using a third party provider. CB explained that the use of a third party provider would enable benchmarking against the Higher Education Sector as a whole. There was discussion regarding the timetable for completion and communication of the results and associated actions. Discussion followed with regard to completion rates and CB advised that the third party provider normally anticipated a minimal 50% completion rate. Further, trade union representatives had been involved from an early stage and were in a position to shape the survey and encourage members to participate. AA added it would be useful to use the outputs to shape objective setting for senior management.

CB provided an update on the current recruitment activity, highlighting that the expected reduction in vacancies following the REF period had not transpired. CB advised that a good response had been received in relation to three senior HR appointments, and interviews would commence shortly. DA requested that CB provide an update to the HR Committee on the new HR structure and responsibilities of the new post holders at a future meeting.

**Action: CB**

CB advised that the People and Organisational Development Strategy would be rolled out to all HR staff at a half-day event scheduled for 3 February 2014.

CB provided an update on a research project currently being undertaken by the HR Group of Universitas 21 on Academic Workforce Planning. The Institute of Employment Studies was commissioned to undertake this work and the report was currently being finalised. CB advised that the University of Glasgow were to host the Universitas 21 presidential symposium in May 2014 and the final report would be presented at this time.

CB provided an update on the HR/Payroll System project, explaining that the ongoing challenges were being resolved and the next phase will proceed with effect from March 2014. A further update would be given to the HR Committee at the March meeting.

**HR/13/23 Internationalisation Presentation**

TS, WMcA and GS presented an update on the Internationalisation Strategy – Staff Theme. GS explained that the Internationalisation HR agenda was managed through a working group and fed into an action plan. The presentation covered the following areas: Recruitment; International Staff Population; Policy and Guidance; Staff Mobility and Support Mechanisms; Staff Development and Equality and Diversity; Ongoing Activity; and Future Objectives. There was discussion on the
points raised and the HR Committee acknowledged the progress that had been made in this area.

**HR/13/24 Single Equality Policy/Dignity at Work and Study**

HS joined the meeting and outlined that the wide range of policies associated with equality and diversity have been combined in line with the Equality Act into one Single Equality Policy, with appendices relating to each of the Protected Characteristics. HS welcomed feedback from the HR Committee. There was discussion regarding the mechanisms through which the policy would be embedded across the University. CB highlighted that the Athena Swan and Gender Charter Mark initiatives will assist along with the normal distribution channels to embed the policies across the University. HS added that the online Equality and Diversity training module would be updated to reflect the new policy. AA confirmed that it is a legal requirement for suppliers to state their position relating to equality and diversity and this is assessed as part of the tender process.

The HR Committee approved the Single Equality Policy and the Dignity at Work and Study Policy on behalf of Court.

**HR/13/25 EDSC Minutes of 29 November 2013**

The Committee noted the minute of the EDSC.

**HR/13/26 KPIs: Proportion of Senior Posts held in Women**

The HR Committee noted the data for the percentage of women in senior posts and the associated distribution over the past three years. DA sought historical data with respect to Court Members. There was discussion regarding improving the number of females in senior posts and it was noted that a future action plan and potential targets should be agreed to influence the future KPI.

*Action: CB*

**HR/13/27 Any other business**

DA thanked GS for his contribution to the HR Committee and wished him success in his new role as Deputy Director at Strathclyde University.

There was no other business raised, therefore the meeting closed at 11:55.

**HR/13/28 Date of next meeting**

The next meeting of the HR Committee will take place on Tuesday 25 March 2014 at 10am in the Carnegie Committee Room, Main Building.
Court - Wednesday 12 February 2014

Report from the Estates Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Estates Committee held on Monday 6 January 2014 are attached.

Action Requested of Court

Court’s attention is drawn to the following items for noting:

The progress of the Estates Strategy (EC/2013/20.1 refers);

Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications JWNC Cluster Tool in the sum of £620k; and MRC SPSHU Relocation in the sum of £625k (EC/2013/21.3 refers);

The current position in respect of the GUU/Stevenson Re-development (EC/2013/21.4 refers).
UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW  
Estates Committee  
Minute of the meeting held in the Estates and Buildings Conference Room on  
Monday 6 January 2014

Present:
Mrs A Allen, Professor J Briggs, Mr R Fraser, Dr M Freel, Dr S Inch, Professor N Juster, Ms J McGrellis,  
Mr D Milloy, Ms M Morton (Convener), Professor A Muscatelli, Mr D Newall

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

Apologies: Professor F Coton, Professor S Beaumont, Professor K Lury

EC/2013/17 Minute of the meeting held on 4 November 2013

The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2013/18 Matters Arising

EC/2013/18.1 Kelvin Hall (Legal Agreements (EC/2013/13.1 refers)

The Committee noted that discussions were continuing regarding the pricing structure and that an update  
would be provided as matters progressed. Tenders were due for issue in January 2014.

EC/2013/19 Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2013/20 Strategies and Performance

EC/2013/20.1 Estates Strategy Progress Report

Following completion of the Stage 2 consultation, it was expected that the Campus Development Framework  
document would be issued in February 2014. A summary of the key themes from feedback were noted as:  
setting; approach and arrival; connectivity and openness; and sustainability. The Committee noted that after  
adoption by Glasgow City Council the document would become a material consideration for all of the  
University’s future development planning applications.

An Asset Strategy and Asset Planning Tool was expected to be complete by February 2014 providing a  
method of reconciling the emerging campus development framework with estates capital and revenue  
budgets. This would provide an opportunity to develop a single estates financial model for the Gilmorehill  
Campus.

A discussion document on potential development opportunities was being prepared.

Engagement sessions had taken place with a range of stakeholders who considered space in terms of  
accessibility, suitability, flexibility, expression and sustainability, and work was underway to develop a  
toolkit to aid the process of defining great space.

Mosaic Space (UK) Ltd had been engaged to undertake a three stage space planning project to be complete  
by May 2014. A report would be prepared for the Estates Committee scheduled to take place in March  
2014.

Joint Working Groups had been established to progress site investigations and feasibility studies of the  
Western Infirmary site and Bennetts Architects had been appointed to consider a range of technical  
elements, master planning and planning compliance matters.

