Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 16 April 2014 in the Senate Room

Present:
Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr David Anderson General Council Member, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Professor Nick Jonsson Senate Member, 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, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Professor Miles Padgett Senate Member, Mr David Ross General Council Member (Convener of Court), Dr Duncan Ross Senate Member, Dr Donald Spaeth Senate Member, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Member

In attendance:
Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), 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 James Conroy (Vice-Principal Internationalisation), 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), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal), 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 Christine Forde Senate Member, Dr Marie Freel Senate Member, Cllr Pauline McKeever Glasgow City Council Representative, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Representative

CRT/2013/37. Announcements
Court welcomed Heather Cousins (Co-opted Member) and Professor Jim Conroy (Vice Principal Internationalisation) to their first meeting of Court.

CRT/2013/38. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 12 February 2014
The minutes were approved.

CRT/2013/39. Matters Arising
There were no matters arising.

CRT/2013/40. University of Glasgow Pension Scheme UGPS
Neal Juster, Margaret Anne McParland and David Newall, Trustees of UGPS, did not attend for this item.
In October, Court had been informed that a proposal would be brought forward on how the deficit in UGPS would be funded over the coming years, including the possible use of security. A draft proposal had been discussed at the December Court meeting, at which greater clarity had been requested regarding the terms and timing. In February, Court had received an update and additional information relating to the areas in question. In relation to possible use of security, Court had heard that asset valuation had the potential to arrive at very different figures, and there was no guarantee that the valuation exercise would come to a conclusion that would satisfy the University and the Trustees. The University might therefore have to consider other potential options, including: a large cash injection up front; higher annual contributions; and the use of assets with guaranteed income, such as rental income from student residences, which could be collateralised as security. Given that these matters had at that point yet to be discussed with the Trustees and, given the Regulator’s deadline of 10 July to have the deficit funding in place, Court had agreed in February that a small subgroup of Court should be formed to liaise with SMG in considering the strategic options, discussing with others as required.

Since the last meeting, Margaret Morton, Duncan Ross and Kevin Sweeney from the subgroup had met with University Officers to agree a proposal for discussion with the UGPS Trustees. The Group had agreed that it did not wish to pursue the option of security; rather, an affordable offer of cash upfront together with annual payments thereafter was preferable. The Group had considered various options for upfront payments and had agreed to discuss with the Trustees an up-front payment of £20M followed by annual indexed payments over 20 years.

University Officers had met with the Trustees in mid March to discuss the proposal and brief them on the campus development. Following that, information had been provided to the Trustees’ covenant assessor. A letter had since been received from the Chair of the Trustees proposing an alternative recovery plan, and had been provided to Court. In summary, the Trustees’ proposal was an up-front cash payment of £40M followed by annual payments over 15 years, and also included a request that the University commit to further measures, including consulting with the Trustees at key points in the campus development, and providing quarterly key financial metrics.

Following discussion, Court unanimously agreed that it could not support agreement to the terms proposed by the Trustees, for reasons including the potential for capital to be locked for a much longer time than might be necessary, and the potential for involvement of the Trustees in the management of the campus development being inappropriate. Court noted that a 15 year timespan for repayments would be feasible. Court agreed that the matter should be referred back to the subgroup and that a response be provided to the Trustees.

Court would be updated at its next meeting.

**CRT/2013/41. Report from the Principal**

**CRT/2013/41.1 Universities Superannuation Scheme USS**

At the last meeting Court had heard that USS had recently started a process of engagement with employers ahead of the triennial valuation in March. At the previous valuation in 2011, the scheme had had a deficit of £2.9bn and a recovery plan and a package of benefit changes had been approved by the Trustees. The estimated deficit had grown over the last 3 years. The deficit had been £7 billion on 30 September 2013; this had reduced slightly to £6.4 billion as at 31 December 2013, having been much higher in March 2013 at £11.5bn (based on the 2011 valuation assumptions). Much of the volatility over these months had been due to the estimates of the scheme’s liabilities as opposed to its assets, due to market movements. The deficit was not expected to be significantly different at the triennial valuation in March. Proposed
adjustments to the investment, longevity and inflation risk assumptions for the 2014 valuation would, however, increase the current deficit significantly.

Universities UK had responded collectively to the engagement paper issued by the USS Board, based on consultation meetings with universities and other USS employers. Following consideration of the UUK response, USS was engaging in a dialogue with the regulator, employers and UCU on the issues raised by the engagement paper. The intention was to complete the valuation process and reach a decision on a financial management plan for the scheme by the end of 2014. Court noted that this would need to include ‘sectionalisation’ of the fund so that institutions were aware of their own liability.

CRT/2013/41.2 IT Strategy

Earlier in the session, Court members had asked for a briefing on the University’s IT Strategy. This was in order to understand how it contributed to advancing the University’s overall strategy and its implications for the Campus Estates Strategy.

Court received a draft IT Strategy, and a briefing from the Director of IT Services, Sandy Macdonald. The strategy had been developed with input from SMG, the Information Policy & Strategy Committee, from each College Management Group, and from the University Services Leadership Team.

Court heard that the strategy had been developed in the context of the University’s strategic plan 2020: A Global Vision, to support the University in delivering on its aspirations across its full range of activity and setting the direction the University would follow to deliver the vision. Priorities included: provision of a scalable, flexible, agile, resilient, secure and robust infrastructure capable of supporting leading edge Learning & Teaching and Research regardless of the location of end users; access to data and applications in a manner that took advantage of flexible, mobile and personalised user interfaces and the opportunities provided by the concept of the personal internet; as part of the Campus Estates Strategy, the creation of an intelligent Campus supporting pervasive access; increased user collaboration and improved delivery of services to all end users; delivery of comprehensive Business Intelligence capabilities supporting complex modelling and predictive analytics in support of all aspects of planning and service delivery; and support of Transnational activities including new partnerships and operating models such as Distance Learning.

In supporting the priorities set out in the draft IT Strategy, SMG had asked that work should now be undertaken on an implementation plan, in particular with a view to identifying those aspects of the strategy that would require new investment. Discussion was taking place with College managers on priorities for improvement and development, and these would be reflected in proposals for investment.

Court approved the IT strategy and noted that SMG would consider the implementation plan in the coming weeks.

CRT/2013/41.3 ELIR Early Outcome Report

The Enhancement-led Institutional Review visits had been completed and the University was now in receipt of a short draft Outcome Report provided by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), which Court noted. The University still had the opportunity to comment on any inaccuracies ahead of the Report being augmented by the more detailed Technical Report, which was expected in late May with full and final publication of the review by the QAA in July.

The content of the ELIR report was very positive, in tone, and the University had received the ‘Effectiveness grading’ which was the best possible outcome. This meant that the University
was considered to have robust arrangements in place for securing academic standards and for enhancing the quality of the student experience.

Court endorsed the Principal’s thanks to Professor Frank Coton, the Senate team and all those who had prepared for the review.

**CRT/2013/41.4 Appointment of Vice-Principal**

Three new Vice-Principal had been appointed since the last meeting:

Professor Roibeard (Robby) Ó Maolalaigh had been appointed Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Arts. Professor Ó Maolalaigh would take up the post on 1 Jan 2015, succeeding Professor Murray Pittock.

Professor Miles Padgett would take up the post of Vice-Principal (Research) from 1 August 2014; and Professor Jonathan Cooper would be appointed Vice-Principal (Innovation and Knowledge Exchange) from the same date, both succeeding Professor Steve Beaumont Vice-Principal (Research and Enterprise). Both would continue with their research and knowledge exchange activities alongside their new vice-principal roles. Court noted that, given potential conflicts of interest with his Court role, Professor Padgett would be stepping down from his role as Senate Assessor, following the May EGM, and thanked him for his contribution to Court business.

**CRT/2013/41.5 Key Activities**

Court noted a summary of some of the main activities in which the Principal had been involved since the last meeting of Court, covering internal and external activities beyond 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.

**CRT/2013/42. Report from the Secretary of Court**

**CRT/2013/42.1 Ordinance on Court composition**

Since the last meeting of Court, a fresh consultation on the draft Ordinance on Court’s composition was under way, with the deadline for submission of comments being 23 April. It has been agreed at the February meeting of Court that a special additional meeting should be arranged, at which Court would receive information on the consultation responses and come to a considered view.

In order to assist Court in this exercise, a short-term Governance working group had been established, chaired by the Convener of Court, and including lay, Senate, staff and student members. The working group would meet on 22 April, to consider all submissions received at that date, including those from the General Council Business Committee meeting on 16 April and the Council of Senate meeting on 17 April. Should any further submissions be received after 22 April, these would also be considered by the working group, which would then report to a special meeting of Court that had been arranged for 2 May. The working group comprised: Dave Anderson, David Anderson, Alan Macfarlane, Jess McGrellis, Margaret Morton, David Ross and Duncan Ross. It would 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.

Court agreed that the special meeting would also consider the setting of RUK Fees from the year 2015/16, following a review of this area by SMG.
CRT/2013/42.2 Glasgow University Union

In November 2013, Glasgow University Union had published the report of the inquiry into the culture within the Union. The report had contained a series of recommendations on future procedures, practice and constitutional arrangements, which the GUU Board had accepted. Court had asked that University officers, and the Student Finance Committee, maintain a watching brief on progress in this area.

The Student Finance Committee had met with the GUU’s senior office bearers in March, and had received from them a progress report on implementation of the inquiry’s recommendations. The report was noted by Court. Court agreed that good progress had been made since the report but that this needed to be maintained.

Certain aspects of the inquiry’s recommendations had required that amendments be made to the GUU’s constitution, and the Union had taken the opportunity also to update the wording of its constitution in other areas. Court noted details of the changes that were now proposed by the GUU’s Board of Management. To be implemented, these amendments now required the approval of a Special General Meeting of GUU, which had been called for 28 April. Court agreed that if the constitutional amendments were approved by the Special General Meeting, they could also be approved by the Secretary of Court on Court’s behalf.

CRT/2013/42.3 Industrial Action

Court had been advised through the HR Committee report that the University might soon face industrial action by UCU and EIS in the form of a boycott of exam marking. Negotiations were taking place on 16 April, with the opportunity then for the national unions to consult with their membership before the planned commencement of the industrial action, on 28 April.

In the event of industrial action taking place, University managers would take all reasonable steps to ensure that examinations were marked, and that students were therefore able to progress as normal to their next year of study or, in the case of final-year students, to graduate. In common with other universities throughout the UK, the University would not accept partial performance by staff.

Court noted an update from Dave Anderson that the threat of action by UCU had been suspended for one week until 6 May, to allow a ballot of members to take place, following further discussions nationally between employers and the unions involved.

CRT/2013/42.4 Socially Responsible Investment Policy

At the last meeting, Court had approved the setting up of a group to consider representations submitted via the SRC for the University to divest from fossil fuel industry companies in accordance with the University’s Policy on Socially Responsible Investment.

The working group involved two lay members of Court (Graeme Bissett and Murdoch MacLennan), one Senate assessor (Marie Freel), one SRC representative on Court (Donald Mackay) and the Secretary of Court.

The group would report to the June Court meeting.

CRT/2013/42.5 Rectorial Election

The Rectorial nominations had been: Alan Bissett; Kelvin Holdsworth; Graeme Obree; Edward Snowden.

Edward Snowden had been elected following a ballot held over 17/18 February. There would be a ceremony to mark his installation as Rector on Wednesday 23 April 2014 at 11.00am in the Bute Hall.
CRT/2013/42.6 Nominations Committee Business

Following approval by the Nominations Committee and consultation with the Audit Committee members, Dr Paul Brady had been appointed as chair of the Audit Committee from 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2015, succeeding Kevin Sweeney.

CRT/2013/42.7 Appointments of Heads of School

Court noted the following appointments:

College of Science & Engineering

School of Chemistry

Professor Stephen Clark had been re-appointed as Head of the School of Chemistry for 2 years from 1 August 2014.

School of Computing Science

Professor Chris Johnson had been appointed as Head of the School of Computing Science for 4 years from 1 August 2014.

School of Engineering

Professor John Marsh had been re-appointed as Head of the School of Engineering for 2 years from 1 August 2014.

School of Mathematics & Statistics

Professor Adrian Bowman had been appointed as Head of the School of Mathematics & Statistics for 4 years from 1 August 2014.

College of MVLS

School of Life Sciences

Dr Rob Aitken had been re-appointed as Head of the School of Life Sciences for 2 years from 1 August 2014.

College of Social Sciences

School of Interdisciplinary Studies

Dr Carol Hill had been appointed as Head of the School of Interdisciplinary Studies for 4 years from 1 August 2014.

CRT/2013/42.7 Scottish Funding Council – Strategic Dialogue

Court noted the SFC’s report on the strategic dialogue visit to the University on 7 February. The SFC had found it an open and informative meeting enabling the Council to gain a better understanding of the University, particularly in relation to the chosen discussion topics: Widening Participation, Knowledge Exchange and Estates. The University had used the opportunity to highlight some of its recent achievements in relation to access and KE and had given a presentation on its plans to develop the estate.

CRT/2013/43. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2013/43.1 Estates Committee

CRT/2013/43.1.1 Campus Development Framework

Court noted and endorsed Estates Committee’s approval of the Campus Development Framework. Court agreed to the establishment of a working group to provide guidance to this process, with the Convener to liaise with David Newall and colleagues on Court about the composition.
CRT/2013/43.1.2 Estates Strategy
Court noted progress made on the Estates Strategy and its associated work streams.

CRT/2013/43.1.3 CapEx Applications
Court noted that Estates Committee had approved CapEx applications relating to: Annual Laboratory and Lecture Theatre Refurbishment Programme £1,194,819; and McCall Building Window Replacement £300k.

CRT/2013/43.2 Finance Committee
CRT/2013/43.2.1 CapEx applications
Court noted that Finance Committee had approved CapEx applications relating to: Annual Laboratory and Lecture Theatre Refurbishment Programme £1,194,819 (from the £1.5m identified in the 2013/14 Capital Plan to fund teaching space refurbishments); and McCall Building Window Replacement £300k.

CRT/2013/43.2.2 Finance Key Performance Indicators
Court noted a report on Finance Key Performance Indicators.

CRT/2013/43.2.3 Investment Managers Report as at 28 February 2014
Court noted Endowment Investment Reports.

CRT/2013/43.2.4 Bank Tender
Finance Committee had confirmed its decision to initiate a tender process for the University’s banking services.

CRT/2013/43.2.5 Financial reports
Court noted an Endowment Investment Report and an Overview of Performance as at 28 February 2014.

CRT/2013/43.3 Audit Committee
The Committee had received an update on the pensions schemes; reports on recent internal audits of risk management and purchase-to-pay; update reports on actions against recommendations from prior internal audits; and a briefing on the University’s heritage assets. It had also approved the internal audit plan setting out the schedule of areas to undergo audit, the plan having been drafted by the recently-appointed internal auditors and based on a full risk assessment of the University’s activities. The University’s risk register and recent updates to it has been noted.

The report was noted.

CRT/2013/43.4 Human Resources Committee
The HR Director had provided an update to the HR Committee regarding: ongoing industrial action and potential marking boycott with effect from 28 April; 2014/15 pay negotiations; arrangements for single table consultation/negotiation with campus recognised trade unions; the 2014 University Staff Survey; recent senior appointments to the University and HR Department; the roll out of the ‘People & Organisational Development Strategy’; and the merger of the Organisational Development Framework 2012-14 with the Strategy. The Committee had received an update from an equality and diversity perspective on the progress
of the Athena Swan bronze award action plans.

The Committee had received presentations from the Director of Finance providing an overview of current pension provisions and associated financial challenges; the HR Director providing an update on Maximising Academic Performance & Career Development (MAPCD) and from Professor Neal Juster with regard to KPI progress reports and the anticipated programme for determining the next strategic planning cycle to follow Glasgow 2020. Court noted that criteria for career progression for University Teachers would be reviewed.

The report was noted.

CRT/2013/43.5 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee

The Committee had received an occupational health report, and approved a policy covering staff who are exposed to vibration at work. The Committee had also received the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Annual Report. It had discussed mechanisms for staff to raise health and safety issues within the institution.

The report was noted.

CRT/2013/44. Any Other Business

Court agreed that a working group would be convened over the summer to look at communication, in the context of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance.

CRT/2013/45. Date of Next Meeting

An EGM will be held 2 May 2014 at 1000 in the Yudowitz Lecture Theatre, Wolfson Medical Building.
The next ordinary meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 25 June 2014 at 2pm in the Senate Room.
Minute of Extraordinary Meeting held on Friday 2 May 2014 in the Yudowitz Lecture Theatre, Wolfson Medical Building

Present:
Mr David Anderson General Council Member, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Professor Christine Forde Senate Member, Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Member, Ms Jess McGrellis SRC President, Cllr Pauline McKeever Glasgow City Council Representative, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Representative, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Professor Miles Padgett Senate Member, Mr David Ross General Council Member (Convener of Court), Dr Duncan Ross Senate Member, Dr Donald Spaeth Senate Member

In attendance:
Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court)

Apologies:

Members: Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Dr Marie Freel Senate Member, Professor Nick Jonsson Senate Member, Professor Karen Lury Senate Member, Mr Brian McBride General Council Member, Mr Donald Mackay SRC Member, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Member

CRT/2013/46. Announcements

Professor Miles Padgett was attending his last meeting in his capacity as Senate Member on Court. Court thanked him for his contributions to its business and wished him well in the future.

CRT/2013/47. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2013/48. Draft Ordinance on Court Composition

At the February meeting of Court, it had been agreed to initiate a fresh consultation exercise on Draft Ordinance 206 relating to the composition of Court. Court had also agreed at that meeting to establish a governance working group to review responses to the consultation and to make recommendations to Court.

Substantial responses to the consultation exercise had been received from the 16 April meeting of the General Council Business Committee and from the 17 April meeting of the Council of Senate. The governance working group had reviewed these responses when it had met on 22 April.

Court had received a number of documents for the present meeting, including: a paper summarising the governance working group’s review and containing its recommendations; the
consultation documents issued by Court on 19 February; responses to the consultation from the General Council Business Committee; a note from the University’s lawyer responding to certain procedural matters that had been raised by members of the General Council Business Committee; responses to the consultation from the Council of Senate and from two individuals; and a legal opinion on the question of whether or not the role of the Rector should be considered to be independent. Court noted that the opinion was that the Rector was not independent.

With regard to the response from the General Council Business Committee to the consultation, Court noted that, following discussion, the Business Committee had voted by 11-8 to oppose Court’s proposal to reduce from 5 to 2 the number of General Council Assessors on Court, and correspondingly to increase by 3 the number of co-opted members. Ahead of this, the Business Committee had raised some procedural matters and had also recorded 14 specific points that had given it cause for concern regarding Court’s proposals. Court noted the submissions on procedural matters and the written response of the University’s lawyer to these procedural matters, which advised, in summary, that changes to the composition of Court were indeed necessary and justified; that GCBC comments relating to a lack of proper consultation and a lack information provision were matters that required the facts to be looked at (on which point Court had received details of the consultation process and updates thereon given to the GCBC); and that there was not a conflict of interest in the Principal and General Council Assessors attending the relevant meeting of the GCBC. Court agreed that the discussion would proceed at the present meeting on the basis that procedure had been followed with regard to the consultation.

