Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 25 June 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 Christine Forde Senate Member, Dr Marie Freef Senate Member, Professor Nick Jonsson Senate Member, Professor Karen Lury Senate Member, Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Member, Ms Jess McGrellis SRC President, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Representative, 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, 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 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: Mr Brian McBride General Council Member, Cllr Pauline McKeever Glasgow City Council Representative

Attenders: Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching)

CRT/2013/46. Announcements

Court welcomed the SRC President-elect, Breffini O’Connor, to the Court meeting.

Alan Macfarlane, Jess McGrellis, Kevin Sweeney, Steve Beaumont and John Chapman were attending their final meeting of Court. Court thanked them for their contributions to Court and wished them well in the future.

CRT/2013/47. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 16 April and Friday 2 May 2014

The minutes were approved. With regard to the minute of 16 April it was noted that the cover paper relating to the IT Strategy had referred to Court’s approval being sought for the strategy, and that this approval had for the purposes of the record been taken as given following the presentation and questions, though it had not been specifically requested during the discussion
at the meeting. Following the Court presentation, discussions were being taken forward with academic managers responsible for Learning & Teaching, for Research and for Internationalisation. These were aimed at agreeing priorities for action and investment in order to realise the ambitions set out in the strategy.

**CRT/2013/48. Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising.

**CRT/2013/49. University of Glasgow Pension Scheme UGPS**

Neal Juster, Margaret Anne McParland and David Newall, Trustees of UGPS, did not attend for this item.

At the last meeting, Court had unanimously agreed that it could not support agreement to terms proposed by the Trustees to address the deficit in the scheme, 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 had referred back to the existing UGPS Court working group for a response to be provided to the Trustees.

Since April, members of SMG had engaged with the Trustees, supported by the Court working group. There had been positive engagement over the recovery plan, including on the affordability of payments and the sharing of information on the campus development. Members of the working group had been kept informed and agreement sought from members on the acceptability of the proposals as they developed. The working group had now agreed the terms of the recovery plan, in summary 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 recovery plan would be monitored formally on a triennial basis, timed according to the actuarial valuations, the next of which was due on 31 March 2016.

Court noted that in addition to the formal recovery plan, which would require to be agreed by the Pensions Regulator, it had been agreed to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the Trustees concerning progress with the campus development, particularly as it affected the University’s financial position. The Trustees would be consulted, as a significant stakeholder, as funding proposals for the campus development emerged and on any other significant event that might have a material impact on the Scheme. It was noted that this did not entail the Trustees having a veto; details regarding the campus would be provided for their information.

The Trustees would be updated on a 6 monthly basis on the status of a number of key points, 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 included proposals for security over assets or prior ranking debt arrangements, and major acquisitions or disposals proposed.

In addition, the Trustees would be notified if any Notifiable Events arose or any ‘Type A’ events arose or were being considered outside of the 6 monthly reporting. Type A events were events which would have a material impact on the Scheme meeting its pension liabilities and required a clearance statement from the Pensions Regulator.

The agreement would be formalised via appropriate documentation. Court agreed that it was
content that the matter be progressed.

**CRT/2013/50. Budget 2014/15 and Financial Forecasts and KPIs**

The Principal explained that the context of the budget was the *Glasgow 2020* Strategic Plan developed in 2010, at which point there had been a number of areas requiring improvement, including a relatively narrow research base in terms of the highest quality research (4* in terms of REF) and a very low international profile and international student population. Significant investment had taken place in the interim, including recruitment of new staff and development of new buildings and facilities. Action had been taken to invest to improve the REF grade point average, and also to invest in teaching, and to grow international student numbers and Trans-National Education (TNE). Further investment would take place ahead of the next REF. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) had seen improvements in the majority of areas, moving the University into a better competitive position. The key to continuing this trend was continuing targeted investment in people and facilities. Court would receive additional information at key junctures over the coming years, to provide good visibility of budgets and management thereof including management of voids (vacant posts).

Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice Principal, provided an update on progress against the University’s KPIs in the past 12 months, to accompany the paper that had been circulated. The overall KPI scorecard had improved markedly between 2010 and 2014, with targets achieved in most of the areas measured. Of the remaining KPIs, three were related to the student experience and the current budget allocated significant resource to this area; the University continued to do well relative to competitors in these areas and in a further area was scheduled to achieve the target in the coming year. Court noted progress against the KPIs, and noted details of the University’s position in recent league tables.

In discussion, Court heard that it was important to achieve an optimal balance of outcomes to enhance the University’s performance in league tables. Investment in accommodation arising from increased student numbers was a key factor; in addition, metrics including student:staff ratios would be kept under review. Court noted that budgets for student facing services were reviewed annually to assess areas for potential additional investment. There was also liaison with the student bodies in this regard. Student feedback on teaching and assessment was being examined in a systematic way.

Court noted that the additional pressures on staff time arising from TNE activity was being kept under review as the area increased in scope.

Court had received a paper on the 2014/15 University Budget and financial forecasts, containing additional information requested by the Finance Committee at its meeting on 28 May, together with a commentary thereon provided by the Committee. Court noted details including: the main areas of investments and details about how these proposed investments would drive progress against the University’s strategic objectives; a sensitivity analysis for the next 2-3 years including details of mitigation and containment of risk; information/analysis on the growth planned in fee income; key assumptions; variations since 2013/14; and surplus trends.

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 equated to statutory accounting surpluses of £2.2m, £9.2m and £12.3m in the same three-year period.

Court noted that the biggest challenge for the University in the next 2-3 years would be to
continue to invest in estates improvements and in the academic base, while achieving a level of operating surplus which would allow financing of the planned estates development. This was also in the context of the sector as a whole being affected by higher pension contributions and static public funding. The financial forecast indicated areas for income generation to offset these aspects, with a balanced investment in academic staff to safeguard student:staff ratios and the student experience. It was noted that fixed costs were high, therefore small movements could result in significant cost differences.

Court received an update on the capital plan to 2017/18. Priorities in the plan would be adjusted in the light of the Estate Strategy, and all capital projects would be built into a cash-flow projection when the Estate Strategy, which was currently being developed, was considered by Court in October. The strategy would set out the framework against which future capital plans would be developed, and would be underpinned by proven business cases for all projects. £108m had been previously approved by Court, with £109m in the present plan.

A new planning cycle would be starting over the summer, with a timetable for development of the resulting Strategy noted by Court. Court would continue to be kept informed on progress.

Ken Brown, chair of the Finance Committee, thanked Professor Juster for the work undertaken in providing additional information since the Finance Committee meeting. Court noted that future budgets would be presented in the context of a more strategic approach to cost saving, including the methodology for efficiency savings, that the budgets would include voids and ensure sustainability, and that Finance Committee would be informed of major assumptions and pressures as the budget was formulated.

Court approved the 2014/15 Budget and four year financial forecasts, and approved the Capital Plan noting that further details on all funded capital projects would be provided in October. Court thanked Professor Juster and his colleagues for their work on these areas.

CRT/2013/51. Report from the Principal

CRT/2013/51.1 SFC Grant Award and Dumfries Regional Outcome Agreement

Court noted a summary of 2014-15 funding as recently advised by the SFC. The total Teaching and Research allocation had risen by 0.6% to £143.19 m, an increase of £912,000 on 2013-14.

Court also noted the Dumfries Consolidated Outcome Agreement and strategic vision: 2014-15 to 2016-17, and that funding for the University in this area would not be affected by other institutions’ approach to their Agreements.

CRT/2013/51.2 Universities Superannuation Scheme USS

At the last meeting, Court had heard that Universities UK had responded collectively to the engagement paper issued by the USS Board, based on consultation meetings with universities and other USS employers. USS was 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. It was intended to complete the valuation process and agree a financial management plan for the scheme by the end of 2014, and therefore Court would be updated more fully in the autumn. During the summer months there would be discussions between UUK and UCU on the elements of the financial management plan.

CRT/2013/51.3 University Rankings
Court noted details of recent University rankings tables.