A workshop had been arranged for February 2014 and would be led by the Principal to consider College  
priorities with consideration of outputs by SMG scheduled for March 2014.
The Committee noted that the current programme (see Annex 1) proposes the final Strategy being put to Court in June 2014.

**EC/2013/20.2 Maintenance Strategy (Fire Safety Improvements)**

The Committee noted that the current Maintenance Policy approved in November 2012, had proposed a strategy to protect business critical buildings and to maintain a clear focus on statutory compliance. It noted that acquisition of the Western Infirmary site and the emerging campus development framework would result in a need for business criticality to be reassessed.

The Committee noted that Safety and Environmental Protection Services (SEPS) had overall responsibility for fire safety management and within this responsibility undertake detailed fire risk assessments (FRAs) and prepare action plans for each property.

Estates and Buildings is responsible for physical improvements which reduce risk, ensure maintenance arrangements are in place for fire detection and alarms, emergency lighting, fire doors etc. The department had recently begun to compile a prioritised campus improvement action plan however resource limitations have impacted on the ability to achieve target timescales. Fire safety improvements are funded from Estates legislative compliance budgets which in recent years have ranged from £100k to £200k per annum, although a sum of £300k had been identified in 2013/14. Further project-specific funding had also been secured via CapEx applications.

The Committee noted that SEPS had undertaken an audit of existing arrangements in early 2013 and had identified concerns regarding implementation of the duties of Area Fire officers who were appointed by Heads of Service and had a duty to ensure appropriate local management arrangements were in place, including routine fire drills. Estates and Buildings was also concerned about lack of clarity in these activities.

The Committee noted that Estates and Buildings was recruiting a Fire Engineer who would work in conjunction with the SEPS Fire Safety Manager and would develop a detailed, costed fire safety improvement action plan for the estate, together with a series project plan to achieve maximum value from resources. A risk mitigation proposal would also be prepared in conjunction with the Fire Safety Manager for buildings where there may be an exit or disposal strategy.

The Committee noted that Estates and Buildings would be seeking increased funding for fire safety legislative compliance for 2014/2015 with a focus on highest business critical priorities. Thereafter, a costed 4 year plan would be prepared.

**EC/2013/20.3 Minute of Carbon Management Committee (16 December 2013)**

The minute was noted.

**EC/2013/21 Projects**

**EC/2013/21.1 Approved Projects Status (RAG) report**

The Committee noted the report and the current status of projects.

**EC/2013/21.2 Project Exception Report**

EC/2013/21.2.2 CP11/444 SGH Clinical Trials Facility - The Committee noted that whilst the construction element was progressing GGHB had been slow in progressing the lease and development agreement.

EC/2013/21.2.3 CP12 556 Censis Fit out - The Committee noted that despite pressure to deliver the project by middle of January 2014 procurement challenges and a delay in the Scottish Enterprise works programme have made this unachievable. Subject to the completion of Landlord works the project was scheduled to complete in March 2014.
EC/2013/21.2.4 LM12/534 Main Building Tower - The Committee noted that conclusion of works prior to the commencement of the Commonwealth Games was extremely challenging. It noted that a revised strategy was being considered and which would aim to deal with the highest risk works such as removal of loose masonry etc ahead of July 2014. This revised plan would result in erection of scaffolding after the conclusion of the Commonwealth Games and would cause the programme to run into 2015.

EC/2013/21.3 CapEx Applications

The Committee approved CapEx applications in respect of:

JWNC Cluster Tool in the sum of £620k; and
MRC SPSHU Relocation in the sum of £625k.

EC/2013/21.4 GUU/Stevenson Update

The Committee noted the update on the costs, programme and re-tender position.

It noted the position on additional expenditure and that this was expected to remain within the figure identified in the paper presented to it in November 2013, which had outlined the impact of a higher than anticipated tender figure; the subsequent value engineering exercise undertaken to reduce costs; and the requirement for additional funding.

The Committee noted that whilst it had been concerned that the value engineering exercise may have been too extreme and may consequently have lowered the specification to the point that functionality would be impacted, a subsequent review had been conducted and had concluded that the value engineering had been reasonable. The design team had progressed design changes and bills of quantities, required for re-tender, were being prepared with re-tender planned for 10 February 2014. Subject to the tender being awarded on 19 May 2014 and a revised project programme (60 weeks) the project completion was expected in September 2015.

The Committee noted that the scheduled dates for the governance boards do not coincide with the programme for return and tender award. The Committee therefore agreed that authority be granted to a sub-group of Estates Committee and Finance Committee with a remit to consider and approve the final additional expenditure figure based on recommendations from the Director of Estates.

The Committee noted that Jones Lang LaSalle had been appointed to review the issues around the project and would report its findings in January 2014. These would be brought to the Committee.

EC/2013/22 Estates Operating Matters

EC/2013/22.1 Critical Path

Noted.

EC/2013/23 Any Other Business

The Committee noted that Mr Alan Seabourne had been recommended to Court as a new coopted member of Estates Committee, and that Mr David Milloy had, subject to final approval, been appointed as a full Court member, in addition to retaining his membership of Estates Committee.

EC/2013/24 Schedule of Meetings for 2013/14

The schedule of meetings was noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business priorities</strong></td>
<td>Engagement Colleges</td>
<td>Research priorities</td>
<td>SMG debate</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMG review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space planning</strong></td>
<td>Space principles refined and tested</td>
<td>First outputs space planning model</td>
<td>SMG discussion to consider long term teaching space requirements</td>
<td>Inform court debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus development Framework</strong></td>
<td>Internal review by E&amp;B</td>
<td>issue to GCC and Estates committee</td>
<td>Final engagement University and community Estates Committee Approval</td>
<td>part of Court engagement</td>
<td>Submit to GCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Infirmary Development and Campus site investigations</strong></td>
<td>Dev Phase 1 Building appraisal study. development of urban design themes and massing plans</td>
<td>February - conclusion on Phase 1 appraisal</td>
<td>assessment other WI buildings</td>
<td>Completion GIS model for whole of campus</td>
<td>Ongoing investigation plan developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asset Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Asset Plan available</td>
<td>Development appraisals available</td>
<td>Consider disposal options and strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial appraisals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refine and re-running DCF</td>
<td>Review and consider funding options</td>
<td>Refinement of appraisals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer of WI</strong></td>
<td>Debate with GGHB</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refine handover arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Plan</strong></td>
<td>Sequencing diagrams developed</td>
<td>Procurement strategy developed</td>
<td>Review sequencing with demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>Shaping of options for locations and facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval &amp; governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMG debate Estates Committee debate</td>
<td>Court debate</td>
<td>Refinement – SMG &amp; Estates Committee</td>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The information in this document, and accompanying papers, is confidential information of the University of Glasgow. The information must not be released in response to any request without first seeking advice from the DP/FoI Office."
Court - Wednesday 12 February 2014