Court heard that the working group had considered each of the 14 specific points raised by the Business Committee, and noted the outcome of that consideration, point by point. The group had not considered that Court should amend the draft Ordinance in response to the points, but had proposed changes aimed at addressing concerns that had been raised by the General Council Business Committee, in particular relating to the desirability of a strong University of Glasgow graduate presence on Court.

Court unanimously approved recommendations from the working group, to the effect that:

1. Court confirmed its intention to reduce by 3 the number of General Council Assessors, from 5 to 2, and to increase by 3 the number of Co-opted members;

2. Court agreed that membership of the Nominations Committee should be amended such that in future it would always include a General Council Assessor;

3. Court agreed that, in the future recruitment of Co-opted members, Nominations Committee should liaise with the General Council Business Committee with the aim of encouraging applications from graduates of the University; and

4. Court agreed that, in situations where graduates of the University were demitting office as co-opted members of Court, the job specification for their replacement should state that applications from Glasgow graduates were particularly welcome.

It was noted that Court had already committed, in February 2011, that it would ask Nominations Committee to ensure that, in recommending individuals to Court for co-option, it should bear in mind the desirability of having at least three co-opted members who, as graduates of the University, were members of the General Council.

With regard to the response from the Council of Senate to the consultation, discussion at the Council of Senate, from which a written response had been provided to Court, had focused on the proposed reduction from 7 to 5 in the number of Senate members, and the corresponding increase of 2 in the number of Co-opted members. While the Council of Senate had recognised the need
for an independent majority on Court, it had voted strongly against a reduction from 7 to 5 Senate Assessors, and strongly for a counter-proposal that the number should be reduced from 7 to 6, which Court noted had been made very much in a spirit of compromise. The Court governance working group had been conscious that the Council of Senate had sought to identify a way forward that would meet the requirement of the Code, while at the same time maintaining a strong presence of Senate members on Court. The Privy Council had also specifically asked that Court’s proposed reduction to 5 Senate members should be the subject of further discussion with Senate.

The working group had been clear that its principal concern should be that the new Ordinance was compliant with the Code of HE Governance. The working group was therefore recommending to Court that:

1. if Court was confident that, in accepting the Council of Senate’s counter-proposal, it could demonstrate compliance with the Code of HE Governance, then the Draft Ordinance should be amended such that the number of Senate Assessors would be reduced by one (from 7 to 6), and the number of Co-opted members increased by one. Court noted that agreeing this option would be very much in keeping with the spirit with which Senate had approached the matter, that is with a view to a compromise;

2. if Court was not confident that, in accepting the Council of Senate’s proposal, it could demonstrate compliance with the Code, then the Draft Ordinance should remain unaltered, such that that the number of Senate Assessors would be reduced by two (from 7 to 5) and the number of Co-opted members increased by two.

The matter of the independence of the Rector had been further explored with the obtaining of a QC’s opinion, which was that the role was not independent as described in the new Code of Good Governance. As such a reduction from 7 to 6 Senate Assessors would produce a simple majority of 13-12. This raised the question as to what was required to comprise a “clear” majority in these circumstances. Court noted, however, that another interpretation of “independent” was possible: that the Rector was not a member of staff or a student of the University, therefore not personally affected by decisions of Court. This definition had the benefit of being clear and, in terms of this definition, the Rector was clearly independent, since the 1966 Act of Parliament and the subsequent Ordinance 186 prohibited members of staff and students of the University from standing for election as Rector. A further alternative interpretation of “independent” might be that the person was not beholden to any group and was therefore in a position clearly to exercise independent judgment. By this definition, the Rector’s independence was questionable since, as the choice of the University’s students, s/he was expected to represent the interests of students on Court.

In discussion, Court members expressed views to the effect that the Rector could not always be counted on to be independent, for example the post-holder might in the future be very much driven by a student electorate mandate at each meeting. Comment was made to the effect that Counsel’s opinion has gone back to first principles and had concluded ‘in the round’ that the Rector was not independent. In addition, given the doubts in general about the way the role might be exercised, this pointed to non-independence. It was also commented that Court needed to factor in cases where the Rector did not attend meetings, which was currently the case and had been so on several occasions in the recent past.

A further consideration was the apparent inconsistency in considering that the Rector was not independent simply on the grounds that s/he was elected by students, given that Senate Assessors were elected by Senate but nevertheless acted in the interests of the University rather than their ‘constituency’ when discussing Court business. Court noted also that ‘representatives’ and ‘delegates’ were not synonymous; the former made decisions based on their own judgment.
Arguably, the crux of the issue was not ‘independence’, but the disquiet on the part of a number of Court’s stakeholders about the implications of the Ordinance. It was agreed important that Court listened to the issues and responded appropriately to points made during the consultation. Court recalled that it had already taken on board feedback from the consultation, having agreed to change the number of Senate Assessors from 7 to 5, rather than from 7 to 4, and to ask Nominations Committee to 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, given Senate’s response following the first consultation in 2011. Court’s ability to respond further was made difficult because of the Code, which required a clear majority, but it remained keen now, as it had been in 2011, to take on board concerns.

The Convener pointed out that the SFC would require a ‘comply or explain’ approach to the Code; there was no option involved, and institutions would have to explain the reasons, if they were not compliant. Compliance would be a condition of grant, and Court agreed that non-compliance was not likely to be taken lightly by the SFC.

Court strongly agreed that it would not wish to increase its membership to more than 25 in order to achieve a clear independent majority. A maximum membership of 25 was described in the governance code as a benchmark of good practice, and Court did not believe there was good reason why the University could argue that it alone of Scottish universities was unable to adopt this benchmark. Court noted that Aberdeen University was understood to be reviewing the size of its Court so as to reduce it to no more than 25. Court also discussed a possible phased approach, for example by moving to 6 Senate Assessors in 2014/15, and then 5 in the subsequent years. It agreed not to pursue this approach, which might simply postpone into the future further debate on the composition of Court.

Following further discussion and given its wish to respond positively to feedback from the consultation, Court unanimously agreed that it would amend the draft Ordinance so that the number of Senate Assessors moved from 7 to 6, with the total number of Co-opted members increasing to 9 rather than 10. If the view of Privy Council, advised by the Scottish Government, was that it could not accept the Ordinance so drafted, on the grounds that it would not satisfy the requirements of good governance, then unless the Privy Council advised that the reduction in the number of Senate Assessors to 6 rather than 5 was acceptable, the draft Ordinance should be re-submitted to the Privy Council with the number of Senate Assessors reduced instead from 7 to 5, and with the number of co-opted members increased to 10 rather than 9. Should the Privy Council require the addressing of other specific points, then Court would respond to these following further consideration. Details of the decision by Court would be communicated to the General Council Business Committee and the Council of Senate.

Court also agreed the following approach to implementing the Ordinance:

1. The new Ordinance should have effect from 1 August 2014;

2. with effect from that date, three new co-opted members should be appointed: two to fill the positions vacated by Kevin Sweeney and Alan MacFarlane, who would complete their terms of office as General Council members on 31 July 2014; and one to fill the position vacated by Miles Padgett whose period of office as a Senate Assessor would end on 3 May 2014.

3. on the next occasion when a General Council Assessor reached the end of his term of office, that person would be replaced on Court by a new Co-opted member;

4. in the event that the new Ordinance provided for a reduction to 5 Senate Assessors then, on the next occasion that a Senate Assessor reached the end of his/her term of office, that person would be replaced by a new Co-opted member;
5. should the implementation of the new ordinance be delayed until after 1 August, and should new Assessors be appointed in the intervening period, by General Council or Senate, then the terms on Court of these new appointees would terminate immediately upon the new Ordinance coming into effect.

CRT/2013/49. RUK Fees

Court received a paper giving details of the current position in respect to the University’s approach to RUK tuition fees and financial incentives, previously agreed by Court in 2011. The paper also provided an update on recent application and registration data; gave a summary of comparative fees and support information for competitor institutions; listed details of proposed student support packages; and highlighted risks that should be taken into consideration.

While noting the importance of presentation of the outcomes, Court approved a number of recommended changes, relating to changes to the University’s pricing and support packages for RUK students for 2015/16, as follows:-

i. The annual fee for all undergraduate degrees be £9,000, but capped at £27,000 for all degrees other than Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Medicine, and other five year programmes, where the cost would be £36,000, in line with the total degree ticket price being communicated currently. David Newall noted a comment from Jess McGrellis that consideration should be given to the matter of 3 year Ordinary degrees and whether these should attract a discount;

ii. The promotion be ‘final year free’, but for those RUK students undertaking an international exchange programme the free year would be the year they were not at the University; in approving this Court noted that consideration would be given following the meeting to the specific circumstances of Modern Languages students who were required to study a compulsory year abroad as part of their degree programme;

iii. Bursaries and Scholarships be offered to students from Low Income Households and those possessing high academic attainment; the £1,000 first year Welcome Bursary for all RUK students be amended and the Access Tuition Fee Discount be rebadged as an Access Bursary offered as a cash sum and with one less banding, ensuring that students from households with less than £42,600 a year were offered greater support;

iv. HEBBS undertake the awarding of financial support on behalf of the University, thereby significantly reducing staff administration and streamlining the process.

Court noted that should a new Labour government cap tuition fees at £6,000 per annum, the University would move to a headline fee of £6,000 for every year of study and would also reduce the level of financial support on offer.

CRT/2013/50. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2013/51. Date of Next Meeting

The next ordinary meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 25 June 2014 at 2pm in the Senate Room.
University of Glasgow Pension Scheme (UGPS)

Further to the meeting of Court on 16 April 2014 at which Court agreed that it could not support the terms proposed by the Trustees of the UGPS in addressing the historic deficit in the Scheme, members of SMG have engaged with the Trustees, supported by the Working Group of Court established for the purpose.

Clear feedback was provided to the Trustees and their advisers from the Court meeting in April and a constructive dialogue ensued. Rather than establishing constricting proposals, we have had good engagement over the recovery plan including the affordability of payments and the sharing of information on the campus development. Members of the Working Group have been kept informed and agreement sought from members on the acceptability of the proposals as they developed. The Working Group has now agreed the terms of the recovery plan as follows:

1. An initial lump sum of £30m paid on or before 31 July 2014 and
2. The balance of the deficit to be repaid over a 20 year period. Based on the current deficit this would equate to contributions of £2.5m per annum, increasing at 2.5% per annum over the 20 year period, with each payment being made by 15 March each year and the first payment being made no later than 15 March 2015.

The significance of the March payment date is that the Trustees’ financial year is April to March. The recovery plan will be monitored formally on a triennial basis, timed according to the actuarial valuations (the next of which is due on 31 March 2016).

In addition to the formal recovery plan which will require to be agreed by the Pensions Regulator, we have agreed to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the Trustees concerning progress with the campus development, particularly as it affects the University’s financial position. The Trustees will be consulted, as a significant stakeholder, as funding proposals for the campus development emerge and on any other significant event which might have a material impact on the Scheme. Accordingly we will share with the Trustees the following:

- Our annual budget and five year capital plan in June each year following approval by Court.
- Copies of our management accounts on a biannual basis (in February and in August covering the previous 6 month period)

In the spirit of dialogue we have undertaken to update the Trustees, including in writing, on a 6 monthly basis on the status of the ‘key points’ below, prior to formal decisions being taken, together with any proposed or known changes in the 6 month horizon from the date of the reporting. The ‘key points’ are:

- Proposals for security over assets or prior ranking debt arrangements
- Proposed new debt or overdraft facilities
- Progress on funding of the campus development
- Proposed significant capital expenditure projects
- Major acquisitions or disposals proposed
• Significant contingent liabilities proposed
• Whether the University will be applying to the Pensions Regulator for Clearance in relation to the campus development activities (N.B. there is no requirement to do so from tPR)
• The USS position.

In addition we have further agreed to notify the Trustees in writing as any Notifiable Events arise or any Type A events arise or are being considered outside of the above 6 monthly reporting. [Type A events are events which would have a material impact on the Scheme meeting its pension liabilities and require a clearance statement from the Pensions Regulator.]

D A Welch
17 June 2014
Court - Wednesday 25 June 2014

Principal’s Report

Items A : For Discussion

1. SFC Grant Award and Dumfries Regional Outcome Agreement

The SFC advised us of our 2014-15 funding on 14 May 2014. Our total Teaching and Research allocation rose by 0.6% to £143.19 m an increase of £912,000 on 2013-14. The following table outlines the 2014-15 Grants against 2013-14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15 £k</th>
<th>2013-14 £k</th>
<th>Diff £k</th>
<th>Diff %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Teaching Funding</td>
<td>87,180</td>
<td>86,429</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Excellence Grant</td>
<td>47,317</td>
<td>46,916</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Postgraduate Grant</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>6,411</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Exchange/Transfer Grants</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>-234</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research</td>
<td>56,010</td>
<td>55,849</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>143,190</td>
<td>142,278</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes ring-fenced places for controlled subjects

I have also attached for Court’s information (Annex 1) the paper ‘Crichton Campus Consolidated Outcome Agreement and strategic vision: 2014-15 to 2016-17’.

2. Universities Superannuation Scheme USS

At the last meeting Court heard that Universities UK responded collectively to the engagement paper issued by the USS Board, based on consultation meetings with universities and other USS employers. USS is continuing to engage in dialogue with the regulator, employers and UCU on the issues raised by the Trustees first consultation on the Financial Management Plan. As previously advised, it is intended to complete the valuation process and agree a financial management plan for the scheme by the end of 2014, and therefore Court will be updated more fully in the autumn. During the summer months there will be discussions between UUK and UCU on the elements of the financial management plan.
Items B: For Information

3. University Rankings

We now have details from two of the UK League Tables, The Complete University Guide and The Guardian. The Times will publish its table later in June. In the Complete University Guide, we have dropped to 30th, from 23rd place last year. We are now 25th in the Guardian league table, down from 21st last year. While fluctuations in table positions are likely given their sensitivity to very small changes in scores across the various measures, we will be addressing the causes over the coming weeks to ensure we address key areas and reverse any downward trends for the future.

4. Appointment of Vice-Principal/Head of College of Science & Engineering

As Court knows, Muffy Calder, Professor of Computing Science, will succeed Professor John Chapman as Vice Principal and Head of the College of Science and Engineering.

Due to her commitments as Chief Scientific Adviser for Scotland, she will take up her post on 1 January 2015. As John retires this summer, Professor David Fearn, who is already a member of the College Management Group as Dean of Learning and Teaching, will take on the role of Acting Head of College for the intervening period. I am very grateful to David for agreeing to take on this additional responsibility.

5. International and National Developments

I am highlighting five recent developments in our internationalisation activities:

- A three-way Memorandum of Understanding has been signed between the Universities of Glasgow, Warwick and Sun Yat-sen in Guangzhou, to facilitate the exchange of medical students between Glasgow and Sun Yat-sen universities, with Warwick’s student exchanges in other areas.

- A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed with the University of Delhi, with the first initiative being the use of video-link technology to teach aspects of English literature to students in Delhi and for Glasgow students to receive lectures in post-colonial literature, from Delhi.

- Planet Earth Institute (PEI), an international charity working for the scientific independence of Africa, is proposing to create an African Research Centre in Health and Environmental Science (ARCHES), based in Mozambique, with a primary focus on public health, primary care and environmental science. A Memorandum of Understanding was signed last month by various partners. The Colleges of MVLS and Science and Engineering will deliver a Professor Training Programme for Eduardo Mondlane University, including delivery of discipline-specific PhD supervision and research training.

- Discussions are continuing regarding the establishment of a Joint Graduate School with Nankai University in Tianjin as part of our expansion of Trans-National Education (TNE). We should hear back during the summer from the Ministry of Education on whether we can launch the new School in October.

- Following the successful launch of our TNE operations in Engineering with UESTC in Chengdu, with very successful initial phase of student recruitment, our partners are exploring with us
whether we can expand our collaboration in terms of new courses and programmes in future, and this is being considered within the College of Science and Engineering.

Nearer to home, the Scottish Government has announced plans to establish an independent Scottish Fiscal Commission, based at the University of Glasgow. The Commission will review government forecasts of receipts from devolved taxes as part of the Scottish Parliament’s new powers under the Scotland Act (2012).

On the 20th anniversary of the death of the Rt Hon. John Smith, the John Smith Centre for Public Service is being created to promote public service. It will be housed at the University and operational by the end of 2014. Its focus will be to encourage debate on, and provide research into, the value of public service, and to attract young people to contribute to public life.

The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Scottish Government announced that they have jointly awarded just under £3 million to the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, for a new What Works Scotland (WWS) initiative. The Centre is intended to help policy makers and practitioners in the public services in Scotland transform the way they work. It will be led by Professor Nicholas Watson, Chair of Disability Studies at the University of Glasgow and Professor James Mitchell, Professor of Public Policy at the University of Edinburgh.

From 14-16th May, leaders of some of the world’s major universities gathered in Glasgow for the annual general meeting and presidential symposium of Universitas 21 (U21). It was an extremely successful event which gave delegates a taste of Glasgow’s rich culture and campus and all those involved in organising and supporting the event at all levels within the Glasgow team are to be congratulated.

The meeting, hosted for the first time in the UK, considered the role of the ‘University of the Future’, exploring the effective development of talent and examining the impact of online learning and international campuses on higher education. For the third time U21 hosted a student leaders summit, and the University Presidents welcomed a presentation from the students on the impact of HE on future careers, which requested increased activity in the areas of importance of experiential learning, interdisciplinary opportunities and undergraduate research opportunities. Guest speakers were Phil Smith, CEO of Cisco Systems UK & Ireland and Glasgow alumnus, and Simon Nelson, CEO of FutureLearn online education platform.

Changes agreed at the 2014 meeting included the planned appointment of a new Executive Director of U21, and a higher level of student involvement in strategic planning and network activity.

UKTI, Scottish Government, Scottish Enterprise and the Commonwealth Business Council are organising a major Commonwealth Games Business Conference - 22-23 July 2014, and it will be held at the University of Glasgow. The event will be attended by senior international business and government representatives.

The event will focus on issues and opportunities common to all countries, such as: employment and skills, infrastructure development, improving financial services for business, and the development of smart cities of the future. I have been asked to welcome delegates at the VIP reception and also to participate in a panel on Future Cities, highlighting the contribution that our University is making in this area.
6. 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.