**CRT/2013/51.4 Appointment of Vice-Principal/Head of College of Science & Engineering**

Professor Muffy Calder, Professor of Computing Science, would 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, Professor Calder would take up her post on 1 January 2015. Professor David Fearn would take on the role of Acting Head of College for the intervening period.

**CRT/2013/51.5 International and National Developments**

Court noted a number of recent initiatives including the signature of Memoranda of Understanding with international partners.

**CRT/2013/51.6 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/2013/52. Report from the Secretary of Court**

**CRT/2013/52.1 Socially Responsible Investment Policy – Fossil Fuel**

At the February meeting, Court had approved the setting up of a working group to consider representations submitted by the Glasgow University Climate Action Society (GUCAS), via the SRC, for the University to divest from fossil fuel industry companies in accordance with the University’s Policy on Socially Responsible Investment (SRIP). The working group had 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 had met on 16 May to consider the document provided by GUCAS and to hear representations from four of its members. Since then, the group had contacted the Investment Advisory Committee IAC for its views on potential divestment in fossil fuel extractors (oil/gas/coal extraction), which was the area which the GUCAS members who attended the meeting had clarified was the focus of the campaign. Court heard that IAC members had expressed a range of views; if there was a consensus, it was that divestment should be over a lengthy period, and that the University might expect there to be a small reduction in portfolio returns.

The working group had itself also considered that divestment should be over a lengthy period; and that a modest risk to financial returns existed. The group had however noted that one of the University’s two brokers currently placed less than 5% of its investment portfolio with the fossil fuel industry. The level of investment by the fossil fuel industry in the University in terms of research funding and donations from the industry was small. The conclusion of the Working Group had been that it supported the ethical case for divesting from the fossil fuel extraction industry, that it recognised this would involve a modest risk to the financial return on the University’s investments, and that it believed that this risk could be effectively managed by divesting over a substantial period of time. It had made
recommendations to Court accordingly.

At the meeting, Court noted from the working group’s members that the case for climate change being a fact had been taken as made, that the group had been strongly persuaded by the quality of the arguments presented by the GUCAS, and that for the University to take a lead in the area of disinvestment from the fossil fuel extraction industry would be a positive symbolic step. It would also see the University taking a lead as an early supporter of the proposal, which it was understood was being considered by a number of institutions worldwide. While it had not received formal representations from bodies that were opposed to what GUCAS was suggesting, the group had considered potential downsides, in particular the potential loss of income both from investments and funding, but had concluded that on balance it would recommend progressive disinvestment and that instructions should be given to fund managers to this effect.

In discussion, mixed views were expressed by Court members. Concerns were raised as to whether alternative arguments had been examined as part of the process; Court heard in response to this point that details of University funding from the fossil fuel extraction industry had been sought and the IAC had been consulted for its views. Reference was made to the terms of the SRIP, namely that “the key criterion against which specific cases would be considered would be whether the activity complained of and substantiated by the concerned group, was wholly contrary to the University’s value systems either as reflected in the Mission Statement or the Strategic Plan or in regard to wider issues of social, environmental and humanitarian concern”; it was questioned whether this criterion could be said to be the case here, for example in the context of the University recently having recently approved a gas-powered Combined Heat & Power system. Against this, reference was made to the University’s commitment to carbon reduction via its Carbon Management Plan. It was also confirmed that the terms of the SRIP had indeed been considered by group, and reflected in its recommendation that a phased disinvestment take place, the decision having been taken that the GUCAS proposal did not fit neatly on one side or the other of the criterion, but that environmental damage was nevertheless a key challenge for the current times: it was argued that the idea of not reducing the impact of fossil fuel extraction in this wider global context could indeed be considered as ‘wholly contrary’ to the University’s value systems.

Court heard views that ensuring the maximum returns from investments was vital for funding scholarships. The University’s portfolio could be negatively affected by the proposed disinvestment, since few companies had such good yields as the fossil fuel companies in question, and were also riskier investments. It might also be difficult properly to clarify which companies could be classified as extractors. Such companies might also in time take the lead in developing alternatives to fossil fuels. Concerns were also expressed about the effect on University funding, although it was noted that the present level of both philanthropic donations and direct research funding from the industry was small. It was commented that the reverse might in fact apply, that other companies might be positively encouraged to support the University if it disinvested in the fossil fuel industry, since the move could add value to the University’s attractiveness to funders.