Report from Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee

The minutes of a meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee held on Thursday 12 December 2013 are attached. There are no matters requiring Court’s approval or decision.

The Committee received the Campus Security annual report, and a report on road safety; an update on stress management training; an update on the next staff survey; safety and occupational health update reports; and a paper relating to the employee assistance (counselling) programme.
University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Thursday 12 December 2013 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, Mr Deric Robinson, Mr David Somerville, Ms Selina Woolcott, Dr Robin Easton, Ms Nicky McComb (SRC), Ms Aileen Stewart, Mrs Christine Barr

In Attendance:

Ms Debbie Beales, Mrs Janice Thompson, Mrs Linda MacDonald, Mr Gordon Mackenzie

Apologies:

Mrs Ann Allen, Mr James Gray, Ms Julie Ommer, Mr Paul Phillips, Ms Louise Graham (SRC)

Convenors Business:

The Convenor welcomed Ms Nicky McComb, the new SRC rep, to the Committee. He also welcomed Mrs Janice Thompson from RPS who was attending in lieu of Mr James Gray and Mr Gordon Mackenzie, Head of Security and Central Services, who was attending to discuss Paper 1. The Convenor informed the Committee that, as Dr Robin Easton was retiring at the end of the year, this would be Robin's last meeting. The Committee thanked Robin for his support over the last 8 years where he had been a critical friend to the Committee.

HSWC/2013/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday 20 September 2013

The Minute of the meeting of Friday 20 September 2013 was approved.

HSWC/2013/2 Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

HSWC/2013/3 Campus Security Annual Report & Student Road Safety (Paper 1)

The Committee noted the Paper that had been circulated. Mr Mackenzie informed the Committee that bikes were now being targeted by professional thieves and security staff were being especially vigilant. Housebreaking at student accommodation had also been an issue but this had been reduced with the simple act of security staff ensuring that any open ground floor windows were closed when patrolling. In the past 12 months there had been 2 serious crimes committed on campus (1 rape and 1 instance of wilful fire raising & malicious mischief). In both instances the individuals responsible had been apprehended by the Police with one convicted and sentenced and the other leaving the
country with a prosecution pending. As a result of discussions regarding changes that would be taking place due to the acquisition of the Western Infirmary, concerns had been raised about road safety at library hill and the main gate. As this land is owned by Glasgow City Council, the University had asked that traffic calming methods be put in place. The University were also looking to educate students on road safety. Mr Mackenzie informed the Committee that evacuation chairs were now in operation 24/7 on both campuses with security staff being trained. Security staff were also conducting initial investigations on reports of missing persons to assist the Police. He summarised by stating that the University was remarkably safe with very low crime levels considering it was such an open campus. The Committee thanked Mr Mackenzie for his help over the past 12 months.

**HSWC/2013/4 Stress Management Training (verbal update SW)**

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that, with the help of HR and SDS, she was now delivering stress management training. The first course, which she had delivered twice, was a 1 hour stress risk assessment workshop. This training was a result of concerns shown at previous HSWC meetings where it was felt that managers would benefit from guidance on how to risk assess stress. The second course was i-resilience training which focused on individual resilience and so far she had received positive feedback. Ms Woolcott agreed to inform the Committee of any future training dates. The Committee thanked Ms Woolcott for her work on this issue.

**HSWC/2013/5 Staff Survey Review (verbal update SW)**

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that she was working with Martin Boyle (Director of Planning), Christine Barr (Director of HR) and Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary to Court) to find the best way to deliver the next staff satisfaction survey. It had been decided that using an external provider would potentially increase the amount of staff completing the survey and the University could benchmark the results against other HEI’s. Two out of three companies had provided portfolios, including costs and presentations, and these would be passed to the Principals Advisory Group in January. It was hoped that the survey would take place in spring 2014 and that it would still include the HSE stress indicator question set.

**HSWC/2013/6 SEPS Report (Paper 2)**

The Committee noted the Paper that had been circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee on accidents reported to SEPS in the previous quarter and brought 2 specific items to the Committees attention:

1. HSE investigation of vibration issues in Estates & Buildings. Mr McLean updated the Committee on the investigation which had included interviews with staff. SEPS were working with E&B and HSE to ensure that exposure times were limited by rotating workers and tasks. E&B were looking at monitors for staff using relevant equipment and agreed that this had been a learning curve but were happy that this was manageable. So far there had been no fee for intervention and E&B were satisfied that the best equipment was used for each task and was well maintained. HSE had stated that they were happy with the health surveillance conducted by Occupational Health which was robust, with a good recall in place.
2. Fire Service visits to the St Andrews Building and Rowardennan. Mr McLean informed the Committee that the Fire Service now conducted post incident audits after all fires and had asked for an action plan from the University. A concern raised was the fact that Rowerdennan was partly residential and should have a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) license. In order to get this license PG staff would now act as senior residents and had received appropriate training. E&B were looking into delivering fire risk assessment works in critical buildings.