6.1 Academic Development and Strategy

- SMG Risk Workshop (23 April)
- 12 May involved in the launch of the John Smith Centre with Catherine Smith and interviews on Good Morning Scotland, STV and the BBC
- 13 – 16 May the U21 Symposium and AGM as noted above
- SMG Strategy Day and dinner (20 June)
- On 25 June I will take part with representatives from NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde in the official opening of the new Lister building based in the Royal Infirmary

6.2 International Activities

- Met with Olivier Dyens, Deputy Provost (Student Life & Learning), McGill University (13 May)
- 15 May during U21 signed MoU with Delhi University as noted above
- Met with the Latvian Ambassador (28 May)
- Met and hosted a lunch with a delegation of Deans of Medicine from Saudia Arabia to discuss potential collaborations in medical education.
- Met the Lithuanian Ambassador (4 June)
- Welcomed and hosted a lunch with the President of Tianjin University of Finance & Economics (TJUFE) and his party. Currently Glasgow has an MoU and a 3+1(+1) and 4+1 MoA signed in 2011. There are currently 32 students involved in these arrangements. This visit was in part to explore developing a three-party partnership between the University, TJUFE and the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England & Wales (ICAEW). The proposal is that students study 4 years in TJUFE, take Advanced ICAEW exams soon after the end of their final year, and progress on to a professional version of the MAcc course at Glasgow, with Credit for Prior Learning based on the two Advanced ICAEW papers

6.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

- Welcomed delegates to a Knowledge Exchange and Impact Conference organized by our Research Strategy and Innovation Office (22 April)
On 1 May met in Edinburgh with the First Minister and then the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth

Chaired meetings with Pensions Regulator and USS Valuation Subgroup (7 May) and chaired a USS Group meeting on 23 May

Attended CASE Europe Board of Trustees Meeting, Zurich (8-9 May)

Welcomed delegates to the Launch of the Scottish Network of Combustion and Gasification Engineering (12 May)

Attended the Universities Scotland Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee meeting (Stirling, 13 May)

Chaired Glasgow Leadership Higher & Further Education Workstream (22 May)

Attended the GCMB Board meeting on 27 May

Attended Universities Scotland Main Committee meeting (3 June)

Attended SFC Liaison meeting (3 June)

Welcomed delegates to the International Lymphoedema Framework Conference (5 June)

Welcomed delegates to the Scottish Student Sport Conference, announcing new funding on behalf of SFC (10 June)

Attended House of Commons reception hosted by EPSRC who were presenting Professor Lee Cronin with a RISE (Rising stars In Science and Engineering) leader award (10 June).

Attended the National Centre for Universities & Business (NCUB) Board Meeting in London (11 June)

Due to meet with Councillor Gordon Matheson, Leader of Glasgow City Council, for an update meeting on 16 June

Hosting a CASE Europe dinner for Scottish Schools Leaders in Fundraising on 18 June

6.4. Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

Interviewed for Director of Institute of Molecular Cell & Systems Biology (2 June), for the VP and Head of College Science & Engineering (3 June) and Professorial interviews for the School of Geographical & Earth Sciences (6 June)

Attended and chaired the opening of the Wolfson Wohl Cancer Research Centre (1 May)

20 May, introduced the first in the series of 4 Gifford lectures delivered by Prof. Jean-Luc Marion. Hosted a dinner in the Lodging to mark the start of the series

Attended the annual, University of Glasgow/University of Edinburgh Boat Race (24 May)

Attended and gave the welcome and introduction to Professor Paul Younger’s inaugural lecture to the Rankine Chair of Engineering (21 May)
• Hosted a new staff reception for University Services (28 May)

• Opened the Italian Studies workshop: Society, Culture and conflict in 20th – century Italy: current research in the UK

• Hosted a reception for donors in the Lodging prior to the Concert in the Chapel by the group Black Voices, and associated with the Commonwealth games (6 June)

• Attended Alumni events in London on 11th June at the Haberdasher’s Hall for over 200 alumni and friends and on 12th for dinner at the University of Glasgow’s London Women’s club Annual dinner. I was also able to meet a number of London based alumni and donors individually over the three days of my trip

• The second all staff Campus Conversation will be held on 17 June and will include discussion regarding the development of our University Strategy, the Campus development, and the Staff Survey

• Commemoration Day (18 June)

• Hosting a Trust and Foundations Briefing meeting in the Lodging (19 June)

• Annual Awards Reception for major Grant winners (23 June)

7. Senior Management Group business

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

**SMG Meeting of April 2014**

• Estates Strategy Update
• Partnership Review Procedure for Validated Institutions
• Complaints Report
• RUK Fees
• Update on the Deloitte work
• Update Admissions Report
• Communications Report

**SMG Meeting of May 2014**

• Budget and Capital Plan
• Impact of Lower Revenue Budget 2014 to 2019
• Next Steps – Estates Strategy
• Central Heating Plant proposal
• Marketing Strategy Group
• Staff Survey update report
• New Financial Reporting
• Update report on GIC
SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Socially Responsible Investment Policy – Fossil Fuel investment

At the February meeting, Court approved the setting up of a group to consider representations submitted from the University Climate Action Society (via the SRC) for the University to divest from fossil fuel industry companies in accordance with the University’s Policy on Socially Responsible Investment.

The working group involved two lay members of Court (Graeme Bissett and Murdoch MacLennan), one Senate assessor (Marie Freel), one SRC representative on Court (Donald Mackay) and the Secretary of Court.

The group met on 16 May to consider the document provided by the Climate Action Society and to hear representations from four of its members. Since then, the group has contacted the Investment Advisory Committee for its views on potential disinvestment in fossil fuel extractors (oil/gas/coal extraction), which is the area which the CAS members who attended the meeting clarified was the focus of the campaign.

Annex 1 contains the report of the group’s meeting on 16 May, which Court is asked to note. The group will receive the views of the Investment Advisory Committee before Court meets, and I will update Court on what the group would like to recommend in the light of that advice.

A.2 SRC Motion on Conflict Free Campus (‘Conflict minerals’)

The Students’ Representative Council has supported a motion relating to the Conflict Free Campus Initiative, by calling on the University to make the reduction of the use of conflict minerals a priority in its procurement policy. Further details including details of the resolutions agreed are at Annex 2.

While this issue does not come within the scope of Court’s Socially Responsible Investment Policy, it has some similarities, and Court may like to ask a working group to consider the matter and report to the next meeting of Court. If so, it would be important for the group to have professional advice on procurement. Would Court be content to establish a working group to consider this matter, comprising: two lay members, one Senate Assessor, one SRC representative, the Secretary of Court and the Head of Procurement?
A.3 Code of Practice for Student Bodies

Following the review of the GUU undertaken in the summer of 2013, it was agreed that the Code of Practice for student bodies would be revised to include a requirement for the student bodies to be compliant with current legislation. The University Court is required to keep under revision the Code of Practice for student bodies, therefore the opportunity has also been taken to update the Code (including removing references to bodies no longer in existence) and correct for typographical errors. In addition, the Code has been updated to delete the somewhat cumbersome referral to the University Court in the case of appeals following complaints to the student bodies and those unfairly disadvantaged by opting out of the SRC; instead, referral is made to the University Complaints Procedure introduced in the summer of last year.

Court is asked to approve the revised Code of Practice, which has been drawn up in consultation with the student bodies.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Ordinance on Court composition

Following the 2 May EGM of Court, Ordinance 206 on Court’s composition has been submitted to the Privy Council. We will not have heard the outcome by the time of the June Court meeting, therefore Court members will be kept updated over the summer. In view of the advice we have received from the Scottish Government and the Privy Council, we do firmly expect that the matter will be considered by the Privy Council at its meeting in July, and therefore in time for the Ordinance, should it be approved, to have effect from 1 August 2014 as Court has requested.

I advised Court members by email that, after Court Office submitted the draft Ordinance to the Privy Council on 8 May, the Privy Council received two representations, to which it sought a response from the University. One was from the Convenor of the General Council Business Committee (GCBC) on behalf of the Committee; the other from the Convenor of the GCBC again, this time writing on behalf of himself and 9 other members of the GCBC.

The first of these two submissions simply advised of GCBC's opposition to the draft ordinance and asked that the Privy Council take this into account. Court Office responded to this by noting that all the points of concern raised by the GCBC had been considered by Court's Governance working group and then by Court itself, as evidenced in the paperwork that had already been sent to the Privy Council. The second submission was rather longer, including some matters that had already been raised by the GCBC and some others that had not. A response to this submission was drafted by the Convenor of Court and was then agreed with David Newall and Duncan Ross before being sent to the Privy Council.

Finally, I have received an email from the Convenor of the GCBC in which he: suggests that Court’s working group did not have adequate time when it met to consider fully the issues raised by the GCBC; suggests that the working group’s report is misleading in that it does not identify the fact that certain working group members were among those expressing the minority view at the GCBC; asks to receive correspondence between myself and the University’s legal advisers; and queries why
the word ‘unanimous’ has been inserted in the minute of the Court meeting on 2 May. The Convenor of the GCBC has asked for these issues to be raised formally with Court.

Unless Court advises otherwise, I will draft a reply to this correspondence, and share it for comment with the members of the Governance working group.

B.2 **RUK Fees**

At the 2 May meeting, Court approved a number of recommended changes to the University’s pricing and support packages for RUK students for 2015/16.

There were 2 points on which Court agreed that further consideration was required:

1. the matter of RUK students who spend just three years at the University, and whether they should benefit from a discount;

2. the specific circumstances of Modern Languages students who are required to study a compulsory year abroad as part of their degree programme.

Advice is that the University should not offer a discount to the small number of RUK students who spend just three years at Glasgow. Regarding year-abroad language students, it is proposed that they be charged a fee equivalent to 15% of the annual fee in relation the study-abroad year. In view of the complexity of this latter issue, the arrangements will be kept under close review.

B.3 **Court Strategy Day/Campus Estates Strategy Court working group**

A Court strategy day will be held on 30 September, with part of its focus on the Campus Estates Strategy, and also on the recent Staff Attitude Survey. Further details will be sent nearer the time.

Ahead of 30 September, a Court working group will be meeting over the summer to provide input on Court’s behalf into the ongoing development of the Campus Estates Strategy, and to liaise with SMG in this area.

B.4 **Nominations Committee Business**

(i) Court and Court committee vacancies

Depending on the outcome of the Privy Council’s decision on Ordinance 206, recruitment will take place if applicable over the summer for Co-opted positions arising from the posts vacated by Miles Padgett, Alan Macfarlane and Kevin Sweeney. Court will be kept informed. The Nominations Committee would oversee this process and make recommendations to Court.

Nominations Committee will be mindful that there will be a vacancy on the Audit Committee arising from Kevin Sweeney’s departure from Court, and a vacancy on the HR Committee arising from Alan Macfarlane’s departure from Court.

There is also a vacancy on the HR Committee arising from a non-Court lay member, Stephen McCafferty, having demitted office. Nominations Committee will make a recommendation to Court in relation to a replacement.

There remains a vacant external position on the Remuneration Committee.
Once new members of Court are in post, 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.

(ii) Audit Committee membership
Jo Elliot, a current external member of the Audit Committee, will continue for two years from 1 August 2014 following the end of his first 4-year term of office.

B.5 Employee Representative on Court
Margaret Anne McParland has been reappointed as Employee Representative on Court and will serve a 4-year term from 1 August 2014.

B.6 Appointments of Heads of Research Institute and School
College of MVLS
Institute of Molecular, Cell and Systems Biology
Professor Neil Bulleid has been appointed as Head of the Institute of Molecular, Cell and Systems Biology from 1 January 2015 for 5 years, succeeding Professor Richard Cogdell.

College of Arts
School of Humanities
Dr Jeremy Huggett has been appointed as Head of the School of Humanities from 1 August 2014, for 2 years in the first instance, succeeding Professor Roibeard O’Maolalaigh.

School of Culture and Creative Arts
Professor Dimitris Eleftheriotis has been appointed as Head of the School of Culture and Creative Arts from 1 August 2014, for 4 years, succeeding Professor Nick Pearce.

B.7 SRC Elections
The following candidates were successful in the Spring 2014 SRC elections and will take up sabbatical officer posts on 1st July 2014:

- President: Breffni O’Connor
- VP Education: Cal Davies
- VP Student Support: Liam King
- VP Student Activities: Gin Masiulyte

B.8 Student Unions – Constitutional Changes
As agreed at the meeting of Court on 16 April, I have approved changes to the constitution of the GUU, as endorsed by the GUU Management Board on 9 May. In
addition, on Court’s behalf, I have approved changes to the constitution of the Queen Margaret Union. These are minor in nature, except in respect of Equality & Diversity, where the Union’s commitments are now set out much more fully than before.
Court group convened under Socially Responsible Investment Policy  
16 May 2014 2pm in the Principal’s Meeting Room

Present: Graeme Bissett, Marie Freel, Donald Mackay, Murdoch MacLennan,  
David Newall, Deborah Maddern

A request had been made via a petition co-ordinated by the GU Climate Action Society, for  
the University to cease investing in fossil fuel companies.

The group heard that the University’s endowment funds were managed by 2 brokers.  
Funds were invested to provide a return for staff and student activities.

The group met with 4 representatives of the Climate Action Society (CAS). The  
representatives explained that they understood the University’s financial responsibilities to  
the institution, but considered that a moral responsibility was not being upheld. In  
response to a suggestion from the Court group that the University also had a moral  
responsibility to provide scholarships and other support from the endowment funds, the CAS  
replied that investment in fossil fuels was not risk free and was not an essential  
long-term investment: no losses had been reported in studies of funds where such  
investment was not made - the funds did just as well over a 2 year period. It was also  
pointed out that Glasgow alumni might be keener to donate to the University if it  
disinvested in fossil fuels.

The CAS was asked where the line would be drawn, for example would ‘downstream’  
organisations such a chemical companies also be targeted for disinvestment. The CAS  
confirmed it was looking at oil and gas only. The Court group commented that the list if  
organisations that had been supplied as part of the petition also included distributors. The CAS  
confirmed that only extractors would be the priority.

The Court group commented that lobbying the government was an option, with the aim of  
financial regimes inducing a change of direction by oil and gas companies, although it  
noted that this was a balancing act given that costs might be passed on to consumers. The CAS  
considered that a number of costs associated with health problems and pollution  
were not picked up by the companies presently. The CAS was also asking for a social  
movement in favour of disinvestment, which was why the University was being  
approached.

The CAS was asked about the potential impact on developing countries, who might suffer  
if there was pressure to reduce use of fossil fuels. The CAS responded that such  
countries were being adversely affected by climate change caused by overuse of fossil  
fuels by developed countries, for example by hurricanes. These countries were also  
interested in greener technologies; some had asked for assistance in developing these. They were open to these renewable technologies, which might be on a smaller scale, that  
would suit them.

The CAS reiterated statistics in the paper that had been circulated, referring to a 2 degree  
target and the fact that current usage (burning of fossil fuels) would not achieve this. CAS  
considered that the science was widely agreed worldwide, but the world was not acting.  
Carbon capture, a possible remedial action, had not started early enough.
It was noted that the NUS had endorsed the campaign in the current week. Other universities were also looking into the matter. A US university had pledged to disinvest.

With regard to the 5 year timescale proposed to the University of Glasgow to disinvest, the CAS explained that this was being proposed as a reasonable timescale. The CAS was not being prescriptive about what the University might invest in instead of fossil fuels: the CAS want the best return for the University and does not want it to suffer financial hardship. In response to a suggestion about a possible longer timescale, perhaps 15 years to align with the emergence of green technologies, and to acknowledge that medical and scientific developments need the input of the fossil fuel industry, the CAS view was that the world was running out of time and could not keep pushing back timescales. The CAS mentioned that Norway was stepping back from the fossil fuel industry in some measure.

The CAS explained that the list of companies had been provided by the parent organization, and contained distributors as well as extractors of fuels. The CAS would revert to DN on this matter.

The CAS explained that, in summary, the University owed it to current and future students and staff to disinvest in fossil fuel companies.

The CAS was thanked for presenting its case and for the quality of the content.

**Points and actions agreed by Court group:**

- Agreed that the case had been excellently presented by the CAS, which was to be commended.
- Agreed that the Investment Advisory Committee would be consulted for its views on divestment and the effect that this might have on the health of the funds. This view to include any comments about possible timescales.
- Agreed that University services dealing with funding (grant/donations) would be contacted to establish current levels of funding from the fossil fuel industry. Noted that disinvestment might be of benefit in terms of income and marketing.
- Agreed on the basis of general but not expert knowledge of the subject-matter, that the balance of evidence supports the concerns expressed by CAS about climate change and the linkage to fossil fuels.
- Recognised that the scale of the University’s investment in the major Oil & Gas companies, although significant to our portfolio, meant that any divestment would exert very limited financial pressure on the investee companies, so that action of that type would be symbolic.
- Agreed that such action could nonetheless have important symbolic impact in the general debate.
- Agreed that subject to understanding the wider implications of the further information being sought, that progressive divestment over a relatively long period could demonstrate a long-term intent in tune with wider efforts to displace fossil fuel based energy sources with greener alternatives.
- Agree that fund managers could as part of this strategy be encouraged to identify green energy investments which would continue to fulfil the University’s fiduciary obligations.
SRC Motion on Conflict Free Campus

This motion calls the Students’ Representative Council to support the Conflict Free Campus Initiative by calling on the University to make the reduction of the use of conflict minerals a priority in its investment and procurement policy.

The SRC notes:

That the University has declared its commitment to socially responsible investment through its Socially Responsible Investment Policy; and

That the University has acknowledged through its Environmental Purchasing Policy the need to take account of sustainable, ethical and social considerations in the purchase of goods; and

That in the Sustainable Development Policy it states that the University ‘is concerned about the effects of its decisions and actions on the quality of life, the economy and world poverty, as well as the environment and natural resources’ and that sustainable development be ‘integrated into all aspects of University planning and activities’; and

That the European Parliament and UK Parliamentary Select Committees have determined that armed groups bear responsibility for atrocities in the eastern Congo, a situation that is facilitated in part by the unregulated trade for minerals mined in areas of conflict;¹ ² and

That on the 28th March 2014 the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) was extended by the Security Council for another year in recognition of the ongoing humanitarian crisis in the DRC as a result of the abuses of human rights and violations on international law by armed groups operating in the region³; and

That the International Rescue Committee has found more than 5.4 million civilians have been killed since 1998 and countless more remain at risk as a consequence of attacks conducted by armed groups in eastern Congo;⁴ and

That armed groups generate an estimated $144 million each year by trading in conflict minerals;⁵ and

That in the United States recent legislation signed into law (The Dodd Frank Act) requires that companies submit an annual report to the Securities and Exchange Commission disclosing whether their products contain gold, tin, tantalum, or tungsten.