It was agreed that more information was needed to inform a decision, and that as such the matter should be reviewed further by the working group over the summer, with specific proposals to be presented and discussed further at the October 2014 meeting of Court. In particular, information would be provided to link the GUCAS concerns about investments in the fossil fuel industry to the SRIP criterion of this being ‘wholly contrary’ to the University’s value system. Greater clarity would also be provided on the potential risks and impact on University income, which needed to be quantified as best as possible, and should include consideration of the potential difficulty in accepting funding from fossil fuel extraction.
companies in the future. Individual Court members were invited to submit details of any other points for consideration by the group.

It was noted that the basic case about climate change being a fact would not be re-considered by the group and would be taken as given.

**CRT/2013/52.2 SRC Motion – Conflict Minerals**

The Students’ Representative Council had 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.

It was agreed that the matter would be carried forward to the October meeting of Court.

**CRT/2013/52.3 Code of Practice for Student Bodies**

Following the review of the GUU undertaken in the summer of 2013, it had been 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. Court was required to keep under revision the Code of Practice for student bodies, therefore the opportunity had also been taken to update the Code (including removing references to bodies no longer in existence) and correct some typographical errors. In addition, the Code had been updated to delete the 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 was made to the University Complaints Procedure introduced in the summer of 2013.

The revised Code had been drawn up in consultation with the student bodies.

Court approved the revised Code of Practice.

**CRT/2013/52.4 Ordinance on Court composition**

Following the 2 May EGM of Court, Ordinance 206 on Court’s composition had been submitted to the Privy Council. Court members would be kept updated over the summer.

After the draft Ordinance had been submitted to the Privy Council on 8 May, the Privy Council had received two representations, to which it had sought a response from the University. One representation had been from the Convener of the General Council Business Committee (GCBC) on behalf of the Committee; a reply had been provided to the Privy Council 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 other submission had been from the Convener of the GCBC, writing on behalf of himself and 9 other members of the GCBC and included some matters that had already been raised by the GCBC and some others that had not. A response to this submission had been drafted by the Convener of Court and agreed with David Newall and Duncan Ross before being sent to the Privy Council.

An email had also been received from the Convener of the GCBC raising further concerns. Court had received a copy of the email. The Secretary of Court would draft a reply to this correspondence, and share it for comment with the members of the Governance working group.

**CRT/2013/52.5 RUK Fees**

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

Court noted a commentary from the Director of the Recruitment and International Office, on these two points. The advice was that the University should not offer a discount to the small number of RUK students who spent just three years at Glasgow. It was agreed that further information on the background to this advice would be provided to the October meeting.

Regarding year-abroad language students, it had been 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 would be kept under close review.

CRT/2013/52.6 Court Strategy Day/Campus Estates Strategy Court working group

A Court strategy day would be held on 30 September, with part of its focus on the Campus Estates Strategy, and also on the recent Staff Attitude Survey.

Ahead of 30 September, a Court working group would 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.

CRT/2013/52.7 Nominations Committee Business

(i) Court and Court committee vacancies

Depending on the outcome of the Privy Council’s decision on Ordinance 206, recruitment would 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 would be kept informed. The Nominations Committee would oversee this process and make recommendations to Court.

Nominations Committee would be mindful that there would 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 was also a vacancy on the HR Committee arising from a non-Court lay member, Stephen McCafferty, having demitted office. Nominations Committee would make a recommendation to Court in relation to a replacement.

There remained a vacant external position on the Remuneration Committee.

Once new members of Court were in post, Court would be invited to appoint two new members to the Nominations Committee, to fill the vacancy that had arisen 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, would continue for two years from 1 August 2014 following the end of his first 4-year term of office.

**CRT/2013/52.8 Employee Representative on Court**

Margaret Anne McParland had been reappointed as Employee Representative on Court and would serve a 4-year term from 1 August 2014.