HSWC/2013/7 OH Report (Paper 3)

The Committee noted the Paper that had been circulated. Ms Stewart introduced Linda MacDonald, Deputy OH Manager, to the Committee. Mrs MacDonald was in attendance to see how the Committee worked. In the event of Ms Stewart being unable to attend future meeting Mrs MacDonald would deputise. Ms Stewart discussed the stats in the report and informed the Committee that the previous quarter's stats for sickness absence were not yet available but that she would bring them to the next meeting. The Clerk asked the Committee if they were happy with the current look of the report and, if not, to let her know by email.

HSWC/2013/8 Employee Assistance Programme (EAP) Statistics (Paper 4)

The Committee noted the Paper that had been circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that the overall uptake of counselling services had decreased by 48%. This was worrying as uptake had already been very low and various promotions such as poster drives and articles in Campus News appeared to have made little impact on awareness of the service. The Committee discussed whether the current service was the best way to provide staff support and were told that a working group had been formed to look at whether an in-house service would be better used. This had previously been discounted as it was felt that staff may be reluctant to use an in-house service but it had become clear that the present system wasn't reaching many staff and that other options should be considered. As the current service would be in use for at least another 18 months the Committee were asked to give any thoughts on improvements or publicity to Ms Woolcott via email.

HSWC/2013/9 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Wednesday 5 March 2014 at 10am in the Senate Room.

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales
In this, my last report to the Court as Rector, I would wish to confine myself to two brief and broad observations based on my fulfilling experiences of the past six years.

1. Intriguingly, the most telling and recurrent impression which I have gleaned over many campus surgeries, has been consistent from the outset. In the main, undergraduate students are very well served by their student representatives and their individual problems are comparatively limited in the overall scheme of things. Equally, the University authorities in my experience will always go the extra mile towards meeting individual issues in as sensitive and tailored a way as possible. As a public institution in this respect Glasgow University stands out in my experiences of many other public bodies over the past thirty years at Westminster.

Those who do tend to encounter more complex and frustrating circumstances come in larger proportion from the postgraduate, returning and mature student categories - more often than not as a result of wider family and benefit circumstances which seem less than well orientated towards individual circumstances. I am sure that we are not unique in this respect. There are implications here for wider public policy making.

2. International students. As the percentage of students being drawn globally continues to grow, so too will the legitimate pressures and demands upon meeting specific needs. In years to come I am sure that further campus provision - both material and consultative - is going to be required to ensure a continuing positive experience for this important category. I do not doubt that such matters will feature ever more prominently on the agendas of future meetings of Court.

Finally, not being a fan of fond farewells, I would simply like to conclude by thanking all past and present members of Court for their support and encouragement throughout my two terms - and, in particular, the officers and staff of the Court itself.
University Court – Wednesday 12 February 2014

Communications to Court from the meetings of Senate held on
12 December 2013 and 6 February 2014

(All matters are for noting)

1. Establishment of a Council of Senate

At the end of 2012, Senate had established a working group to address several matters of concern regarding its constitution and operations – principally, that the quorum was one-third of the total membership. Membership was presently 562, and this level of attendance had become increasingly difficult to achieve. Typically, c. 100 members attended meetings. The quorum was established in primary legislation and would consequently be difficult to amend. It was also presently the case that there was no provision for student membership of Senate. A further factor was that only c. 25% of Senate members were elected. (Again by statute, all professors of the University are members of Senate ex officio, and the ratio of professorial to elected members is 3:1.) Furthermore, in each of these respects, Senate was out of step with the recommendations of the recent Government review of governance in Scottish Higher Education.

In consequence, Senate had considered proposals from the working group to establish a Council of Senate, which would undertake the normal business of Senate, and would have a constitution which addressed all of the concerns outlined above. It would have a total membership of c. 120, which would again comply with the recommendations of the Review of HE governance. The Council would be in essence a committee of Senate. Current committees of Senate would report to the Council. Its meetings, however, would be open to all members of the full Senate and all members of Senate would receive Council papers.

Detailed proposals had been developed in 2013 and discussed and revised in light of discussion at three Senate meetings. Senate had expressed its contentment with a draft constitution of the Council at its meeting on 12 December 2013. However, the University’s lawyers had advised that approval of the establishment of the Council would require to be taken by a quorate meeting of Senate –that is, with a minimum of 188 members present. There was no provision for the decision to be taken by alternative means, such as by electronic ballot.

In consequence, an extraordinary meeting of Senate was called for 6 February 2014. 221 members attended. In the ballot held on the establishment of the Council of Senate, voting was as follows:
Votes in favour of the establishment of the Council of Senate: 208
Votes against the establishment of the Council of Senate as proposed above: 11
Abstentions: 2

It was accordingly noted that Senate had decided to establish the Council of Senate.

It is planned that the first meeting of the Council of Senate will take place on 17 April 2014. Ordinary meetings of the full Senate will be suspended. Senate will next hold a scheduled meeting in c. two years’ time, whereupon it will review the operations of the Council.

2. Draft Ordinance on Court’s composition

Senate had discussed the draft Ordinance on the composition of the University Court at its meeting on 12 December 2013. It had been reported at that meeting that Court wished to proceed with the promulgation of the new Ordinance, in order that the composition of Court would comply with the recommendations of the new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance. A key provision of this was that institutions’ governing bodies should have a clear majority of lay members.

The Secretary of Court provided an update on developments. Mr Newall reported that Court would be considering the matter at its meeting on 12 February, and would receive a recommendation from the Convener, Principal and Secretary that a fresh consultation exercise should be initiated on the Ordinance, which would include consultation with Senate and General Council. Advice provided previously by the Scottish Government had recommended that Court should consult further with Senate, but current advice was that the matter should be treated as a freshly drafted Ordinance and the normal full consultation take place. This would permit members of Senate both collectively and individually to submit views. It was being recommended to Court that the normal consultation period should be extended, to permit Senate to consider the matter at its meeting scheduled for 17 April. [Secretary’s Note: The meeting scheduled for 17 April 2014 will be replaced by a meeting of the Council of Senate, to be held that day.] In response to a question, Mr Newall reported that the reason for the recent advice from the Government to carry out a full fresh consultation was that it had noted members of the General Council had submitted opposing views on the draft Ordinance and that members of Senate had also submitted views opposing its terms – primarily, the proposed reduction in the number of senate Assessors on Court from seven to five. The Government had not advised Court of any further concerns with the draft Ordinance. Further information would be circulated to Senate members after the Court meeting on 12 February.