² http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmsctech/726/72607.htm
⁴ http://www.rescue.org/special-reports/special-report-congo-y
⁵ http://www.jww.org/conflicareas/congo/overview/conflict-minerals
from the Congo or nearby areas;\(^6\) and

That the European Commission has drafted European legislation on supply chain due diligence for tin, tungsten, and tantalum and their ores, as well as gold originating in conflict-affected and high-risk areas\(^7\); and

That the House of Commons Science and Technology Select Committee has endorsed the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative and the International Council on Mining and Metals, and has invited the UK Government to evaluate whether similar legislation to the Dodd Frank Act be introduced in the UK to improve the social impact of mining in conflict areas\(^8\); and

*That the University has procured electronic goods from companies whose products are not certified ‘conflict-free’ and therefore conflict minerals can be found in such goods procured by the University.*

**The SRC believes**

That unregulated conflict mineral extraction violates human rights, as well as being one of the biggest contributors to the continuation of the conflict in the Congo.

That given the humanitarian cost of conflict mineral extraction the University should aim to reduce its use of conflict minerals.

That, although there are few certified ‘conflict-free’ products available on the market, some companies have been noted to have stronger records of due diligence and transparency on this issue than others.

That ethical procurement represents an important component of ethical investment, to which the University has committed itself.

That by taking part in the Conflict Free Campus Initiative, the University of Glasgow would be the biggest university in the UK and Europe to do so, and would be in the company of the 52 American and Canadian institutions of higher learning that have made ‘conflict free’ pledges.

That, given the draft legislation proposed by the European Commission to the European Parliament on the 5\(^{th}\) March 2014, legislation enforcing transparency and accountability on this issue similar to that seen in the United States would appear to be forthcoming. As such, the University would be seizing the agenda by partaking in this initiative.

\(^6\)http://banking.senate.gov/public/_files/070110_Dodd_Frank_Wall_Street_Reform_comprehensive_summary_Final.pdf

\(^7\)http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/march/tradoc_152227.pdf

\(^8\)http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmsctech/726/72607.htm
**Resolve:**

To call for the University to give priority to companies who implement due diligence when sourcing their minerals – tin, tungsten, tantalum, and gold – from the Democratic Republic of Congo, when considering vendors for future electronic product purchases.

To call for the University to express and foster a strong commitment to purchasing products that have been certified as ‘conflict free’, upon considering the future procurement of electronic devices, once commercially available.

To call for the University to express a strong commitment to purchasing electronic products from companies that respect and promote human rights throughout the products’ lifecycle including the mineral extraction and trading phases.

To call for the University to issue formal letters of inquiry to contracted electronics suppliers on the status of company efforts to address mineral supply chain transparency and accountability.

Attempts to address these issues of transparency and accountability should pay heed to these guidelines, developed by the University of Pennsylvania Conflict-Free Campus Initiative, instructing companies to:

1. Strengthen company management systems (including establishing and distributing a supply chain policy);
2. Identify and assess risks in the supply chain;
3. Design and implement a strategy to respond to identified risks;
4. Ensure independent third-party audits of supply chain due diligence at identified points in the supply chain;
5. Disclose publicly supply chain due diligence and findings.

If these approaches fail to bring change in a reasonable amount of time, the University should give purchasing preference to compliant companies as well as consider not renewing contracts and divesting from non-compliant ones.

To mandate the Students’ Association to do all of the above in their sourcing of electronics.

**Proposed by Glasgow University Amnesty International**

Supported by:
Amnesty International UK
St. Andrews Coalition for a Conflict Free Campus
Enough Project
STAND
Court – Wednesday 25 June 2014

Report from the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on

28 May 2014

Cover Sheet

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

Action Requested

A Items – for action

CA/2013/66. Budget 2014-15 and Four Year Forecast

Finance Committee received the proposed budget for 2014-15 and financial forecasts to 2017-18. The 2014-15 budget outlined a management accounting surplus of £5.7m equating to a statutory accounting surplus of £4.8m.

The budgetary forecast predicted management accounting surpluses of £3.1m, £10.1m and £13.2m in 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 respectively. This equates to statutory accounting surpluses of £2.2m, £9.2m and £12.3m in the same three-year period.

Finance Committee expressed concern around the levels of operating surpluses forecast. Of particular concern was the need to generate sufficient operating surpluses to finance investment in the Campus Estates Strategy. In recent years, the University’s operating surpluses had been approximately £10m, or 2% of turnover. In future years, as well as sustaining this annual surplus, there might be a need to generate an additional £6m or so per annum in order to service borrowing.

In the light of these points, Finance Committee asked that, before it agreed on the advice it would provide Court on the budget and financial forecasts, some further information should be provided, as follows.

- An introduction setting out at a high level how proposed investments will drive progress against the University’s strategic objectives;
- A sensitivity analysis for the next 2-3 years including upside and downside risks and demonstrating how potential downsides can be mitigated and contained where necessary;
- Information/analysis on the ‘bottom up’ growth planned in fee income (RUK and international) by Colleges to demonstrate the realism of projected income growth;
• An introduction to the capital plan which stresses that priorities may be adjusted in the light of the estates strategy, and that all capital projects will be built into a cash-flow projection when the estates strategy is considered in October.

Following consideration of this additional information, Finance Committee agreed to recommend the budget and forecasts to Court.

CA/2013/74. Capital Plan

The Senior Vice Principal presented the Capital Plan to Finance Committee. The Committee noted that the capital plan was flexible and responsive and would be impacted significantly by the new Estates Strategy expected in October 2014. The Capital Plan forecast £230.7m of capital and revenue spending on estates development projects through to 2017-18 and an additional £87.6m on estates operations costs.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend the Capital Plan to Court.

B Items – for noting


The Committee received a presentation on the mandatory changes to Financial Reporting Standards which would be introduced from 2015-16.

Finance Committee approved the recommendations set out in the presentation.

CA/2013/68. CHP project

Finance Committee received a paper setting out options for building and operating the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit, evaluating the choice between building and operating the unit within the University or creating a new subsidiary company.

Finance Committee accepted the recommendations in the paper with regard to the final structure and the required funding method, namely that the CHP system should be purchased (through equity investment from the University) and operated by a subsidiary company.

Finance Committee agreed that the CHP Project Board should explore the opportunity to apply for an interest free loan from Salix to assist with the cost of the CHP engine and, if deemed to be appropriate, engage with Salix for the funding available.

CA/2013/69. Library Level 3 Improvement Works: Capex Application

Finance Committee received a request for £2.66m of investment to continue the environmental improvement works in the main library. The next phase of works would focus on level 2 and 3 of the main library building and would provide much needed additional networked study spaces to address the increase in student numbers both at undergraduate and postgraduate level.

Finance Committee approved the application.
CA/2013/70. Wind Tunnel, Acre Road: Capex Application
Finance Committee received an application for £250k of funding towards new infrastructure supporting a series of future developments in aerodynamic technologies. The Committee noted that this work was a vital component of the Acre Road Wind Tunnel facility upgrade project where £1.644m of external funding from EPSRC has been obtained.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2013/71. Tay House Refurbishment: Capex Application
The Committee received a capital expenditure application for £0.7m to fit out a suite of offices at Tay House in the city centre to accommodate c.220 members of staff working in non-student facing services. The Committee noted the pressing need to release space on the Gilmorehill campus.

Finance Committee approved the application, on the basis that options for cost reduction would be explored and reported back to the Committee.

CA/2013/72. Phase II Imaging, South Glasgow Hospitals: Capex Application
Finance Committee received a request to underwrite a potential funding gap of £1.2m relating to the development of Phase II Imaging at the South Glasgow Hospitals campus. The Committee noted the range of potential investments proposed and that the final extent of the investment would be determined by the external funding committed to the project. £1.2m was the current extent of the funding gap on the baseline project.

The Committee agreed to underwrite the £1.2m funding gap.

CA/2013/73. Additional Teaching Space: Capex Application
Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application for £673k of investment to increase availability of large teaching venues in order to relieve space pressure on campus. The Committee noted the proposals to improve the flexibility of the Bute Hall and GUU Dining Room to accommodate teaching, and to upgrade AV facilities in the GUU Debating Chamber and Hunter Halls.

The Committee approved the application.

CA/2013/77. Overview of Performance at 30 April 2014
Finance Committee noted that the Period 9 results were £15.3m ahead of budget at £25.3m. The full year outlook at period 9 was £13.3m, £9.3m higher than budget. The main movements in Period 9 outlook include salaries £0.2m lower than Period 8, consumables £0.6m lower than P8, an increase of £0.5m in research contribution and an increase of £0.3m in commercial income.

The projected full year outlook variances against budget include a £3.4 under spend on salaries and £3.7m higher than budget spend on consumables, including £2.5m in Residences and Hospitality which is offset by increased income. The full year outlook
projects tuition fee income to be £4.4m higher than budget and research income to be £0.3m higher than budget.

**CA/2013/78. Debtors Report at 30 April 2014**

Overall debt levels had increased year on year to £31.25m at April 2014 (£28m at April 2013).

Finance Committee noted that the overall increase was largely due to higher levels of outstanding commercial debt, which stood at £19.73m, an increase from £16.6m at April 2013. This was primarily due to timing of billing, with most of the increase being current. The ageing of outstanding commercial debt had reduced, with debtor days at 39.

Student and sponsor debt levels were lower in April 2014 in comparison to April 2013 with £6m outstanding against students and £1.66m against sponsors. Within the sponsor debt, the top ten balances represent 57% of total sponsor balances outstanding.

Following a request at the previous meeting, the Committee received a brief analysis of aged (90 days+) Vet debt which stood at £0.28m. £0.22m of this total was insured, and of the remaining £61k, £54k was with collection agencies. Approximately £30k of the outstanding balances were over a year old.
Present:
Mr Graeme Bissett, Mr Ken Brown (Convener), Mr Robert Fraser, Ms Jessica McGrellis, Prof Anton Muscatelli, 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 Margaret Morton, Mr Kevin Sweeney

CA/2013/62. Farewell
The Convenor thanked Professor Miles Padgett, Ms Jessica McGrellis and Mr Kevin Sweeney for their contribution to the Committee. Prof Padgett was no longer a member of the Committee as he had stepped down from his role as a Senate Assessor in preparation for taking up the post of Vice Principal in August 2014. Ms McGrellis was stepping down from her tenure as SRC President. Mr Sweeney was stepping down as Convenor of Audit Committee.

CA/2013/63. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 26 March 2014
The minutes of Finance Committee held on 26 March 2014 were approved.

CA/2013/64. Conflicts of Interest
No conflicts of interest were noted.

CA/2013/65. Matters Arising

CA/2013/42. Stevenson Building extension
Finance Committee noted that tenders had been considered by the sub-group of Estates and Finance Committees which had been granted delegated authority to take forward the Stevenson Building project. Although the tenders were higher than hoped, the group had approved the appointment of a contractor and approved additional expenditure on the project. Work was due to start within a few weeks with a completion date of September 2015.

CA/2013/54. Annual TRAC Return for 2012/13
The Group Financial Controller shared a report on TRAC Benchmarking for 2012/13 noting that, when compared to the Russell Group average, the University was largely in line with the benchmarks. The Committee welcomed the report.
CA/2013/57. Bank Tender

The Director of Finance noted that banking tenders had still to be received.

CA/2013/66. Budget 2014-15 and Four Year Forecast (paper 5.1)

Finance Committee received the proposed budget for 2014-15 and financial forecasts to 2017-18. The 2014-15 budget outlined a management accounting surplus of £5.7m equating to a statutory accounting surplus of £4.8m.

The budgetary forecast predicted management accounting surpluses of £3.1m, £10.1m and £13.2m in 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 respectively. This equates to statutory accounting surpluses of £2.2m, £9.2m and £12.3m in the same three-year period.

The budget and financial forecasts were based on a number of assumptions and risks. Finance Committee noted that salary inflation costs were projected at 2% for 2014-15 and 2.5% for each subsequent year. Rising pension costs in both UGPS and USS were also a factor in reducing surpluses. In order to achieve the projected surpluses, tuition fee income from overseas students was expected to increase incrementally to £94.9m per annum (2017-18) from £60.6m in 2013-14.

Finance Committee expressed concern around the levels of operating surpluses forecast. Of particular concern was the need to generate sufficient operating surpluses to finance investment in the Campus Estates Strategy. In recent years, the University’s operating surpluses had been approximately £10m, or 2% of turnover. In future years, as well as sustaining this annual surplus, there might be a need to generate an additional £6m or so per annum in order to service borrowing. Finance Committee was concerned that the required levels of surplus were therefore not being budgeted, and yet that the forecasts included an ambitious (c.20%) increase in international student numbers.

Set against these concerns, it was reported that the University had budgeted conservatively in recent years, and that annual outturns had consistently exceeded the budgeted surplus. In addition, it was explained that forecasts of student numbers had been built bottom-up, and reflected realistic plans for expansion.

In the light of these points, Finance Committee asked that, before it agreed on the advice it would provide Court on the budget and financial forecasts, some further information should be provided, as follows:

- An introduction setting out at a high level how proposed investments will drive progress against the University’s strategic objectives;
- A sensitivity analysis for the next 2-3 years including upside and downside risks and demonstrating how potential downsides can be mitigated and contained where necessary;
- Information/analysis on the ‘bottom up’ growth planned in fee income (RUK and international) by Colleges to demonstrate the realism of projected income growth;
- An introduction to the capital plan which stresses that priorities may be adjusted in the light of the estates strategy, and that all capital projects will be built into a cash-flow projection when the estates strategy is considered in October.

The Senior Vice Principal would circulate a revised paper to Finance Committee, and the members of the Committee would respond in advance of the next meeting of Court.
CA/2013/67. Changes to Financial Reporting Standards / FE HE SORP (paper 5.2)

The Committee received a presentation on the mandatory changes to Financial Reporting Standards which would be introduced from 2015-16.

Finance Committee was asked to comment on the following:

- Recommendation that the University should adopt the performance model for recognising Government grants (both capital and revenue) under SORP;
- Recommendation that a one-off revaluation of fixed assets as at 31 July 2014 should be carried out and recognised in the first accounts;
- Recommendation that a review of the estimated remaining useful life of property should be carried out at the same time as the revaluation;
- Decision on ongoing policy of revaluation of fixed assets.

The Committee approved the first three recommendations and agreed that with regard to the revaluation of fixed assets a valuer would be engaged to begin the process and assist with decision-making as to the ongoing policy of revaluation.

Finance Committee noted that the USS recovery plan would require to be recognised on the balance sheet. In the past USS liabilities had not appeared on the balance sheet as it is a multi-employer scheme and assets/liabilities were not separately identified. A deficit recovery plan is currently under review by UUK and USS and when eventually agreed the University’s liability is expected to increase.

CA/2013/68. CHP project (paper 5.3)

Finance Committee received a paper setting out options for building and operating the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit, evaluating the choice between building and operating the unit within the University or creating a new subsidiary company. The Committee was reminded of the background: approval had been given to install a new Low Temperature Hot Water system (LTHW) and a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit on the Gilmorehill campus. This decision was taken in order to replace the 50-year-old district steam heating infrastructure which had become obsolete.

Finance Committee considered a proposal to create a new subsidiary company which would be registered for VAT under a separate VAT registration number. The Subco would then operate the CHP unit and the full amount of VAT could be recovered on the purchase of the CHP system.

Finance Committee accepted the recommendations in the paper with regard to the final structure and the required funding method, namely that the CHP system should be purchased (through equity investment from the University) and operated by a subsidiary company.

The Group Financial Controller provided a brief paper setting out an opportunity to apply for an interest free loan from Salix to assist with the cost of the CHP engine. The Committee noted that Salix was an independent, publicly funded company, set up to provide the public sector with loans for energy efficiency projects. Funding would be made available as an interest free loan to assist in achieving green objectives.

Finance Committee agreed that the CHP Project Board should explore the opportunity and, if deemed to be appropriate, engage with Salix for the funding available.
CA/2013/69. Library Level 3 Improvement Works: Capex Application (paper 5.4.1)

The Committee received a request for £2.66m of investment to continue the environmental improvement works in the main library. The next phase of works would focus on level 2 and 3 of the main library building and would provide much needed additional networked study spaces to address the increase in student numbers both at undergraduate and postgraduate level. Reconfiguration of Level 3, and temporary works to Level 2 (pending further developments that were planned for summer 2015) would increase the number of student reader places by 220 for session 2014-15.

Finance Committee approved the £2.66m capital expenditure request.

CA/2013/70. Wind Tunnel, Acre Road: Capex Application (paper 5.4.2)

Finance Committee received an application for £250k of funding towards new infrastructure supporting a series of future developments in aerodynamic technologies. The Committee noted that this work was a vital component of the Acre Road Wind Tunnel facility upgrade project where £1.644m of external funding from EPSRC has been obtained.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2013/71. Tay House Refurbishment: Capex Application (paper 5.4.3)

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for £0.7m to fit out a suite of offices at Tay House in the city centre to accommodate c.220 members of staff working in non-student facing services (HR, Planning and Business Intelligence, around half of Estates & Buildings and most of Finance Office). The Committee noted the pressing need to release space on the Gilmorehill campus. Finance Committee questioned the high cost associated with the commitment to provide car parking spaces in the city centre and the precedent this would set for the estate redevelopment.

Finance Committee approved the application, on the basis that options for cost reduction would be explored and reported back to the Committee.

CA/2013/72. Phase II Imaging, South Glasgow Hospitals: Capex Application (paper 5.4.4)

Finance Committee received a request to underwrite a potential funding gap of £1.2m relating to the development of Phase II Imaging at the South Glasgow Hospitals campus. The Committee noted the range of potential investments proposed and that the final extent of the investment would be determined by the external funding committed to the project. £1.2m was the current extent of the funding gap on the baseline project.

The Committee noted the actions being undertaken to close the gap, namely:

- Identification of savings on equipment spend through the competitive tendering process currently underway;
- Continued negotiation with NHS to utilise a share of substantial funding received from the Chief Scientist Office;
- External funding applications, in particular a bid for government infrastructure funding in partnership with Glasgow City Council.

The Committee agreed to underwrite the £1.2m funding gap.

CA/2013/73. Additional Teaching Space: Capex Application (paper 5.4.5)
Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application for £673k of investment to increase availability of large teaching venues in order to relieve space pressure on campus. The Committee noted the proposals to improve the flexibility of the Bute Hall and GUU Dining Room to accommodate undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, and to upgrade AV facilities in the GUU Debating Chamber and Hunter Halls.

The Committee approved the application.

CA/2013/74. Capital Plan (paper 5.5)

The Senior Vice Principal presented the Capital Plan to Finance Committee. The Committee noted that the capital plan was flexible and responsive and would be impacted significantly by the new Estates Strategy expected in October 2014. The Capital Plan forecast £230.7m of capital and revenue spending on estates development projects through to 2017-18 and an additional £87.6m on estates operations costs.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend the Capital Plan to Court, subject to an introduction being added to stress that priorities will be adjusted in the light of the Estates Strategy, and that all capital projects will be built into a cash-flow projection when the Estates Strategy is finalised in October.