**CRT/2013/52.9 Appointments of Heads of Research Institute and School**

**College of MVLS**

*Institute of Molecular, Cell and Systems Biology*

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

**CRT/2013/52.10 SRC Elections**

The following candidates had been successful in the Spring 2014 SRC elections and would take up sabbatical officer posts on 1st July 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Breffni O'Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Education</td>
<td>Cal Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Student Support</td>
<td>Liam King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Student Activities</td>
<td>Gin Masiulyte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRT/2013/52.11 Student Unions – Constitutional Changes**

As agreed at the meeting of Court on 16 April, David Newall had approved changes to the constitution of the GUU, as endorsed by the GUU Management Board on 9 May. In addition, on Court’s behalf, he had approved changes to the constitution of the Queen Margaret Union. These were minor in nature, except in respect of Equality & Diversity, where the Union’s commitments were now set out much more fully than before.

**CRT/2013/53. Reports of Court Committees**

**CRT/2013/53.1 Finance Committee**

**CRT/2013/53.1.1 Budget 2014/15 and four year forecast**
Finance Committee had expressed concern around the levels of operating surpluses forecast, in particular given the need to generate sufficient operating surpluses to finance investment in the Campus Estates Strategy. Finance Committee had asked that, ahead of its advice to the Court meeting, some further information should be provided. Following provision of consideration of this additional information, Finance Committee had agreed to recommend the budget and forecasts to Court.

Court had approved the 2014/15 Budget and four year financial forecasts, under item CRT/2013/50. Budget 2014/15 and Financial Forecasts and KPIs.

CRT/2013/53.1.2 Capital Plan
Finance Committee had agreed to recommend the Capital Plan to Court. Court had approved the plan under item CRT/2013/51. Budget 2014/15 and Financial Forecasts and KPIs

CRT/2013/53.1.3 Changes to Financial Reporting Standards / FE HE SORP
Finance Committee had approved recommendations associated with mandatory changes to Financial Reporting Standards which would be introduced from 2015-16.

CRT/2013/53.1.4 CHP project
Finance Committee had 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 had 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 had 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.

CRT/2013/53.1.5 CapEx applications
Court noted that Finance Committee had approved CapEx applications relating to: £2.66m of investment to continue the environmental improvement works in the main library; £250k of funding towards new infrastructure supporting a series of future developments in aerodynamic technologies; £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, on the conditional basis that options for cost reduction would be explored and reported back to the Committee; underwriting of the current funding gap of £1.2m associated with the development of Phase II Imaging at the South Glasgow Hospitals campus; £673k of investment to increase availability of large teaching venues in order to relieve space pressure on campus.

CRT/2013/53.1.7 Financial reports
Court noted an Overview of Performance and a debtors report as at 30 April 2014.

CRT/2013/53.2 Audit Committee
The Committee had received an update on the pensions schemes; reports on recent internal audits of House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) licences, Language Centre procedures, and
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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 had recorded its thanks to Kevin Sweeney, who was attending his final meeting, for his chairmanship of the Committee.

The report was noted.

**CRT/2013/53.1 Estates Committee**

**CRT/2013/53.1.1 Estates Strategy**

Court noted progress made on the Estates Strategy and its associated work streams.

**CRT/2013/53.1.2 Capital Plan**

Court noted the update to the plan, which it had approved under item CRT/2013/50. Budget 2014/15 and Financial Forecasts and KPIs

**CRT/2013/53.1.3 CapEx Applications**

Court noted and endorsed Estates Committee’s approval of the lease terms and CapEx for: Tay House for the relocation of part of University Services; and Olympia Building for the creation of a Social Sciences Hub. It was noted that the matter of the cost of parking arrangements for staff who would be working at Tay House had been the subject of discussion at Estates and Finance Committees.

Court noted and endorsed 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; LM13/605 Library Environmental Improvement Works (Level 3) in the sum of £2.66m; South Glasgow Hospital – Phase 2 Imaging underwriting funding gap risk of £1.2m in the event of a shortfall; and CP13/570 Supersonic Wind Tunnel in the sum of £0.25m

Court noted and endorsed Estates Committee’s approval, which Court noted had been jointly given with the Finance Committee, for the increase in budget from £13.383m to £15.345m to allow acceptance of the tender for the Stevenson/GUU project.