3. Enhancement-led Institutional Review

It was reported that the University’s Reflective Analysis document had been finalised and submitted to QAA (Scotland) on 6 December.

The two-part review will take place on 19-20 February and 24-28 March. The reports from the review are expected to be received for comment by the end of May.
4. Research Excellence Framework Update

At its meeting on 12 December 2013, Senate received a copy of an early report which had been prepared for Court summarising the University’s submission for the REF 2014 on 27 November 2013.

Professor Beaumont thanked all members of Senate for their co-operation in the extensive exercise which had been undertaken by the University to select research items and prepare the submission which covered 32 Units of Assessment. It was reported that the selection process had operated more smoothly with fewer appeals than in previous research assessment exercises. The greater clarity of the HEFCE guidance on selection and their clear criteria for special circumstances were considered to be significant factors in this improvement.

Senate heard that the overall proportion of University staff contributing to the REF was slightly lower than for the last exercise (84% compared to 87%) but noted that this figure was in the context of a 40% turnover in staff since 2008, with 30% recruited since the mini-REF in 2011. The 2014 REF submission had also included information on the impact of the University’s research with 137 impact case studies having been selected from over 200 areas where impact had been highlighted. Professor Beaumont reported that work would continue in this area with a cluster analysis of case studies which would highlight areas of the greatest potential to contribute to the University’s Knowledge Exchange Strategy and also assist with continuing impact analysis work in preparation for the next REF.

Professor Cogdell advised Senate that the impact case studies revealed some of the tremendous research that was being undertaken across the University. Professor Beaumont confirmed that consideration was being given to ways of publicising this activity to highlight the University’s engagement with non-academic users through its research.

5. Principal’s Q & A

5.1 Zero-Hours Contracts

- The Principal has recently introduced a new item on the Senate agenda, ‘Principal’s Q&A’, where members of Senate were invited to propose questions for the Principal for discussion at Senate. Proposed questions are considered initially for inclusion on the agenda by the Senate Business Committee. The Business Committee had agreed that the following question, received from Mr Owen Mooney, SRC General Representative, would be included on the Senate agenda for 6 February:

"In light of recent revelations about the large numbers of staff, both general and academic, employed on zero-hours and atypical contracts, would the Principal comment on whether he feels it is appropriate that use of these is so widespread, and whether the impact of them on academic standards, the student experience and the university’s reputation has been considered?"

The Principal responded, noting that, as the employer of University staff, Court had responsibility for employee contracts, and that the Court Human Resources Committee advised Court on such issues. The Principal also noted that the matter lay within the province of Senate in that the use of zero-hours contracts potentially impacted upon academic quality. His personal view was that, while there were good grounds for deploring the use of such contracts in other employment sectors, there was little real concern that full-time academic staff were being
replaced by staff on zero-hours contracts. There were 771 staff with zero-hours appointments presently; this equated to c. 100 FTE. Of these staff members, 56% were female. Many of the academic staff concerned were retired members of full-time staff or post-doctorates who were unable to take on more extensive commitments. If they were not employed in their present capacities, there would be a loss of teaching expertise. As were other institutions, the University was presently discussing the matter with campus Trades Unions, and discussions were proceeding on an amicable basis. The Principal advised that the position would be monitored and, if necessary, an alternative approach could be considered.

Mr Mooney asked whether there was, however, concern for the University’s academic reputation given the very widespread negative views on zero-hours contracts. The Principal responded that this was the primary reason for the current discussions. It was highly important that the University did not lose the expertise of those concerned. He asked that any member of Senate who was concerned about matters such as the balance between full-time and zero-hours staff should write to him.

5.2 University Governance

At the meeting of senate on 12 December, the Principal spoke to the following question which had been submitted by Professor Maley:

“In the light of the recent report on the Democratic University published by the Jimmy Reid Foundation*, will the Principal comment on how he sees the principles of democracy contained in the report working at the University of Glasgow?”


The Principal advised Senate that his response to this question reflected his personal view rather than an agreed perspective from the University. The report from the Jimmy Reid Foundation defined six models of governance used in universities ranging from a ‘democratic model’ to a ‘managerial hegemony model’ and asserted that current arrangements in Scotland were increasingly moving to the managerial hegemonic model where governance and control of universities were held by a small professional managerial group. The report proposed that university governance should return to a more collegiate approach and operate under the model of democratic governance with Senate wholly elected by academic staff of the institution and the membership of Court being wholly elected by all staff and students.

Senate heard that while the Principal agreed with some of the problems inherent in governance structures identified in the report, he found real weaknesses in the analysis of the report and its conclusions. For example, no evidence was found to support the assertion that universities in Scotland were now operating primarily under the model of ‘managerial hegemony’; and there was no evidence to support the assumption that particular decision-making structures within universities could be associated with particular models of governance. The Principal agreed with the problems cited under the hegemonic model where power was held by one individual or a small group of individuals; however he suggested that operation of the democratic model could also create the same structure of power and control. Continental European universities had the governance structures which the paper from the JRF proposed, with the election of university management, yet in reality power was often held in a very similar way to that described under the hegemonic model. The Principal stated that he was very familiar with this model, as it was prevalent in Italian universities. Under such arrangements there was often an
insular focus on particular sections of the electorate (so that Rectors/Principals typically supported their electoral base with resources); there was little or no reference to external stakeholders; bureaucracy was not diminished, coupled with a tendency for the administration to continue to operate the institution without managerial input at times of conflict, and so with little accountability.

The Principal suggested that the behaviour of individuals within any structure was a critical element which had been omitted in the report. He agreed that all stakeholders were important and that universities were significant bodies which would have a lasting impact on their internal members and wider society. For this reason it was crucial to strike a balance between the autonomy within the institution and independent scrutiny to safeguard the long-term interest of the institution for all stakeholders, including society as a whole. Indeed this was a reason why independent majorities on governing bodies were such an important feature of governance structures in well-functioning university systems.