CA/2013/75. Endowments Investment Reports (paper 6.1)

Finance Committee noted the endowment investment reports. The Committee agreed that a simplification and standardisation of format, showing trends, would be welcome in future reports.

CA/2013/76. Draft Minutes of Student Finance Sub-committee 19 March 2014 (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee received the minutes of Student Finance Sub-committee for information.

It was noted that GUSA reported a surplus of £9k (an improvement from an adjusted surplus of £4k in 2012-13), QMU returned a surplus of £29k (against a £20k forecast – an increase of £56k on the previous year’s £27k), the GUU reported an operating surplus of £70k (in comparison with a £12k prior year surplus) and the SRC reported a small operating surplus of £5k as against a £3k prior year deficit.

The Committee noted that in accordance with the revised Charity Statement of Recommended Practice, GUU had reported development funding and similarly funded capital assets in a different way. The Student Finance Sub-committee Convenor would meet separately with GUU to discuss the accounts.

Student Finance Sub-committee agreed to fund the following for 2014-15:

GUSA - £229,500
QMU - £234,090
GUU - £234,090
SRC - £558,054

CA/2013/77. Overview of Performance at 30 April 2014 (paper 7.1)

Finance Committee received an overview of performance in Period 9. Finance Committee noted that the Period 9 results were £15.3m ahead of budget at £25.3m. The full year outlook at period 9 was £13.3m, £9.3m higher than budget. The main movements in Period 9 outlook
include salaries £0.2m lower than Period 8, consumables £0.6m lower than P8, an increase of £0.5m in research contribution and an increase of £0.3m in commercial income.

The projected full year outlook variances against budget include a £3.4 under spend on salaries and £3.7m higher than budget spend on consumables, including £2.5m in Residences and Hospitality which is offset by increased income. The full year outlook projects tuition fee income to be £4.4m higher than budget and research income to be £0.3m higher than budget.

CA/2013/78. Debtors Report at 30 April 2014 (paper 7.2)

The Group Financial Controller provided an overview of debtors as at 30 April 2014. Overall debt levels had increased year on year to £31.25m at April 2014 (£28m at April 2013).

Finance Committee noted that the overall increase was largely due to higher levels of outstanding commercial debt, which stood at £19.73m, an increase from £16.6m at April 2013. This was primarily due to timing of billing, with most of the increase being current. The ageing of outstanding commercial debt had reduced, with debtor days at 39.

Student and sponsor debt levels were lower in April 2014 in comparison to April 2013 with £6m outstanding against students and £1.66m against sponsors. Within the sponsor debt, the top ten balances represent 57% of total sponsor balances outstanding.

Following a request at the previous meeting, the Committee received a brief analysis of aged (90 days+) Vet debt which stood at £0.28m. £0.22m of this total was insured, and of the remaining £61k, £54k was with collection agencies. Approximately £30k of the outstanding balances were over a year old.

CA/2013/79. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 17 September 2014, 2pm – Melville Room
Report from the Audit Committee

Brief description of the paper

The paper contains Audit Committee minutes from a meeting held on 20 May 2014, for information.

The Committee received: an update on the pensions schemes; reports on recent internal audits of House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) licences, Language Centre procedures, and contract management; details of a risk management workshop; update reports on actions against recommendations from prior internal audits; and a briefing on the external auditor’s approach to the University’s financial statements for the year ending 31 July 2014.

The Committee recorded its thanks to Kevin Sweeney, who was attending his final meeting, for his chairmanship of the Committee.

*Prepared by Deborah Maddern*

*16.6.14*
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Audit Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Tuesday 20 May 2014
in the Melville Room

Present:
Dr Paul Brady, Ms Heather Cousins, Mr Hamish Guthrie, Mr Jo Elliot, Mr Kevin Sweeney (Convener)

In attendance:
Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young), Mr Jim Bishop (Ernst & Young), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Mr Nick Holland (Group Financial Controller), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Ms Lindsey Paterson (PwC), Ms Lorna Stafford (PwC), Dr Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary) (DW)

Apologies: Mr Neil Menzies (NM), Mr Ian Looker (PwC)

AUDIT/2013/34. Introductions

Ms Heather Cousins was welcomed to the Committee.

AUDIT/2013/35. Minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2014

The minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2013/36. Matters Arising

1 Update on any investigations of fraud/impropriety

There were no cases to notify to the Committee.

2 Pension Schemes

The existing UGPS scheme had been continued for existing members, but closed to new entrants and a new Defined Contribution Scheme offered to new entrants from 1 April 2014. Discussions with respect to addressing the UGPS deficit were still ongoing, and were likely to involve a cash injection and payment of the balance over a period to be defined.

With regard to the USS deficit, Universities UK had responded collectively to the engagement paper issued by the USS Board, based on consultation meetings with universities and other USS employers. Following consideration of the UUK response, USS was engaging in a dialogue with the regulator, employers and UCU on the issues raised by the engagement paper. A valuation process would be done and a financial management plan put in place, which was likely to include an increase in the Employer’s contribution and a change to the benefits scheme.

The Committee would be kept updated on progress.

RF

3 Review of Consultancy Policy

The policy had been reviewed by SMG in 2012 and the group had recently decided to undertaken the next review in 2015. College heads would in the meantime receive regular reports on consultancy activity undertaken by staff, including financial levels.
.4 Expense claims analysis
A report had been provided. There was a low level of non-compliance and no significant problems had been found, with the small percentage of rejected claims having been resolved via, for example, provision of receipts which had earlier been omitted.

.5 Research Management System
The software for the system was being configured, with a view to implementation in the final quarter of 2014 and roll out across the University in March 2015. It was agreed that a briefing would be provided to the Committee at the pre-meeting in November 2014, to include an update on the management actions list arising from the audit.

RF

.6 Heritage Assets
An update on the GRASP survey of assets had been circulated to the Committee members since the last meeting, together with brief details on Special Collections and Archives. With regard to the Kelvin Hall project, the Committee agreed that optimal security measures related to the movement of items were vital. The Committee noted a comment provided in writing by NM that the governance of the matter was highly specialised, as was the knowledge to compile the Risk Register, such that the joint management of the collection should be responsible for the Register and the mitigating actions. The project manager for the Kelvin Hall move would be notified of the Committee’s views. DN/DM

AUDIT/2013/37. Internal Audit Update
Two reviews had been completed since the last Audit Committee, with a further audit outcome reported in part. Four areas were planned for review in the next quarter. No reports in the current quarter had been classified as critical or high risk.

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

House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) Licences
Overall, the audit had indicated a functioning HMO management system. No critical or high risk recommendations had been identified and the findings were in areas of the process which would benefit from a more formalised approach, relating to documenting the HMO management structure and process at the University; and to the contract between Glasgow Student Villages (GSV) and the University explicitly addressing the process Sanctuary Housing Association would take in ensuring that the residences it managed remained HMO compliant; this was to be approved via the joint board by end of 2014.

Language Centre Procedures
Overall, the audit had indicated that although the Language Centre was broadly adhering to the University’s policies and procedures, there was room for improvement to strengthen the control environment in relation to key financial processes, specifically cash handling, where segregation of duties was needed; and in relation to some HR activities.

It was agreed that RF would provide the next meeting with an update on the analysis of income relating to International English Language Testing. RF
**Contract Management (part 1)**

Overall, the audit on contract management arrangements within Estates and Buildings had identified some areas for improvement, but the auditors had been unable to complete sample testing on compliance with University policies and procedures, since some information had not been available. A second report would follow.

The review had highlighted one high risk finding to the effect that some situations arose whereby suppliers with an annual spend exceeding the threshold of £25,000 operated outside formal framework agreements and were not subject to the formal tendering/quotation process. This was because the individual amounts involved did not exceed procurement limits; however, no consideration was given to total expected expenditure over a forty eight month period, as required by University policy. There had also been a finding relating to the absence of a register for staff to record interests with external suppliers. The Committee expressed concern that compliance issues such as this one had been raised before in other areas. It was agreed that the matter would be discussed with Estates management in relation to that service in particular, and that a general reminder would be sent to staff in relation to hospitality and gifts requiring to be recorded.

**Risk Management**

A risk workshop had been held to refresh the University’s strategic risk register, at the SMG meeting on 23 April 2014. The format of the workshop had been revised from those held in previous years, with attendees requested to undertake some preparatory work in advance of the meeting, namely reviewing the existing strategic risk list to identify any risks that might no longer be relevant or lower priority, and any new risks to be considered for inclusion; and identifying the top two risks for their area of responsibility for discussion at the workshop, to assess whether they should be escalated to the strategic risk register.

The auditors had collated and circulated all responses received into one document prior to the workshop and had used this to focus discussions. The output of the workshop had been a revised list, consisting of 15 risks, which it was noted were largely the same as those previously identified. The next step, currently ongoing, was for SMG members to assess the impact and likelihood in order to prioritise the risks, and to update action plans.

The auditors would be facilitating College workshops in a similar format. These would be extended to cover the prioritisation process and agreement of actions and owners to address risks. It was noted that the areas of activity involved would be those for which the Colleges themselves were responsible.

It was agreed that the Committee would receive a briefing on the Campus Estates Strategy, in early 2015, with particular reference to Risk and involving if possible the chair of the Estates Committee and the Director of Estates & Buildings.

**AUDIT/2013/38. Implementation of Outstanding Priority 1 and 2 Recommendations**

**Finance Office**

Since the last meeting, 4 new audit actions had arisen, 1 action against audit reports had been completed, 7 had been partially implemented and 22 were being progressed, many of which would be addressed by the rollout of the new Research Management System, including the centralisation of accounts payable and the interface with Agresso; the latter was currently on hold given staffing requirements. It was agreed that an additional column would be added to the report in future, for items closed off.
Departments other than the Finance Office

Mr Newall referred to key points to note from audit reports, as follows:

Audit reports 2013/14

The report of the audit of risk management had identified 5 medium category findings with target implementation dates ranging from 30 April 2014 (one) to 31 January 2015 (two). The action to revise and update the risk management policy (target date 30 April 2014) had been partially implemented: the policy had been reviewed, taking account of the agreed points in the audit report, and a draft of the revised policy was currently with senior officers for comment. In addition, progress had been made in implementing the agreed actions on the annual risk workshop process with the SMG workshop having taken place on 23 April without the involvement of non-executive participants, as reported earlier in the meeting.

Audit reports 2012-13

Items not yet fully implemented were:

Scholarships Management

The Scholarships Management Audit had produced a total of fourteen recommendations, eight of which remained to be implemented. The report had recommended a fundamental review of scholarships policy and management, involving: consistent policy in the assessment and approval of scholarships; a central system of managing scholarships; improved communication of scholarship opportunities through the website; and improved management information, at strategic and operational level. Work to address these recommendations was being taken forward by the Director of RIO, in the context of a wider range of recommendations flowing from a recent review of student recruitment and marketing activity with the intention that the first phase of the work be complete in September 2014.

UK Bribery Act Compliance

There were four outstanding Priority 2 recommendations, each of which would be addressed by June 2014. These were: Introduction of on-line anti-bribery training; Requirement that international agents undertake that training; Update of the University’s financial regulations; and a Risk Workshop event to review risks in this area.

Audit Reports pre-2012/13

There were ten recommendations from older audits that were not yet fully implemented. Five of these (including two Priority 1s) would be addressed by rolling out a University-wide system of Business Continuity Planning. This had now been piloted with three schools, a common template had been developed, and each business unit had identified Business Continuity Coordinators. Two recommendations relating to the Staff Development audit awaited new functionality on the HR/Payroll system. Two relating to the Value for Money audit were being taken forward. The final recommendation related to Application Handling and involved development of a CRM enquiry management system.

AUDIT/2013/39. Audit Planning Report

External Audit’s approach for the year to 31 July 2014 involved measures that included understanding the business and financial statement risks facing the University and assessing their potential impact on the financial statements; undertaking discussion with senior management and the Audit Committee of the identified audit and accounting issues; assessing the internal procedures and control environment and tailoring the approach to design an effective and efficient audit strategy; reviewing developments in the Statement of Recommended Practice: Accounting for Further and
**Higher Education (SORP)** as well as any changes to accounting standards or auditing standards and their impact on the audit; and interaction with the Internal Auditors, discussing the work they had performed during the year.

The auditors would issue a report on the consolidated financial statements which stated whether, in the auditor’s opinion:

.1 the financial statements of the University gave a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the group and of the University as at 31 July 2014; and of the surplus of the University’s income, expenditure and cash flows for the year then ended and that they had been properly prepared in accordance with the *Statement of Recommended Practice: Accounting for Further and Higher Education*.

.2 the financial statements of the University and subsidiary entities, where relevant, had been prepared in accordance with the Companies Act 2006, the Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005 and regulation 8 of the Charities Accounts (Scotland) Regulations 2006;

.3 funds from the Scottish Funding Council, grants and income for specific purposes and from other restricted funds administered by the University had, in all material respects, been applied only for the purposes for which they were received; and

.4 income had, in all material respects, been applied in accordance with the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act 1992 and, where appropriate, with the Financial Memorandum with the Scottish Funding Council.

The key areas of emphasis would include: Pension obligations; Cash management; Accounting for research balances; Income recognition; Capital expenditure projects; Fraud risk and risk of management override; and Compliance with the *Statement of Recommended Practice / Accounting Policies*.

The University was also required to prepare a set of financial statements in accordance with US GAAP, audited in accordance with US Government Auditing Standards. The auditors were working with the University to meet these requirements and would integrate those additional procedures required with the UK GAAP auditing procedures.

The Committee approved the External Auditor’s proposed approach to the audit of the University's accounts.

With regard to the approach to the treatment of potential fraud, it was noted that mechanisms existed for the external auditors to be kept informed of any issues and that also the whistleblowing mechanism existed for staff to raise any concerns within the institution. The external auditors would also examine the overall control environment and areas such as journal entries, where non-standard processes were used. The internal auditors would be involved in investigations on a case by case basis if required, and would be alerted by University management in such circumstances. The relevant policy documents would be shared with the Committee at the next meeting, for discussion. These included the Research misconduct policy, about which the Committee already received an annual report. The report would be augmented to include details of any actions taken in relation to fraud management or whistleblowing.

With regard to the new HE/FE SORP it was noted that this was being examined in detail by Finance Office management, and the Committee would be kept informed on changes to current practice arising from it.

**AUDIT/2012/40. Any Other Business**

Kevin Sweeney was attending his last meeting. On behalf of the Committee, David Newall thanked him for his contributions to the work of the Committee and in particular for his work as chair, and wished him the best for the future.
Dr Paul Brady had been appointed as chair of the Audit Committee from 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2015, succeeding Kevin Sweeney.

**AUDIT/2012/41. Date of Next Meeting**

Monday 1 September 2014 at 2pm in the Melville Room.
Other meetings for the 2014/15 session:
Tuesday 4 November 2014 at 2pm
Wednesday 18 February 2015 at 2pm
Wednesday 20 May 2015 at 2pm
Venues TBC

Prepared by: Deborah Maddern, Clerk to Committee, deborah.maddern@glasgow.ac.uk
Court - Wednesday 25 June 2014

Report from the Estates Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Estates Committee held on 19 May 2014 are attached.

Action Requested of Court

Court is asked to:

Note the progress made on the Estates Strategy and its associated work streams (EC/2013/36.1 refers);

Note the annual update to the Capital Plan (EC/2013/36.3 refers);

Note and endorse Estates Committee’s approval of the lease terms and CapEx for: Tay House for the relocation of part of University Services (EC/2013/37.3.1 refers); and Olympia Building for the creation of a Social Sciences Hub (EC/2013/37.3.2 refers)

Note and endorse Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications in respect of: CP13/596 Bute Hall/Hunter Halls/GUU Debating Chamber and Dining Room in the sum of £673,834.00 (EC/2013/37.4.1 refers);

LM13/605 Library Environmental Improvement Works (Level 3) in the sum of £2.66m (EC2013/37.4.2 refers);

South Glasgow Hospital – Phase 2 Imaging underwriting funding gap risk of £1.2m in the event of a shortfall (EC/2013/37.4.3 refers); and

CP13/570 Supersonic Wind Tunnel in the sum of £0.25m (EC/2013/37.4.4 refers).

Note and endorse Estates Committee’s approval for the increase in budget from £13.383m to £15.345m to allow acceptance of the tender for the Stevenson/GUU project (EC2013/37.6 refers);

Lynn Duncan
Clerk to Estates Committee
2 June 2014
UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW  
Estates Committee  
Minute of the meeting held in the Estates and Buildings Conference Room on  
Monday 19 May 2014

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

In Attendance: Mrs N Cameron, Mrs L Duncan, Mr N Harris, Mr R Kilpatrick, Ms B O’Connor (SRC President Elect)

Apologies: No apologies received

EC/2013/33 Minute of the meeting held on 17 March 2014

The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2013/34 Matters Arising

EC/2013/34.1 Estates Strategy Progress Report (EC/2013/28.1 - Western Infirmary Transfer refers)

The Committee noted that work was continuing with the Health Board to finalise NHS relocation plans.

EC/2013/35 Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2013/36 Strategies and Performance

EC/2013/36.1 Estates Strategy Update

The Committee noted that Estates and Buildings required some additional time to conclude its work on the business priorities work stream. It noted the ongoing review of the University Strategy and the importance of ensuring that the conclusions of the Estates Strategy were aligned with this. The strategy would be structured to set out a vision and opportunities, business need and demand and delivery scenarios and must deliver on the vision already set for the University estate and provide a framework against which future investment decisions are made. The Committee noted and approved the draft structure for the strategy and the Director of Estates undertook to provide the Committee with further detail as this develops.

EC/2013/36.1.1 Court Workshop

The Committee noted the detailed feedback received from the Court Workshop held on 16 April 2014 (Paper 4.1 Appendix 2). The feedback had been analysed and three main areas of focus had been identified:

*Level of Investment/Affordability* - Based on current surpluses and income generation, Court could not support investment of more than £450m, or borrowing of more than £100m. In addition, whatever level of investment was agreed, Court would not be supportive of more than the original £450m spend would require a clear strategy for improved income generation, increased efficiencies and improved margins.

*Investment Priorities* - Prioritisation of investment should be driven by the direction of the University Strategy and outline business cases were required for each of these priorities. There should be focus on the items that achieve growth including student numbers and research income. Co-location must grow income, drive efficiency gains and cost reduction including improved utilisation of existing buildings.

*Key Risks* – Affordability; capability and capacity in the University to deliver change and deliver a programme of this size; disincentive to those parts of the University which do not have investment;
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uncontrolled costs to the University of interest rates, pensions etc.; alignment with the University Strategy; timing and scheduling; and market movement and associated cost increases.