Senate was given examples of recent amendments, or proposed changes, to the managerial process at Glasgow which the Principal considered to illustrate that measures were taken to protect the University from the negative features cited in relation to the hegemonic managerial model. Senior management appointments were now subjected to an appointment process involving an appointment committee including student, senate assessor and lay member representation rather than being an appointment of Court on the recommendation of the Principal. For Senate operations, the proposed move to the Council of Senate would give students full membership and voting rights which they currently did not have. They would also involve a majority of elected members and representation of different areas of the University roughly in accordance with size, but with safeguards to allow smaller areas adequate representation. The Principal concluded by confirming to Senate that he would endeavour to continue to respect all stakeholders and to ensure that the University governance reflected the interests of the current university community, alumni, future students and future society.

Professor Maley commented that he considered that the question of the application of democratic principles at Glasgow had not been addressed. He referred to the Vice Chancellor of University of Cambridge who had recently described that University as a “community of scholars”. Professor Maley suggested that this was a concept that lay at the heart of the Democratic University. The Principal fully agreed with the concept of the community of scholars and believed it was a key element in the governance debate, however he also felt it important that the University of Glasgow was defined more widely than this, which is why the recent review on HE Governance in Scotland and the Scottish code put so much emphasis on governing bodies having an independent majority. This would ensure that a university was run not only for the benefit of its current staff and student community, but in a sustainable way, for the benefit of alumni, of future staff and students, and for the benefit of society as a whole, as a public asset.

Professor Munck had found the Principal’s analysis helpful and agreed with his views on the importance of individual behaviours within management structures, concurring with the view that the way individuals fulfilled their roles within the governance framework was critical. Professor Munck called for further action to ensure that a balance was being achieved in the decision-making process at Glasgow. He also suggested that decisions must be devolved to the level best equipped to make them in order to reach correct and appropriate decisions, and to retain flexibility. The University’s procedures for programme and course approval were cited as an area requiring review. Professor Munck was concerned that these currently involved seven layers of approval which made them burdensome and thus stifled innovation in programme development. He suggested that simplification was needed along with grass roots engagement,
and thus the focus of activity should be at School level. In response, the Vice Principal for Learning and Teaching, Professor Coton, agreed to invite the Academic Standards Committee to review these procedures. Professor Coton reminded Senate that this was a complex area with some external constraints, as laid out in the Quality Assurance Agency’s Quality Code, but confirmed that the University was continually looking for opportunities to streamline these procedures. The point was also made that while the School role was critical, a wider perspective was also needed for programme approval to ensure that the potential impact of any changes was considered in terms of the whole University.

In response to Professor Munck’s comments, the Principal also referred to operations under a Council of Senate, if this was established, and identified the need to establish a mechanism for academic issues raised at School level to be brought to the Council of Senate for consideration. This would be taken forward by the Senate Office after the decision on the Council of Senate was made in February.

A general comment was made about the transparency of the University’s current management structures and it was noted that limited information was available on the University website. The model of online governance information available from Yale University was commended. Senate agreed that, once structures were confirmed after the decision in February, further information on the University’s governance structure should be published prominently online.

6. Estate Strategy Update

At its scheduled meeting on 6 February, Senate received an update on the development of the Estate Strategy from Mrs Allen, Director of Estates and Buildings.

Mrs Allen noted that the Estate Strategy was intended to facilitate the University’s overall strategy and its aim of enhancing our position as one of the world’s great broad-based, research-intensive universities. The estate was thus viewed as a factor in enabling the achievement of University ambitions: to grow income, drive efficiencies, improve our reputation and support resilience. This in turn shaped the Estate Strategy vision: to create a campus that was fit for today and the future, that was innovative, courageous in design and reflective of the University’s heritage and ambition in research and teaching and learning. The elements of the emerging Strategy addressed:

- Vision and guiding principles
- Business need
- Campus development framework & urban design
- Site investigation on the Western
- Space principles and efficiencies
- Asset strategy
- Funding arrangements
- Delivery Plan
A number of general themes were emerging from discussions and consultations that had taken place to date:

- Co-location
- Fit for purpose teaching and research space
- Quality of environment to attract best students and researchers
- Role the campus plays in the student experience
- Supporting functions – catering etc.
- Fit for purpose estate for staff

Mrs Allen stressed the consultative aspect of the development of the Strategy and the Campus Development Framework that would guide work. There had been 1900 responses in the second stage of consultations.

Much work was also presently underway in analysing the Western Infirmary site. As well as infrastructural matters, this included consideration of factors arising from the Listed Building status of parts of the site and of what facilities might be reused. In compiling the Campus Development Framework, consideration was being given to the 'plateau' formed by the buildings around the Gilbert-Scott Building. The Western site effectively formed a second plateau, and thinking included the paralleling of features of the historic plateau, such as the quadrangles, in the new area. While urban-based the University enjoyed the great advantage of occupying what was very much a green site. Consideration would also be given to how best to make use of this asset. Another matter being considered was the openness of the campus and the nature and location of its main gateways.

In recognition of the care required in the use of space, principles had been established in this regard also. These were: accessibility, fitness for purpose, flexibility, expressiveness and sustainability.

Looking ahead, the next steps included the final stages of consultation on the Campus Development Framework. Further shaping of plans would then take place through discussions with Court and SMG and a final round of consultation in the summer before the Development Framework was submitted to the City of Glasgow Council and a final submission to Court in October.

The Principal encouraged members of Senate to contribute ideas and views to the consultation on the Estate strategy. Acquisition of the Western site represented a rare and historic development for the University. The opportunity was being taken to consider the whole campus, not just what might be done with the new site.

In discussion, it was asked what current projects were being taken forward separately from the new Estate Strategy, and whether there were arrangements for staff consultation in relation to
these initiatives. Mrs Allen responded that significant current projects included work at the Dumfries Campus; the collaborative project with the NHS at the Southern General Hospital, with a particular focus on imaging facilities for research and teaching; sports facilities development at Gilmorehill; and support for teaching, in the context of larger classes and an increased student population. The Principal also noted that the limitations of space for research and teaching represented a major topic for the University. Consideration was presently being given to ways of prioritising development work and he expected an announcement to be made on this shortly. Mrs Allen noted that Estates and Buildings relied heavily on the experience of staff and student users of facilities to inform development work. A further major project was the replacement of the heating system for Gilmorehill. This was essential, and would help reduce the University's carbon footprint. There would inevitably be disruption caused by the work.