The Committee agreed that the current process for development of project business cases be reviewed to ensure the future proposals were supported by identification of net income growth, improved surplus, efficiency gains and improved space utilisation.

Court recommended establishment of a working group to support the development of the Strategy. Draft terms of reference had been prepared and a meeting would be organised with the Principal and the Convenor of Court to discuss the remit and membership of the group.

EC/2013/36.1.2 Campus Development Framework (CDF)
The CDF sets out early thoughts on the shape and structure for the Campus. The Committee agreed that a general statement should be added to the document which outlined the general assumption that there would be a requirement for building demolitions as part of the overall framework. It was agreed that the document would remain on the agenda for each future meeting of the Committee.

EC/2013/36.1.3 Western Infirmary Site Development Programme
The Committee noted the draft development programme indicating delivery of some new buildings by 2019. It also noted the previous assumption that development of the site would begin at the south, with either demolition or re-visioning of the Phase 1 building. It noted however that if budgets for the next 10 years were limited this would require to be reviewed.

The Committee noted the estimated additional annual maintenance costs for existing buildings would be approximately £5m. It was agreed that early consideration be given to demolition of the maximum number of non-listed properties although it was noted that it would be unusual for the City Council to support demolition where there was no immediate opportunity for redevelopment. To proceed with such discussions with the City Council a clear statement of our future investment intentions and any interim opportunities for use of the land would be required. A plan for short term re-use of listed buildings will also be developed.

EC/2013/36.1.4 Space Principles
The Committee approved the previously circulated document setting out campus Space Principles.

EC/2013/36.1.5 Risk Register
The Committee noted the updated risk register.

The Committee noted that over the next three months Estates and Buildings would progress a number of key areas of work: appointment of infrastructure master planners; review and develop proposals Phase 1 building; develop proposals to maximise investment and income generation from the Estate; conclude submission of the CDF and commence discussions on demolitions; complete the utilisation model and develop targets for improved Campus efficiencies including review of space standards; develop the transfer plan for the Western Infirmary site; develop the Procurement and Funding Strategies; and conclude the drafting of the Estates Strategy.

A full update would be provided to the September 2014 meeting along with the first draft of the Estates Strategy.

EC/2013/36.2 Minute of Carbon Management Committee (24 April 2014)
The Committee noted that the CHP Project was currently out to tender and otherwise noted the remainder of the minute.

EC/2013/36.3 Capital Plan
The Committee noted and approved the Plan which was now an established part of the University’s budgeting process and formed part of the annual budget presented to Court in June 2014.
Projects within the plan were categorised as: Committed (C) - projects approved by Court, construction tenders accepted and either due to start or started on site; Authorised (A) - projects approved by Court with no construction tenders accepted; Not Yet Approved (N) - project yet to be approved but approval expected in 2014/15 with revenue and capital impact accounted for in the 2014/15 budget; or Future (F) - projects which could be approved in future years and require support via the Estates Strategy.

The Plan was based on a range of assumptions: the University can return surpluses in line with budget forecasts to be presented to Court in June 2014; SFC will provide £6.6m per year in capital funding for the period of the plan 80% (£5.3m) of which will be allocated to capital spend and 20% (£1.3m) to revenue; all projects attract the current VAT rate of 20%; No significant disposals proposed for 2014/15; and revenue spend for refurbishments and maintenance will be £15.5m, changed from the previous year where it was assumed that in 2014/15 and onward this would be at an average of £18.5m pa.

The Committee noted a total of £58.9m capital and revenue had been invested in the estate over the last 12 months for a range of major projects: Beatson Translational Research Centre; Virology Building; 2 floors at Glasgow Royal Infirmary (Surgery and Reproductive Medicine); South Glasgow Hospital (Clinical Research Facility); Joseph Black Building Laboratory Facilities (Liskamp); Gregory Building Teaching Facilities; Relocation of MRC Institute of Health; Office Accommodation at Innovo Building (Censis Project); additional large lecture theatre facilities on Gilmorehill (Hunter Halls, GUU Debating Chamber, Bute Hall and GUU Dining Room; annual refurbishment programme of teaching laboratories and lecture theatres; and a large number of relocation projects.

The Committee noted the projects which were approved and due for completion within the next two years: Glass Building and Garscube environmental improvements - on site Summer 2014/completion due Summer 2015; Stevenson/GUU extension - tenders received, due on site Summer 2014/completion due Autumn 2015; Kelvin Hall Phase 1 - Tender receipts due end of May 2014 with start on site August 2014/completion May 2016; Teaching and Learning Facility South Glasgow Hospital; Combined Heat and Power (CHP) – out to tender with work scheduled to Commence Summer 2014; and University Tower Conservation works.

It was also noted that there were a number of projects which required approval at the same time as approval was being sought for the Capital Plan itself. The Committee would request that Court approve these projects at its June 2014 meeting: Imaging Phase 2; additional office facilities University Services; Data Centre co-location; Library improvements (levels 2 and 3, entrance and circulation spaces and catering facilities).

The Committee noted that whilst historically the University Estate was predominantly freehold, during the last 12 months this has shifted and a number of key leases had been agreed: MRC Institute of Health relocation to 200 Renfield Street; Censis Innovation Centre relocation to Innovo building. The Committee noted this shift would reduce capital expenditure but would result in additional pressure on the revenue budget.

It was proposed that in 2014/15 a further 44,000 sq. ft. of leased accommodation be acquired: Tay House for University Services and the Olympia Building for the East End project in additional to a review of potential for leasehold teaching space at Dumfries.

A major focus of 2014/15 would be Campus Master Planning and development of proposals for the Western Infirmary site. Integral to the development of the Estates Strategy were a number of projects which would be briefed and developed to “shovel ready” stage to support grant bids. A range of major projects would also be brought forward during the forthcoming year including: co-location of SPS into the Gilbert Scott Building; provision of additional office facilities for the Business School; potential new data centre; detailed proposals for refurbishment of the Joseph Black Building; potential refurbishment of parts of the West Medical Building; and transfer of the Western Infirmary Site to the University.

The Committee noted the current Capital Plan and level of estate investment over the next 2 years amounted to £134m.
EC/2013/37 Projects

EC/2013/37.1 Approved Projects Status (RAG) report

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

EC/2013/37.2 Project Exception Report

CP09/319 (Centre for Virus Research) – There had been further slippage on programme reported by Laing O’Rourke (LOR) which impacted on the completion with Section 1 (completion of the build) now expected by 23 July 2014 and Section 2 (completion of commissioning) now expected by 8 August 2014. The Committee noted that Estates and Buildings was progressing the plan for a move in date of 15 September 2014.

CP11/433/CP09/305 (GUU/Stevenson) - Refer to EC/2013/37.6 Stevenson/GUU Tender Update.

LM12/535 (Kelvin Building Resilience) - Tenders returned and being assessed. A review was underway to consider alternative options for the server rooms and it was highlighted that a delay on decisions extended the period of risk.

EC/2013/37.3 Project Approvals

EC/2013/37.3.1 Proposed New Lease of Premises - Off Campus relocation for part of University Services

In December 2013 it was recognised that there was an impending shortage of space on Campus. In the long term this would be resolved through the realisation of the objectives of the Estates Strategy but in the interim would potentially limit growth in student numbers. In January 2014 it was agreed that some non-student facing services should be relocated off-campus, conditional upon a number of criteria: close proximity to Gilmorehill; provision of high-quality, open-plan accommodation which would encourage interaction; access to catering facilities as break-out space; provision of adequate car parking and provision of approximately 20,000 sq. ft to accommodate 200-plus staff. Teams identified for relocation were Human Resources, Planning and Business Intelligence, Estates and Buildings (approx. 50%), most of Finance (including the Research Support Office).

A Steering Group was established and a timetable prepared with moves planned to take place between September 2014 and March 2015.

After a detailed search of available premises and viewings by senior University Services Managers, the top (6th) floor at Tay House, 300 Bath Street, Charing Cross was identified as the preferred site. The building provides modern, good quality and flexible office accommodation and the location offers access to good a choice of catering and other facilities in the immediate area. Negotiations were undertaken with the landlord and non-binding Heads of Terms were provisionally agreed.

The Committee noted and approved the lease terms, recommending to Court that the University legally enters the lease, subject to satisfactory formal lease contract terms being agreed. It asked that following consultation with the Convener over final detailed terms, the Secretary of Court should conclude a lease on behalf of the University.

EC/2013/37.3.2 Proposed New Lease of Premises at the Olympia Building, Bridgeton Cross, Glasgow - Creation of a Social Sciences Hub

The Committee noted the Hub would provide potential to achieve greater research opportunities through community presence ultimately resulting in additional research, widening access, PGT/PGR, CPD and public engagement activities which could not be delivered at Gilmorehill. The College of Social Sciences had assessed the area and the University Property Surveyor had carried out a search of available premises for lease in and around the East End. The preferred option was a full floor of the Olympia Building. Negotiations were continuing with Clyde Gateway to reach mutually agreeable terms:
The Committee recommended to Court that the University enter a lease of either the second or third floor of the Olympia Building, subject to finalised cost and tenure terms with Clyde Gateway and also to terms being agreed for a sub-lease to NHS/GCPH setting out accommodation and cost sharing arrangements. It also asked that following consultation with the Convener over final detailed terms the Secretary of Court should conclude the lease and sub-lease on behalf of the University.

**EC/2013/37.4 CapEx Applications**

**EC/2013/37.4.1 CP13/596 - Bute Hall/Hunter Halls (AV upgrade)/GUU Debating Chamber (AV upgrade) and GUU Dining Room**

The completed project would increase the supply of large, flexible central teaching spaces (200+) from the beginning of academic year 2014/15 ultimately improving the student experience.

The Committee approved the project in the sum of £673,834.00 excl VAT and noted that works would commence in June 2014 and were due for completion by August 2014.

**EC/2013/37.4.2 - LM13/605 Library Environmental Improvements Works Level 3**

The project continues the programme of environmental improvements within the Library. It would deliver an improved front-of-house experience, centralising various support services and improved legislative compliance in terms of physical accessibility, an increased number of study spaces, relocation of short-loan/high-use text collection to level 3 and provision of Photographic and Print Units which were currently located within the James Watt Building.

The Committee approved the project in the sum of £2.66m and noted that works were due for completion by 12 September 2014.

**EC/2013/37.4.3 - South Glasgow Hospital (SGH) - Phase 2 Imaging**

The Committee noted the application which set out a range of potential investments proposed as part of the development of Phase 2 Imaging at SGH.

The Committee noted the current shortfall of £1.2m in funding which was expected to be recovered by savings on equipment spend through the competitive tendering process; continued negotiation with NHS to utilise a share of £3m funding received from CSO; and external funding applications currently underway. The Committee noted the risk that the sum was not recovered and that the shortfall would prohibit acquisition of a 7T MRI scanner (£7m) upon which external funding already committed to the University was dependant.

The application request was that the University underwrites the risk in relation to the £1.2m funding gap and, in the event it cannot be mitigated, that a call be made on the capital plan for this amount in 2014/15.

The Committee approved that the funding gap be underwritten in the sum of £1.2m and requested that it be updated on the progression of closure of the funding gap.

**EC/2013/37.4.4 - CP13/570 Supersonic Wind Tunnel**

The project with a total upgrade cost of £1.894m would support a series of future developments in aerodynamic technologies and was considered a vital component of the Acre Road Wind Tunnel facility upgrade project which had already secured £1.644m of external funding from EPSRC.

The Committee approved the Capital investment in the sum of £0.25m.

**EC/2013/37.5 Kelvin Hall Update**

The Committee noted that tenders had been returned and a detailed analysis was underway.
EC/2013/37.6 Stevenson/GUU Tender Update

The Committee noted the outcome of the tender process in which the tender price had come in significantly higher than budget, notwithstanding a pre-tender estimate in the re-tender. A joint Estates and Finance Committee working group reviewed and considered Tenders and approved an increase in the budget from £13.383m (incl VAT) to £15.345m (incl VAT), an increase of £1.962m (incl VAT) to permit the University to proceed to preferred bidder status with Heron Bros Ltd.

EC/2013/38 Estates Operating Matters

EC/2013/38.1 Critical Path

Noted.

EC/2013/38.2 Improvement Plan – JLL Lessons Learned Next Steps/Estates and Buildings Governance Structure

EC/2013/38.2.1 JLL Lessons Learned Next Steps - The Director of Estates would work with the Head of Procurement to ensure that the procurement and evaluation processes and contract types were fully reviewed in line with the JLL lessons learned report and would provide progress reports to the Committee.

EC/2013/38.2.2 Estates and Buildings Governance Structure - The Committee noted the appointment of Neil Harris, Assistant Director (Business Transformation and Risk). Since his appointment, and based on the areas of improvement identified within the department and through the JLL report the key issues identified for change were noted as:

Role of Project Boards and quality of decision-making and recording of outcomes
Capabilities of Accountable Officers and SROs
Effectiveness of Gateway Reviews
Quality, relevance and consistency of Project Reporting
Procurement disciplines and controls
Establishing project mandates
Over reliance on Estates and Buildings in development of project briefs
Insufficient financial detail at project level
Estates and Buildings project resource capacity and capability
Rigour and consistency in applying project delivery methodologies
Lack of consolidated programme level reporting and risk management
Lack of KPIs to monitor the performance of project delivery

In cognisance of this a new internal governance approach has been developed which ensures clear oversight of projects by the Director of Estates and more structured peer group review and once adopted would improve the operation and effectiveness of Project Boards.

The new approach to project governance would help to improve the effectiveness of Project Boards which receive standard reports and project mandates. Training would also be provided for Senior Responsible Officers (SROs) and Project Board Convenors and, through the Programme Office, there would be monitoring of Board effectiveness.

A new Depute Director (Construction and Project Management) would be appointed and an interim appointment would be made in advance of advertising the permanent role. An early action for the interim appointment would be to shape the role of the Project Manager and their associated skillset.

EC/2013/39 Any Other Business

EC/2013/39.1 Car Parking Charges 2014/15
The Committee noted that there had been no increase in campus parking permit charges since 2012/13 when there had been a 10% increase applied across the board. It noted the current 2013/14 charges and approved the proposal to increase permit charges by 5% in 2014/15 and by a further 5% in 2015/16.

**EC/2013/40 Schedule of Meetings for 2014/15**

The Committee noted that the schedule of meetings for 2014/15 was being finalised.
Report from the Human Resources Committee

Brief description of paper
The minute of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Tuesday 3 June 2014 is attached for information.

The HR Director provided an update to the HR Committee regarding 2014/15 pay negotiations; staff survey 2014 outcome highlights; University Services relocation; launch of performance and development review 2013/14; employee and organisational development; an update from an equality and diversity perspective on applications for Athena SWAN Bronze Award; HR restructuring plans; and an update on developments with regards to the HR/Payroll system.

The Committee received presentations from Professor Steve Beaumont providing an update on the Researcher Development Committee; and the Internal Communications Manager, Mr Phil Taylor, providing an update on the Internal Communications Strategy.

The Committee received papers for discussion from Professor Steve Beaumont providing an update on the REF 2014 Submission; and from the HR Director on the KPI: Equal Pay & Gender Distribution at Senior Level.

Action required
Court is asked to note the draft minute of the HR Committee meeting on 3 June 2014.

Linsay McKeown
HR Project Administrator & Clerk to the HR Committee
12 June 2014
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Human Resources Committee
Minute of meeting held in Melville Room on 3 June 2014

Present: Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), Mrs A Allen (AAL), Mrs C Barr (CB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Mr R Claughton (RC), Mrs H Durndell (HD), Professor C Forde (CF), Professor N Jonsson (NJ), Mr A MacFarlane (AMcF), Mr D Newall (DN), Professor R O Maolalaigh (ROM), Dr D Spaeth (DS).

Attending: Ms L McKeown (Minute), Professor Steve Beaumont (SB) (item HR/13/42 & 43), Mr Phil Taylor (PT) (item HR/13/44).

Apologies: The Principal (AM)

HR/13/38 Opening Remarks & Apologies
DA opened the meeting welcoming RC to his first meeting of the HR Committee. DA noted apologies from The Principal.

HR/13/39 Minute of the Meeting held on 25 March 2014
The minute was taken as read and approved by the Committee.

HR/13/40 Matters Arising from 25 March 2014
Matters arising were covered in the HR Director’s report.

HR/13/41 HR Director’s Report
CB provided an overview of the HR Director’s report (attached), highlighting a number of substantive areas including an update on 2014/15 pay negotiations; staff survey 2014 outcome highlights; University Services relocation; launch of performance and development review 2013/14; employee and organisational development; an update from an equality and diversity perspective on applications for Athena SWAN Bronze Award; HR restructuring plans; and an update on developments with regards to the HR/Payroll system.

There was discussion regarding the topical matter of zero hours contracts. CB advised that she was due to attend Westminster to present evidence to the Scottish Affairs Committee on behalf of the University. CB would be joined by Sheila Gupta on behalf of University of Edinburgh and UCEA colleagues who will represent the Scottish Institutions as a whole. CB explained that the University’s use of zero hours was of a small scale of c.70 FTE (c.780 headcount) and atypical workers slightly higher with just over 100 FTE (c.2970 headcount).

Following the HR Director’s update on the initial high level results of the Staff Survey, as detailed in the HR Director’s Report, there was discussion around how the results will be communicated to Colleges, Schools, and Services. CB advised that substantive reports were forthcoming from CAPITA which would provide analysis for College/University Services level and School/Service level, and would be cascaded over the summer months. It was agreed that a fuller presentation of the survey outcomes along with draft action plans would be presented at the September meeting of the HR Committee and an update on those actions would be presented in the January meeting of the HR Committee.

Action: CB
It was also suggested that the strategy day planned for September would be a good opportunity to discuss the action plan.

**Action: DN**

Following the HR Directors update on the relocation of some University Service areas to Tay House, there was discussion regarding touch down space on campus for those areas that have contact with staff such as the Recruitment Service. Transport was also discussed and AA advised that a travel survey was currently being conducted to determine the requirements for travel between sites.

**HR/13/42 Researcher Development Committee Update**

SB presented an update of the Researcher Development Committee (attached). The presentation covered key activity over 2013/14 including: research training; implementation of Concordat for the Career Development of Researchers; Vitae Researcher Development Framework; Scottish Crucible in June 2014; HR Excellence in Research and CROS and PIRLS surveys.

CB advised that this work will be followed on by Miles Padgett in his new role as Vice Principal (Research).

**HR/13/43 REF Update**

SB presented a paper to the HR Committee on the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 (attached), and directed attention to Sections 1 and 7 and Appendices 1, 2 and 5 in particular.

SB explained that the submission for REF 2014 was in November 2013 and the expected outcomes would be received on 18 December 2014. Following the mini REF exercise it was realised that the number of significant outputs was relatively low and that it was imperative to improve on outputs. This saw a substantial increase in the rate of recruitment and ultimately 40% of staff submitted to REF 2014 had not been employed by the University of Glasgow in 2008.

The process involved significant workload in relation to considering special circumstances. Although those well-defined areas such as maternity leave could follow a relatively routine process, there was a feeling that there was insufficient recorded data for more specific individual reasons and further investigation was needed which required a lot of work to extract information for evidence to support eligibility for a reduced number of outputs.

SB advised that a research review would be undertaken in January 2016 in advance of the REF 2020. CF suggested that this review would be a good opportunity to look at the University profile i.e. female/male roles.

DA thanked SB for both the informative presentation of the Researcher Development Committee and the paper on REF 2014.

**HR/13/44 Internal Communications Strategy Progress Update**

PT presented an update on the progress of the Internal Communications Strategy (attached) following its implementation one year ago. The presentation covered: Campus Conversation; Information for Staff/My Glasgow webpages; Campus
There was discussion around what more could be done on communicating with staff. DN recognised PT and the Communications Office for the good work they have done and highlighted it may not be about sending more information out but about being seen to be listening to staff. CB added that positive feedback had been received at the Staff Survey 2014 in relation to communication by line managers.

DA thanked PT for the useful update on Internal Communications and requested that this is continued on an annual basis.

**Action:** RC/PT

### HR/13/45  KPIs: Gender Pay/Female/Senior Posts

CB presented a paper on Equal Pay and Gender Distribution at Senior Level (attached), and explained that the paper highlighted the process following the update on senior academic females given at the January meeting of HR Committee. CB directed the committee to table 1 (page 2) and highlighted while males’ average pay as a percentage of females average pay (% gender pay gap) at grade 10 level had remained consistent with the previous year, the % gender pay gap at Professorial level had increased from the previous year to 109%. This was likely to have resulted due to a high number of males recruited for REF 2014. CB also directed the HR Committee to Section 3 – Gender Distribution at senior levels and advised that a slight improvement in the number of female academics could now be witnessed however work was ongoing to actively address the trend in females within leadership roles.

DS highlighted that female to male ratios have gone down at every level from Grade 5 upwards. CB advised that progress although slow was steady and moving in the right direction in terms of promotion - 80% of females (who applied for promotion) have been successfully promoted compared to 75% of males at senior lecturer level.

DA thanked CB for the useful data and advised that it was important the HR Committee continued to have discussions regarding Equal Pay and Gender Distribution and suggested this continued on an annual basis.

**Action:** RC/CB

### HR/13/46  HR Committee Review

DA explained that Court in October would reaffirm the remit of each of the reporting Committees and asked the Committee members their opinion on the current running of the Committee and the types of agenda items raised. There was discussion regarding the balance between HR operational activities and strategic decisions and it was agreed that the Committee should not discuss HR operational matters. The Committee members felt that there was a good balance between the Committee members and that the papers and knowledge feeding into the Committee was beneficial. It was noted that the newly formed Joint Committee for Consultation and Negotiation (JCCN) which is held with the Recognised Trade Unions, would report to the HR Committee.

### HR/13/47  Any other business
DA thanked AMcF on behalf of the Committee for his contribution to the HR Committee over the past 7 years, and wished him all the best upon leaving his position within Court.

HR/13/48  **Future dates of next meeting**
The next meeting of the HR Committee will take place on Monday 15 September 2014 at 10am in Room 251, Gilbert Scott Building.
University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 28 May 2014 at 10:00 AM in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr Robert Arthurs, Mrs Christine Barr, Ms Mae Boyd, Mr John F Malcolm, Dr Catherine Martin, Mr David Newall, Dr John O'Dowd, Ms Julie Ommer, Mr Paul Phillips, Mr Deric Robinson, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Selina Woolcott, Ms Louise Bowden, Ms Louise Graham

In Attendance:

Ms Debbie Beales, Dr Phil Walsh

Apologies:

Mrs Ann Allen, Mr James Gray

HSWC/2013/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 5 March 2014

The Minute of the meeting held on Wednesday 5 March 2014 was approved.

HSWC/2013/2 Convenors Business

The Convenor welcomed Ms L Bowden to the Committee as the new union rep for UNISON. The Committee thanked her for also volunteering for the vacant union rep role within the HSWC executive group. The Convenor reminded the Committee that there were still 2 outstanding actions from the last meeting, one of which he would action over the summer. The other action was to be completed by Ms J Ommer/SRC and Dr G Duckett.

HSWC/2013/3 Matters arising

HSWC/2013/3.1 Staff Survey (verbal update Ms S Woolcott)

Mrs C Barr informed the Committee that the staff survey, conducted by external provider CAPITA, had seen over 60% of staff participate, almost double the participation rate of previous staff surveys. The initial reports from CAPITA showed that 90% of staff were happy to work at the University of Glasgow with general results comparing favourably with other HEI's. The survey had been ambitious with a question set that was both quantitative and qualitative and the high level feedback showed high levels of job satisfaction with staff confident with their job role and level of responsibility. Mrs C Barr added that she expected a more detailed breakdown of results within the new few weeks and, based on these, a draft action plan and timetable would be developed.

The Committee discussed the fact that staff had only been given the option to complete a paper survey or an online survey. It was felt that staff only being given the paper option could feel the University was assuming that they were not capable of using a computer. In fact the reasons for this had been to enable participation by staff who did not have easy access to a computer, as well as to prevent staff from potentially completing the survey twice. However, it was appreciated that this should be looked into for future surveys. The
Committee **agreed** that all issues relating to the survey should be logged by HR to ensure that they were addressed in advance of future surveys. Ms S Woolcott **informed** the Committee that the stress indicator report was not available yet, and that she would update the Committee on this in due course.

**HSWC/2013/3.2 Vibration Management (verbal update D McL)**

Mr D McLean **informed** the Committee that the University was currently using a paper based logging system to monitor staff using equipment included in vibration management. E&B were currently purchasing an electronic system which would produce reports listing staff usage of such equipment to ensure that no-one exceeded the daily dose limit of 4 hours. This system would be activated by the staff member using their staff card to swipe in/out equipment. No further action was expected from HSE who seemed satisfied with the action taken by the University. The Committee **thanked** Mr D McLean for his work on this issue.

**HSWC/2013/4 OH Report (Paper 1)**

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms A Stewart **informed** the Committee that there was nothing dramatic to report from this quarter's OH stats, when comparing them to previous quarters. Health surveillance was on the increase again as OH were now working with staff who were located in remote locations such as hospitals. Ms C Barr **informed** the Committee that OH had become oversubscribed for self referrals with 30% of staff self referring before even visiting their own GP. This was not the purpose of the self referral, which was for emergencies only; and OH and HR had consulted with the trade unions to find an alternative. From 1st May 2014 OH had stopped offering self referrals and instead the university counselling service was offering drop in sessions for staff. As this had only been in place for a few weeks it was too early to report on how successful this would prove. Dr J O'Dowd expressed concerns that although the TU's had been consulted, union safety reps had not. In this type of situation it was to be expected that, in compliance with H&S legislation, the safety reps should be specifically consulted. Noting this concern, the Convenor asked that union safety reps be invited to attend a meeting with the Director of HR to discuss the changes.

**HSWC/2013/5 SEPS Report (Paper 2)**

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Mr D MacLean **informed** the Committee that the accident stats consisted of the usual slips and trips with no unusual anomalies to report. Mr D MacLean **tabled** a paper that summarised the current status of the internal safety audits being carried out by SEPS. All units visited had some level of safety management systems in place and the aim of SEPS was to provide each audited unit with a final report within 8 weeks of the audit. Units would then be asked for an update on completion of the recommendations made within the report. The plan for next year was to audit MVLS and Science & Engineering at School level. The Committee **agreed** that SEPS should report any problems with implementation to the relevant College/US member of the HSWC, as well as providing them with copies of the reports for their College/US. Mr D MacLean **updated** the Committee on the latest visit from HSE. The University had received a visit from an HSE Biological Specialist who voiced concerns about the storage of biological samples and liquid nitrogen within the Joseph Black Building. This led to another visit on 9th April 2014 in which HSE interviewed staff and took written statements with an Improvement Notice being served on the 23rd April 2014. According to HSE there were communication failings within the University but ultimately the storage issues had been resolved. Dr P Walsh was working on a reply to the improvement notice with the Institute’s help and steps had
been taken to remind colleagues across the wider University of the requirements associated with the use and storage of liquid nitrogen.

**HSWC/2013/6 EAP Report (Paper 3)**

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms S Woolcott informed the Committee that there had been a 40% drop in uptake of the service compared to the same period last year. Telephone counselling had decreased by 37% and face to face by 44%. Only 21 staff had used the service during the period, 10 lower than the previous quarter despite yet another article in the campus e-news. Similar institutions were also reporting a low uptake of the service. According to results from the staff survey, 58% of staff surveyed were aware of the service. Of the 6% who had used the service, 83% would recommend it to others. The idea of a pilot in-house service had been placed on hold for the moment as the University was currently recruiting a new Director of Counselling & Psychological Services. This would be revisited when the post was filled and the new Director had been given time to prioritise work requirements. In the meantime the service would provide the drop in service mentioned in item 4.

**HSWC/2013/7 Lone Workers Policy Review (Paper 4)**

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms S Woolcott thanked those who had offered comments thus far and informed the Committee that the main difference to the Policy was a better reflection of roles and responsibilities of the University. The Committee agreed to email additional comments to her by Friday 6th June 2014. Ms S Woolcott would then share the amended document (with track changes) with the Committee.

**HSWC/2013/8 HSW Policy Review (Paper 5)**

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms S Woolcott informed the Committee that the only amendment was to clarify the overall responsibility of the Court. The Committee approved the changes and the new version would be posted on the HSW website.

**HSWC/2013/9 Any Other Business**

There was no other Committee business.

**HSWC/2013/10 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Tuesday 16th September at 10am in the Senate Room.

*Created by: Miss Debbie Beales*
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Remuneration Committee

Notes of the Meeting held on 2 May 2014

Present
David Anderson (convener)
Ken Brown
Brian McBride
Anton Muscatelli
David Ross

Attending
Christine Barr
David Newall

1. Notes of the meeting on 10 October 2013
These were approved.

2. Professorial Reward
The Director of HR shared some early thoughts on the University’s future approach to professorial reward. The aim of the discussion was to establish Remuneration Committee’s views on general principles, which would then be reflected in a specific policy proposal to the next meeting.

It was agreed that the University’s policy should have the objectives of: increasing competitiveness; attracting and retaining high quality staff; providing a clear career structure; assisting succession planning; applying fair, transparent and equitable mechanisms; and rewarding excellence. In that context, it had been agreed to date:

.1 that professorial staff should as a matter of course benefit from any nationally negotiated annual award;

.2 that, at University level, recognition and reward should be informed by: annual P&DR outcomes; sustained academic performance outputs; budgetary considerations; and comparative Russell Group professorial pay trends; and

.3 that reward would not be provided in addition to any out-of-cycle pay increase awarded in the course of the year.

In that context, Remuneration Committee agreed that a high level of performance in a single year should be rewarded by a modest non-consolidated payment, and that a consolidated payment, within the relevant professorial zone, should be made in respect of sustained performance over time. The role of the Committee would be, on an annual basis, to approve the level of non-consolidated award (if any) and to approve the algorithm for consolidated payments.
With regard to consolidated payments, Remuneration Committee welcomed a proposed points-based approach, where an agreed number of points would be associated with each performance level on the 5-point P&DR scale. The achievement of an agreed aggregate number of points in any 3-year cycle would result in a consolidated award. Receipt of such an award would re-set the three-year cycle.

Remuneration Committee asked that, following this general approach, the Director of HR prepare a proposed algorithm for the Committee to consider at its next meeting, and which would then be used in determining consolidated payments for professorial staff with effect from a three-year cycle commencing 2013/14.

[Action : CB]

3. Terms of Reference of the Remuneration Committee

At the October 2013 meeting, Remuneration Committee had considered a suggested revision to its terms of reference. This had been prompted by a recent internal audit which had recommended that the remit be expanded to reflect more fully the activities of the committee in relation to professorial salaries and to severance arrangements. Before making a recommendation to Court, the Committee had agreed to have a further discussion of the remit, having regard to the relevant part of the Scottish Governance Code.

Having reviewed Main Principle 15 of the Governance Code and its Supporting Guidelines, the Committee agreed there were no specific additional changes that ought to be made to its terms of reference in respect of the Code. The only changes that should be made at this time were, therefore, those arising from the recommendations contained in the internal audit report. That being the case, Remuneration Committee agreed to

RECOMMEND to Court that the terms of reference of the Committee be amended as set out in Annex 1.

4. Policy on the Publication of Salaries of Senior Staff

The Committee considered the University’s future policy on the publication of salaries of senior staff, noting the Scottish Governance Code’s guidance that, ‘The remuneration committee should identify those posts in the senior team which are regarded as forming the senior executive team, and it should publish the salaries of this group of staff by salary band’.

To date, Remuneration Committee had not published SMG salaries, other than that of the Principal. However:

- The University’s financial accounts identified, in £10K salary bands, the number of staff (clinical versus non-clinical) in each band; and
- in response to Freedom of Information enquiries, it had become standard practice, at
GU and in other universities, to disclose senior managers’ salaries in £10K bands.

Following discussion, it was agreed that, with effect from 2014, Remuneration
Committee should include in its annual report to Court data on highly-paid staff in
£10K bands. This report should cover all staff salaried above £80,000, should not name
individuals, and should show the number of staff in each salary band who were;
members of SMG; other members of academic staff; and other members of
administrative staff.

5. Protocol for Setting the Salaries of newly appointed Vice- Principals’

The Committee had agreed a protocol in recent weeks that had been used in setting the
salaries of new Vice-Principal appointees. The protocol, which would be observed for
future such appointments was:

1. Before interviewing Vice-Principal candidates, the Principal will consult with
the Chair of Remuneration Committee and, for each candidate, will agree a
salary band within which he will have authority to make an offer to the
preferred candidate.

2. If the suggested salary band for any candidate would breach the upper limit of
the current VP salary band, then Remuneration Committee will be advised of
the proposal and of the reasons for it, and Remuneration Committee’s
approval will be required before any offer is made to the candidate.

3. Once a contract of employment is signed, Remuneration Committee will be
informed of the agreed salary, and the rationale for it.

6. Voluntary Severance Approvals

The Committee received a report on those voluntary severance cases that had been
approved since it had last met. Three cases had been authorised by University officers
within the standard terms of the Voluntary Severance Scheme. There had been no cases
in this period requiring consideration by the Committee.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting would be arranged for October 2014.

[Action : DN]

DN, 16.5.14
Terms of Reference of the Remuneration Committee

Plain text = current

Bold = possible addition

Remit

To formulate the University’s remuneration policy, and to review that policy annually, recommending changes to Court as appropriate:

To determine salaries for members of the Senior Management Group, having regard to:
- their performance in advancing the University’s strategic objectives,
- the need to offer salaries that are competitive with those of other major UK universities, as reflected in robust comparative data, and
- the budget approved by Court;

In the absence of the Principal, to determine the Principal’s salary;

Annually, to determine the University’s policy on the performance-related reward of professorial and senior administrative staff (all Level 10 staff); and

On Court’s behalf, to determine advise Court on the University’s policy on severance arrangements for staff, and, within parameters agreed by Court, to implement that policy, considering to consider on an individual basis, any severance proposal:
- that departs from the parameters agreed by Court, and/or
- that pertains to a member of the Senior Management Group.

Membership

The Convener of Court
three lay members of Court, one of whom should convene Remuneration Committee
the Principal
one external member
University of Glasgow

University Court – Wednesday 25 June 2014

Communications to Court from the meeting of the Council of Senate held on 5 June 2014

Dr Jack Aitken, Director, Senate Office

(All matters are for noting)

1. Communications from the University Court special meeting of 2 May 2014: Draft Ordinance 206: Composition of the University Court

At its meeting on 17 April 2014, the Council of Senate had discussed draft University Ordinance 206, on the composition of the University Court. Inter alia, the Council had resolved to reject the reduction of the number of Senate Assessors on Court from the present seven to five as proposed in the draft Ordinance. This had been proposed in light of the expectation in the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance that University Governing Bodies should have both a total membership of no more than 25 and clear majority of independent members. The Council of Senate had also resolved to recommend that the number of Senate Assessors should be six. A note of the discussion and decisions made at the Council meeting had been forwarded to the University Court to help inform the process of consultation on the draft Ordinance.

The Secretary of Court reported that the Council’s submission had been received and considered by the Court working group established to advise Court on the matter. Together with other responses to the consultation and other documents, the Council’s submission was then forwarded to Court for consideration at its special meeting on 2 May. Mr Newall reported that Court had strongly agreed that it would not wish to increase its membership to more than 25 in order to achieve a clear independent majority. Court did not believe there was good reason why the University could argue that it alone of Scottish universities was unable to adopt the benchmark given in the Governance Guide.

Mr Newall continued that, following discussion and given its wish to respond positively to feedback from the consultation, Court had unanimously agreed that it would amend the draft Ordinance so that the number of Senate Assessors moved from seven to six, with the total number of Co-opted members increasing to nine rather than ten, as would have been the case had the number of senate assessors remained at five. If the view of Privy Council, advised by the Scottish Government, was that it could not accept the Ordinance so drafted, on the grounds that it would not satisfy the requirements of good governance, then unless the Privy Council advised that the reduction in the number of Senate Assessors to six rather than five was acceptable, the draft Ordinance would be re-submitted to the Privy Council with the number of Senate Assessors reduced instead from seven to five, and with the number of co-
opted members increased to ten rather than nine. Should the Privy Council require the addressing of other specific points, then Court would respond to these following further consideration.

Court had also agreed the following approach to implementing the Ordinance:

1. The new Ordinance should have effect from 1 August 2014;
2. with effect from that date, three new co-opted members should be appointed: two to fill the positions vacated by Kevin Sweeney and Alan MacFarlane, who would complete their terms of office as General Council members on 31 July 2014; and one to fill the position vacated by Miles Padgett whose period of office as a Senate Assessor ended on 3 May 2014.
3. on the next occasion when a General Council Assessor reached the end of his term of office, that person would be replaced on Court by a new Co-opted member;
4. in the event that the new Ordinance provided for a reduction to 5 Senate Assessors then, on the next occasion that a Senate Assessor reached the end of his/her term of office, that person would be replaced by a new Co-opted member;
5. should the implementation of the new ordinance be delayed until after 1 August, and should new Assessors be appointed in the intervening period, by General Council or Senate, then the terms on Court of these new appointees would terminate immediately upon the new Ordinance coming into effect.

Mr Newall also reported that Court had been appreciative of the spirit of compromise that the Council of Senate had adopted, and which Court had sought to reciprocate. The Principal also expressed his appreciation of the constructive approach the Council had taken.