In response to a question on the extent of external consultation on plans for the development of the Campus, Mrs Allen confirmed that there was extensive on-going dialogue with UK counterpart universities and that there would be overseas consultation following approval of the Estate Strategy in the second half of 2014.

It was asked whether the consultation exercises had identified particular issues for international students. Mrs Allen expressed her thanks for the raising of this matter, noting that, beyond additional demand for sports facilities, nothing had been identified. However, further consideration would be given to ways of ensuring that issues that particularly affected international students were captured.

Professor Willsdon asked whether consideration was being given in planning to the aesthetic embellishment of the campus. Mrs Allen confirmed that this was the case. While discussions remained at an early stage, a particular feature of development would be the further enhancement of existing open spaces. It was hoped that this would include the shifting of car parking away from the historic buildings.

With regard to funding for the new Strategy, the Principal noted that the University was presently in a positive financial position, with good cash reserves and no debt. He expected that finances for the sector would be further squeezed in the next years and that pensions would also provide significant challenges for universities. It was planned that there would be a major fund-raising campaign for the development of the estate. This would commence mainly in c. 2015-16. However, discussions had already commenced with major trusts and charitable foundations, and there had recently been a donation to the University of several million pounds. The Principal's view was that there was significant capacity for further fund-raising, beyond the £6-10M that had been raised annually in recent years.

7. Outcome Agreement with Scottish Funding Council

On 6 February, Senate received the latest version of the draft Outcome Agreement with the Scottish Funding Council. The Senior Vice-Principal, Professor Juster, was leading development of the document. He reported that several comments on the previous draft Agreement had been received from members of Senate; these had been incorporated into the
latest draft. There had also been some minor amendment at the suggestion of the SFC. The document would now be submitted to Court on 12 February 2014 for approval.

In discussion, Professor Clark noted that this was the third annual Agreement with the SFC. He recalled the initial apprehensiveness of the universities that the introduction of the Agreements could lead to undue SFC or governmental intrusion into what was properly the universities' business. He enquired whether this it was felt that this concern had been realised and whether such concerns persisted. Professor Juster responded that the context in which this year's Agreement had been developed differed little from the previous year's. While there had been additional funding last year, this was not the case presently. However, the SFC Chair Board had a new Chair, Professor Alice Brown, and would also shortly appoint a new Chief Executive. It was possible that these changes would lead to a change in approach by the Council. The Principal, who was also a member of the SFC Board, commented that it remained the case that Outcome Agreements could be used to exert pressure on the sector, but there was no evidence of this at present, and the sector had successfully resisted such pressure to date. There remained need for watchfulness. It was possible that employability would become an influential theme for SFC. This would bring challenges for the sector, in part because useful, hard evidence of graduate destinations was difficult to adduce.

8. Convener's Business

8.1 Queen’s Anniversary Prize

At the meeting of Senate on 12 December, the Principal congratulated all colleagues involved in the Boyd Orr Centre for Population and Ecosystem Health’s award of the prestigious Queen’s Anniversary Prize. The prize had been won previously in the University in 1994 and 1998 for work in communication in Art and Music, and Computing Science.

8.2 Autumn Statement Announcement on Student Places in England

Senate was advised on 12 December that there had been an unexpected announcement in the Chancellor of the Exchequer’s recent Autumn Statement in Westminster confirming that 30,000 additional student places would be available to universities in England in 2014 and indicating that the cap on numbers would be removed entirely in the following year. This was a significant change which was likely to impact on recruitment in Scottish universities and therefore the University would need to give detailed consideration to this matter.

8.3 The White Paper on Scotland’s Future

At the meeting on 12 December, the Principal referred to the White Paper on Scotland’s Future published by the Scottish Parliament and advised Senate that the University’s work in enhancing and contributing to the constitutional debate was well-recognised. The University would continue to hold events to assist the debate and colleagues were warmly encouraged to engage in the debate and express their views on the question of Scottish independence.
8.4 Scottish Innovation Forum

At the meeting on 6 February, the Principal reported that there had been discussions within Scotland concerning comment from the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning questioning whether Scotland should have a single office to deal with Knowledge Exchange. There had been concern in the HE sector that the possibility of establishing a single centre for KE stemmed from poorly-founded perceptions of the universities being reluctant and inefficient partners in KE initiatives. A working group had been established to consider the matter. Professor Beaumont, Vice-Principal for Research & Enterprise, had been appointed to the group to advise it from the HE viewpoint. Professor Beaumont reported that industry representatives on the group had expressed the view that a single centre was not desirable and that the universities performed well with respect to KE. Discussions had led to the establishment of an Innovation Forum, established to enhance the effectiveness of approaches within Scotland. Senate heard that the Forum had got off to a positive and constructive start, and had begun examining the needs of both HE and industry in the KE context.

8.5 SFC Funding Letter

The Principal reported on 6 February on the main funding letter to the University from the Funding Council. Senate heard that, with the introduction of Outcome Agreements and other changes, the main funding letters were less significant than in the past and more complicated to interpret. The University had performed particularly well with regard to Postgraduate Taught and Access students. The University had done less well regarding Research Transfer funding, although our Research Transfer Grant had been affected by the introduction of a different formula to calculate the level of funding institutions received. Income had also been affected by lower than hoped-for Postgraduate Research numbers. Overall, the university had received an increase in funding of 1.1%.

9. Research Planning and Strategy Committee Report

9.1 Open Access Update

Professor Beaumont, the Vice-Principal for Research & Enterprise, provided the meeting on 6 February with an update on Open Access developments. Senate heard that the Library had done good work on the development of efficient procedures for making research publications available. This contrasted with reports from other universities, where researchers were required to do extensive checking of publication conditions themselves. However, Professor Beaumont noted that only c. 250 publications had been issued on an open access basis through the Library facility. While some other articles may have been made available by means of other sources of funding, this number represented only c. 10% of the normal annual output by the University. Submissions to the next Research Excellence Framework, expected around 2020, would require to be 100% open access. Members were strongly encouraged to make use of the Library scheme. Professor Beaumont agreed with the comment form a member of Senate that there was need to ensure the profile of this issue was raised further.
Professor Beaumont also reported on 6 February on progress regarding the University's approach to open access to research data. The Research Planning and Strategy Committee (RPSC) had established a working group in March 2013 to carry out a pilot study to determine research data management needs across the University in response to the developing requirements in this area, partly through the identification of challenges researchers faced in adhering to funding body requirements. This was a new and challenging area, and RPSC had agreed that the University needed to provide colleagues with appropriate support, including funder-specific guidance and infrastructure for data storage. Where national (or other suitable) repositories already exist, these would be used, as appropriate, and developments would also be monitored regarding the creation of any new central repositories managed at a national level. Requirements to support University research would be considered by the Senior Management Group. While some categories of data were protected and confidential and would remain so, much data presently unavailable would require to be published. Research Councils, notably that for Engineering and Physical Sciences, were becoming more directive on the issue.

10. Presentation on Student Support & Development Committee

Professor Briggs, Convener of the Committee advised Senate that the Student Support and Development Committee dealt with matters related to student support involving twelve student service departments - Sports & Recreation Service, Careers Service, Chaplaincy, Registry, Counselling & Psychological Services, Disability Service, Student Learning Service, Student Lifecycle Team, SRC, International Student Support, Equality & Diversity Unit, Residential Services. In addition, the Committee considered ad hoc items such as examination timetabling concerns.

Professor Briggs, accepting that it can be invidious to single out particular areas of activity, drew Senate’s attention to three items to note.

i. The excellent work undertaken by the University Chaplaincy in supporting students and staff in times of significant stress and trauma.

ii. The significant pressure currently being experienced by Sports and Recreation Services due to increased demand in these facilities. Senate was advised that there was a particularly high usage of the Stevenson Building by international students. Plans for the new extension to the Stevenson Building would in due course relieve current pressures, but this work would not be completed for a couple of years.

iii. Counselling Services were also under significant pressure with increased workloads – currently (as of end of November) there was a waiting list of 295 students, with 109 of these awaiting initial appointments. These figures equated to a waiting time of three weeks for an assessment appointment, and then up to six weeks for ongoing counselling. Senate also heard that in the first two months of this academic year,
there was a 20% increase in students registering compared to the same period last year, and for first year students, there was a 47% increase in undergraduates and a 76% increase in postgraduates seeking support. Senate was pleased to hear that extra staffing resources had been committed to Counselling Services to reduce waiting times for students on both a temporary (immediate relief) and ongoing basis.

Senate wished to put on record its thanks to all the Student Services for their vitally important work in supporting students, noting the level of professionalism and care shown by colleagues in these services.

11. Honorary Degrees 2014

The Clerk of Senate reported that following acceptances had been received from nominees to receive Honorary Degrees in 2014:

**Doctor of Divinity (DD)**
Right Reverend Lorna HOOD
Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland

**Doctor of Laws (LLD)**
The Hon Lord HODGE
Lawyer and Judge
The Rt Hon Sir Geoffrey PALMER
New Zealand Lawyer

**Doctor of Letters (DLitt)**
Colin BLANE
BBC News Correspondent
Gerry HUGHES
First Deaf Teacher in Scotland since 1880 and first deaf person to sail single handedly around the globe via the five southern peaks
Janice KIRKPATRICK (GSA)
Founder of Graven Images, Glasgow
Neil OLIVER (Dumfries)
Archaeologist and Historian *(To be awarded in 2015)*

**Doctor of Science (DSc)**
Professor Michael BOIT
Professor of Sport Science, Kenyatta University
Professor Robert BOYD
Department of Physics, University of Ottawa

Professor Anne GLOVER
Chief Scientific adviser to EU President

Professor Parveen Jane KUMAR
London Digestive Health, Harley Street (Awarded for her efforts in advancing Medical Education)

Professor Giuseppe MANCIA
Head of Department of Medicine, University of Milan

Robin MCLAREN
Geomatical Scientist

Professor Iain STEWART
Professor of Geosciences Communication, University of Plymouth

Doctor of Engineering (DEng)

Captain David MACKAY
Test Pilot for Virgin Galactic

Graeme WADDELL
Former Head of Operations of Rolls Royce Aero Repair

Doctor of the University (DUniv)

HRH Prince Tunku IMRAN
Chair of the Commonwealth Games Federation,

Kamalesh SHARMA
Secretary General of the Commonwealth of Nations and a former Indian High Commissioner to the United Kingdom.

Andy BOW (GSA)
Deputy Design Director of Group 1

Paul Tudor JONES II
Founder and Chairman of Tudor Investment Corporation

Karen MCCLUSKEY
Co-Director Scottish Violence Reduction Unit

Dr Bridget MCCONNELL
Chief Executive, Glasgow Life

Professor Sir Richard TRAINOR
Principal, King's College, London
Senate also received a report from the Honorary Degrees Committee concerning recommendations for the conferment of further Honorary Degrees in 2014.


On 6 February, Senate received from the Education Policy & Strategy Committee (EdPSC) the Code of Practice on Work-Based and Placement Learning. The Code set out concise principles and policy statements and was augmented by a range of supporting appendices drawing on good practice from across the sector and from work-based and placement learning in the University. The Code brought the University into line with other institutions and with the Quality Assurance Agency’s Quality Code in this regard.

Senate approved the Code of Practice, subject to minor textual amendments.

13. Student Support and Development Committee: Student Mental Health Policy

On 6 February, Senate received the draft Student Mental Health Policy for consideration from the Student Support and Development Committee. The policy had been developed by the Mental Health Agreement Working Group and included an outline of staff and student responsibilities and guidelines for staff supporting students with mental health issues. It would replace the current document ‘Staff Guidelines for handling Student Mental Health Difficulties.

Senate approved the Student Mental Health Policy.