2. Budget 2014-15 and Four-Year Forecast

Professor Juster, Senior Vice-Principal, provided a presentation on the University’s draft Budget for 2014/15 and four-year financial forecast. The final draft Budget would be submitted to Court for approval on 25 June. Professor Juster updated the Council on the University’s current performance against its Key Performance Indicators and in league tables and student surveys. For 2014-15, priority areas for investment were:

- Reduce student-staff ratios particularly in the Business School.
- Grow research activity
- Introduction of distance learning courses
- Collaboration arrangements
- Widening participation
- New research grant management tools
- Website
• Marketing strategy
• Fundraising campaign

The University’s annual surplus was expected to decline for the next two years before increasing by 2017-18 to a level higher than the year now ending. Key features that would affect the budgetary position in the next four years included pay inflation and increased pension contributions. A further significant factor was the expected fall in the growth of international student numbers. Initiatives that had been identified to help increase income included:

• Increasing the price of high demand courses
• Introducing new full fee paying courses
• Distance Learning
• Commercial Income
• Transnational Education
  – Expand current
  – Investigate new
• Efficiency of processes

In discussion, it was reported that straightforward action to address areas of relatively poor performance in league tables was complicated by lack of transparency in the metrics used by those compiling the tables and the use of conflicting metrics. It was reported that academic work was being held back by under-provision of administrative staff in Schools. A further factor was the impact of Schools operating on split sites. Professor Juster responded that some recruitment of administrative staff was planned, although decisions on recruitment were a matter for budget holders. It was also noted that the planned increase in staff in the Adam Smith Business School would come after marked increases in student numbers had been supported by current, lower staff numbers. Concern was expressed that the same pressures would be experienced as a result of the increase in Transnational Education (TNE) arrangements and it was suggested that investment should follow sooner after new initiatives were undertaken. Responding, Professor Juster acknowledged the issue and expressed appreciation of the efforts that staff had made. He explained that careful judgement was required in ensuring that a sufficient level of confidence had been reached with such new ventures before the commitment to invest. Professor Chapman, Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Science and Engineering, reported that much had been learnt from experience in TNE and, while matters were not straightforward, careful business plans would help ensure that staff recruitment better matched student recruitment.

3. Estate Strategy Update

Mrs Allen, the Director of Estates and Buildings, provided a presentation updating the Council on progress with the Estate Strategy.

Mrs Allen began by reminding the Council that the Estate Strategy was being developed to be consistent with the University Strategic Plan, its mission and values, and to help enable achievement of the University Strategy’s aims and objectives. The vision of the emerging Estate Strategy was to ‘create a campus that is fit for today and the future, innovative, courageous design and reflective of the
Universities heritage and ambition in research and teaching and learning, inspiring current and future
generations.’ A number of guiding principles had been identified that would inform the Strategy:

- Innovative
- Open
- Sustainable
- Affordable
- Accessible
- Cohesive
- Efficient
- Respectful of heritage

The main elements of the draft Strategy were:

- 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

Staff in Estates and Buildings were working with colleagues in the Colleges and University Services to
understand current and future needs and ambitions. A number of general themes had emerged from
this activity:

- 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 also stressed the consultative nature of the approach being taken to develop the Strategy. In
addition to the identification of business requirements, other key areas where staff and students were
being consulted were in the compiling of the Campus Development Framework and identification of
principles concerning the use of space.

The Council’s attention was also drawn to issues concerning the Western Infirmary site. Work was
underway to help identify in detail the ground conditions, and the age of the site and the way it had
been developed meant that the drainage system and provision of utilities were complicated. There
were listed buildings and consideration was being given to areas of the site that might be reused.
Consideration was also being given to the wider aesthetic impression the new campus would create. In this, the relationship between the campus and Kelvingrove Park was crucial, and ensuring connectivity within the campus and between it and its surroundings would be very important, as would developing a sense of openness. The nature and location of the main gateways into the campus were consequently also crucial.

The principles concerning the use of space that had been identified concerned its accessibility; that it was fit for purpose; that it was flexible, expressive and sustainable.

The next steps in developing the Estate Strategy involved further consultation to seek final views and the submission of the Campus Development Framework to the City Council during the summer, ahead of final submission of the Strategy to Court for approval in October.

In discussion, issues concerning College co-location were addressed. The question of co-location was under consideration by the Colleges. It was noted that co-location could make for better use of space and more efficiencies, although it was also argued that consideration needed to be given to potential disadvantages ahead of decisions on the matter, such as the risk of the creation of four ‘separate universities’.

Discussion also included the potential to develop more social spaces. This, and increased provision for learning and teaching accommodation was seen as essential. The pressure on the Library at present provided a clear indication of this. It was argued that current restrictions limited the potential for staff interaction, to the possible detriment of the University’s research potential. It was noted that it was not necessary to have separate social space for staff and students. For learning and teaching space, the challenge was to anticipate needs for the next 20-30 years.

The view was expressed that proposals for academic staff to occupy open-plan accommodation was not likely to be widely supported. It was reported that recent media coverage suggested some architects regarded open-plan space as obsolete. Mrs Allen responded that there was a considerable body of literature on the matter and that views were varied. Open-plan spaces worked in some contexts, but not in others. She reported that staff had expressed mixed views on the issue, and that further debate was needed. After the conclusion of discussions to identify the key priorities for the Estate Strategy, there would be further consultation with staff. There would be discussion on open-plan/closed accommodation and other issues at the time when detailed planning commenced for new building space.

The Council was reminded that, at the time the Gilchrist Postgraduate Centre was opened, the commitment had been made to develop a postgraduate building for the University, and that this commitment should be fulfilled.

It was requested that a close link was established between teaching space and the room booking system.

It was also noted that some existing buildings on campus had reached the end of their useful lives. Interim as well as long-term solutions were required to the associated issues. There was already a great deal of pressure on space and this continued to increase. The Principal drew attention to the recent announcement that staff from Estates & Buildings, the Finance Office and Planning & Business Intelligence would shortly re-locate to off-campus accommodation as a result of this pressure.
4. Convener’s Business

4.1 Universitas 21

The Principal reported on the recent Universitas 21 Presidents’ and Student Summits held at the University. The Principal thanked staff and students who had participated in the meetings. Feedback from delegates had been highly complimentary about their interactions with University staff and students. There had been a range of valuable sessions during the Summit events; those on student expectations and e-learning had been of particular interest.

4.2 Comments on UK Immigration Policy

The Principal advised the Council that comments he had made on podcasts and in discussion with the SRC had also been picked up by the media. These remarks concerned immigration and the Principal had been critical of UK Government policy.

5. Research Planning and Strategy Committee: Report from the meeting held on 15 May 2014

5.1 Open Access Update

RPSC had received an update on Open Access including implications of the new HEFCE Open Access policy post-2014 REF, which made Open Access a submission requirement for all journal articles and conference proceedings published after 1st January 2016.

Overall, HEFCE’s policy was more aligned with the ‘Green’ Open Access policy, with a focus on deposit into a repository within three months of the output’s acceptance. While this lessened pressure to go down the ‘Gold’ Open Access route, there would still be circumstances in which that route was required (e.g., the funder is RCUK or the Wellcome Trust) or preferable (e.g., prestigious journals). It had also been noted the embargo periods set out by HEFCE were longer than those instituted by most funders, though outputs would still need to be deposited into a repository within three months of acceptance.

Concerns had been raised regarding outputs where the lead author was employed at another institution and whether, in these instances, the University of Glasgow would have guarantees that the appropriate Open Access process had been followed. Currently, there was no way to know this and the University’s approach had been to take responsibility for Open Access regardless of who the lead author was. The Committee had agreed this was a significant concern as other institutions’ decisions could affect Glasgow’s submission and the matter would be raised externally.

An audit trail had to be available for REF and it had been suggested that information on the relevant publications was provided by academic staff and managed by the Library using the method currently in place:

- Academics notify the Library with the author-final version of the output and evidence of acceptance for publication
- The Library checks funder requirements and embargo periods.
However, across the University there was a low level of capturing outputs through this method (approximately 10% of the total outputs published annually) and strategies for increasing engagement were required. The Committee agreed the Library would work closely with the Colleges to publicise the policy and the University’s method. The Library would also contact those who had published within the last year and had not provided details to the Library with the request they did so in future.

5.2 Research Strategy Review

The Convenor, Professor Beaumont, had introduced a review of Research Strategy from 2006 to 2014. This provided analyses highlighting progress made since the implementation of the Research Strategy in 2006 and would be submitted to Court in June 2014. Overall, the analyses indicated an increase in activity following the University’s restructure in 2010. Other positive factors included the reprofiling of staff, increased emphasis on PGR and introduction of KPIs. A final point was raised regarding sustainability of progress and the need for continued investment to maintain position or gain further ground. Considered investment in successful schemes would continue to support the University’s research growth.

5.3 High Level Configuration for New Campus Development

The Convenor had introduced an overview of interdisciplinary research themes illustrating accommodation needs to be addressed in the new campus development. As the project involved developing a campus that would be relevant for the next fifty years, it was important the University was forward-thinking. It had been suggested the University look at current research areas for investment in order to achieve greater international impact, or considered existing priorities to take them to the next level. Overall, it had been agreed it would be useful to focus on the versatility and flexibility of the new campus as it would be difficult to predict future priorities and agendas.

6. Honorary Degree and honorary Fellowship Nominations

The Clerk of Senate advised that nominations were welcome for the award of Honorary Degrees in 2015. Nomination forms were available at:

http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/ceremoniesandhonoraryawards/honorarydegreesandfellowships/

7. Appointment of Senate Assessors on Court

The Council of Senate received a paper from the Clerk of Senate and Director of the Senate Office concerning the approach to the appointment of Senate Assessors on Court.

The draft Ordinance concerning the composition of Court being submitted to the Privy Council for approval included the proposal that the number of Senate Assessors on Court should change from seven to six. There were two resulting issues concerning the appointment of Senate Assessors that required decisions.
While it would otherwise be recommended to await the decision of the Privy Council before moving to implement the change, a decision was necessary now to respond to Professor Padgett’s resignation as a Senate Assessor following his appointment as Vice-Principal.

On the basis that the Ordinance was approved, the Council would also need to decide how it wished to appoint Senate Assessors in the future on the basis of the reduced overall number. A number of approaches might be taken to this; one based on custom and practice and on recent developments was recommended. While this matter could await the outcome of the proposed Ordinance, it was suggested that the Council might decide the matter presently, on the basis that its decision is contingent upon the Privy Council decision. In the event that the Ordinance is not approved, the status quo would continue to apply.

The recommendations concerning both issues stemmed in part from discussions with Dr Spaeth, the Senior Senate Assessor.

Indications were that the draft Ordinance would be decided upon in June or, at the latest, July 2014. On that basis, it was recommended that the Council should not to appoint a successor to Professor Padgett at present, and to initiate the appointment of an Assessor at its meeting in October 2014, in the event that no decision on the Ordinance was made in the interim. The Council approved this recommendation.

It was noted that a range of models might be adopted for the future appointment of Senate Assessors. However, it was noted that Senate had observed a number of principles in appointing Senate Assessors:

- **The period of appointment is four years.** It was not proposed that this should be altered. Senate Assessors have frequently commented that it takes some time to fully engage with the role and their effectiveness may be compromised if the period is shortened.
- **Assessors are elected from across the University.** The constituencies from which the Assessors were appointed had varied according to changes in the academic structure of the University, such as the creation or amalgamation of faculties, and most recently, the restructuring of 2010. Where there was no obvious fit between the number of academic units and the number of Assessors, a combination of local constituencies and cross-University appointments had been adopted. At present, one professor was appointed by each College and the remaining Assessors were elected members of Senate, with the Colleges taking it in turns not to appoint an elected Senate member. It was recommended that measures continued to be implemented to ensure Assessors are appointed from across the University.
- **A majority of the Senate Assessors are appointed from the professoriate.** A majority of 4:3 Professors:elected members had been maintained for many years. However, in establishing the Council of Senate, Senate had reversed the structure of its own composition. Thus, whereas there was a majority of members ex officio on Senate itself, the Council had a majority of 2:1 elected:ex officio members. In a similar way to the Council, it was recommended that the Council should adopt a more flexible balance between the numbers of professorial and non-professorial Assessors.

The Council approved the foregoing recommendations.
It was further noted that, under the terms of the relevant Ordinances, Assessors were appointed by Senate from the membership of Senate. It was not therefore necessary that Assessors were also members of the Council of Senate.

In line with the foregoing, it was further recommended that:

- One member of Senate from each College should be elected by and from the Senate members of the College to serve as a Senate Assessor on Court.

- Two Senate Assessors on Court should be elected by and from the membership of Senate across the University.

- Of the six Assessors, a minimum of two should be elected members of Senate, and a minimum of two should be professorial members of Senate.

- The period of appointment of assessors is four years.

The Council approved the foregoing recommendations.

It was further noted that, if the Ordinance were approved and there were no unforeseen changes in the complement of Assessors, this would mean:

- In 2015, when Dr Spaeth steps down, an Assessor will be elected from the College of Science & Engineering. The appointee may be a professorial or elected member of Senate.
- In 2016, when Professor Forde and Dr Freel step down, two Assessors will be elected from the cross-University Senate membership. Depending on the outcome of the appointment from Science & Engineering in 2015, it may need to be stipulated that one of the appointees is a non-professorial Senate member.

In 2017, when Professor Lury, Dr Ross and Professor Jonsson step down, one appointment each will be made from the Colleges of Arts, Social Sciences and Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences. Stipulations may be required as to the number of elected or professorial appointments to be made. The decision as to which Colleges would be directed to appoint a professorial or non-professorial Assessor would be made by drawing lots.

8. Education Policy and Strategy Committee: Report from the meeting held on 30 April 2014

8.1 Lecture Recording Policy

The Council received for consideration the draft Policy on Lecture Recording.

Discussion was introduced by the Director of the Senate Office. The Council was reminded that Senate had conducted a wide-ranging discussion when it received an earlier draft of the Policy in October 2013. A summary of the Senate discussion and of the recent discussion at the Learning & Teaching Committee
was provided. Senate had noted, inter alia, that lecture recording was happening willy-nilly and spreading and that University provision for video recording was also expanding. It had also noted that the present situation was effectively unregulated and that staff and students were consequently relatively unprotected. These were matters of concern. It was reported that imminent change would take place in copyright legislation to accommodate the advent of on-line learning provision, and the undertaking was provided that the policy would not be introduced without the development and inclusion of guidance on this for staff. A further issue was how the University could support staff who wished to make use of recorded material as a teaching tool.

From feedback during consultation, it appeared that, at the heart of concerns, lay the potential for conflict between the desire to recognise and protect the rights of staff and to recognise the benefits to students (notably those with disabilities) of the availability of lecture material. It was explained that the policy sought to find a way of accommodating both concerns.

Ms McGrellis, SRC President, reported that the SRC was strongly supportive of the policy. She noted that the policy had been amended in light of feedback, and hoped that it represented an acceptable compromise.

Members offered a number of comments regarding copyright issues. These included the complex and time-consuming practicalities of working with the associated regulations, and consequent need for extensive advice and support. Teaching in Archaeology and History of Art involved extensive use of copyright images, and faced commensurately substantial difficulties. It was noted that, once recorded material from teaching sessions was uploaded to Moodle, protection of copyright became practically very difficult. The Head of the School of Law noted the expertise on copyright available within the School and that colleagues might be asked to contribute to the formulation of advice for staff.

Professor Maley made the point that, while providing a potentially valuable resource and future archive, there had been little discussion of the issue of potential subsequent use by the University management of recorded lecture material. It was explained that there could be no subsequent staff liability for defamation, comments were either defamatory or not at the time of utterance. It was also noted that, while encouraged to do so, ultimately, staff were not required to permit recording of lectures. It was explained that students would be required to provide a signed undertaking not to misuse recorded material and that such misuse could result in action under the Code of Student Conduct. The Senate Office would collaborate with the SRC to develop additional advisory information for students, and the Senate office would develop guidance for staff on reporting and dealing with inappropriate use of recorded materials. Professor O’Donnell advised that the School of Psychology had recorded lectures for many years and that students were highly appreciative of this resource. It was not thought to have affected lecture attendance adversely, but rather to complement class attendance.

No –one present was opposed to the proposed policy and it was approved by the Council.

8.2 Examination Feedback Policy

The Council of Senate received for consideration the draft Examination Feedback Policy.
The proposed Policy had been approved by Learning and Teaching Committee at its meeting on 2 April 2014 and endorsed by EdPSC at its meeting.

The Policy set out minimum standards for examination feedback and devolved responsibility to Schools to develop systems and to implement and, where it was wished, to exceed these standards. It was noted that the focus was on the provision of generic rather than individual feedback. Individual feedback would be required only in situations where a student’s progression or graduation was under question, and the means of providing individual feedback would be agreed by Schools.

It had been proposed to implement the Policy for the Spring examination diet of 2014-15 (May 2015) to allow Schools to develop appropriate mechanisms during the coming session. Operation of the Policy would be reviewed shortly thereafter to identify any necessary changes for introduction in 2015-16.

It was commented that, to meet the 15 working days’ deadline for the provision of feedback would be challenging. Not all information could be prepared in advance by means of model answers, etc. Concern was expressed that some of the impact would be upon administrative staff who would already be busily engaged with managing the exam process. It was reported that, in one area of the University which already provided generic feedback, students frequently requested additional personalised comments on their performance. The introduction of a policy that limited feedback to a generic level other than in specific circumstances would be welcomed. Professor Bissell, who had convened the Working Group that had developed the Policy, noted that many other universities were already providing exam feedback and that a number of Schools at the University were doing so also, and to a high standard. It was agreed that it would be very valuable for current good practice to be shared across the University.

The Council of Senate approved the proposed Examination Feedback Policy, noting that its operation would be reviewed immediately following its first use in Spring 2014.

The report from EdPSC was otherwise noted.

9. Intimations

The Council of Senate stood in silence to mark its respect for former members of Senate whose deaths had been announced during the session:

Professor Dennis Gilles FRSE
Professor Gilles died on 5 October 2013. Professor Gilles died on 5 October 2013. In 1957, he was appointed as the first Director of the Computing Laboratory at the University of Glasgow; he was subsequently appointed as the first Professor of Computing Science and Head of the Department of Computing Science. He was instrumental in the foundation of the Glasgow Branch of the British Computer Society.

Professor David Walker
Professor Walker died on 5 January 2014. He was educated at the Universities of Glasgow, Edinburgh and London, and was called to the Scots Bar in 1948. In 1954, he was appointed Professor of
Jurisprudence at the University of Glasgow, and the Regius Chair of Law in 1958. He served as the Dean of the Faculty of Law from 1956-59, and Convener of the School of Law from 1984-88. He was appointed Queens Counsel in 1958. He published extensively on the subject of Scots private law.