**CRT/2013/53.4 Human Resources Committee**

The HR Director had provided an update to the HR Committee regarding 2014/15 pay negotiations; staff survey 2014 outcome highlights, on which matter Court noted that more detailed outcomes would be disseminated across the institution; relocation of some University Services areas; the 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 had received presentations from Professor Steve Beaumont providing an update on the Researcher Development Committee; and the Internal Communications Manager, Phil Taylor, providing an update on the Internal Communications Strategy.
The Committee had 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.

The report was noted.

**CRT/2013/53.5 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee**

The Committee had received reports from Occupational Health and the Safety & Environmental Protection Services; and had noted details of a report on the Employee Assistance Programme, which provided staff counselling and specialist advice on its website. The Committee had also received an updated Lone Workers policy for review.

The report was noted.

**CRT/2013/53.6 Remuneration Committee**

The report was noted.

Court approved a recommendation from the Committee that its remit be amended as follows (deletions marked, and additions highlighted in bold), noting that this had arisen from an audit of the committee’s operation, undertaken by the University’s internal auditors.

**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 for a member of the Senior Management Group.*

**Membership**

The Convener of Court
three lay members of Court, one of whom should convene Remuneration Committee
CRT/2013/54. Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate held on 5 June 2014

The report was noted. Senate had received a report from the EGM of Court held on 2 May, a briefing on the 2014/15 budget, an update on the development of the Estate Strategy, and reports from the Research Planning & Strategy Committee and the Education Policy & Strategy Committee. Senate had discussed options relating to the future appointment of Senate Assessors on Court.

CRT/2013/55. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2013/56. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 8 October 2014 at 2pm in the Senate Room.
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Principal’s Report

Items A : For Discussion

1. Universities Superannuation Scheme USS

At the last meeting, Court heard that USS was 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. At that point it was intended to complete the valuation process and agree the Plan by the end of 2014, with discussions being held over the summer months between UUK and UCU on the Plan’s elements.

I will update Court further on the national position, at the meeting in October.

The University’s own submission to the consultation process is provided with the Secretary of Court’s report.

2. Student Admissions including RUK

Admissions to the University for 2014/15, for Undergraduate and Postgraduate (PGT/PGR), Home, RUK and International students, are summarised in Annex 1. The key points to note are as follows:

Undergraduate

Non RUK (Scottish & EU Admissions)

The drive to reduce the number of fees only students and to recruit to the SFC fundable target has been more successful this year than last with an extremely good outcome. In addition, a tighter admissions policy for EU applicants has also proved to be successful, insuring control over numbers, while attracting and admitting extremely high calibre students.

MD20/MD 40

28.8% of the total number of students who are domiciled in Scotland and who have been admitted are from postcodes classified by the Scottish Government as areas of Multiple Deprivation (MD), with MD20 being the most deprived areas.
Although this year’s intake fell short of our SFC fundable target (833) by 53 students, Glasgow continues to increase its proportion of widening access students. That said, actions will continue to be taken to improve our recruitment from these postcodes for the 2014/15 Admissions cycle.

**RUK Admissions**

RUK student intake (813) is approximately at the same level as last year which is a very positive outcome given the increased levels of competition for RUK students across the UK.

**International**

All Colleges have exceeded their international UG targets.

**Postgraduate PGT/PGR**

Projections for Home PGT/PGR numbers are included in the paper, though as Court members will appreciate, the registration process is not yet complete and so actual numbers are likely to change.

Similarly, final figures for International PGT/PGR are not known, but there is a predicted reduction in PGT numbers (48) over 2013, driven by the decision of the SMG and the Adam Smith Business School to reduce intake numbers to ensure space and teaching capacity were not compromised and so damaging to the student experience.

There is a predicted growth in PGR numbers (31) over 2013.

**Items B: For Information**

3. National Student Survey NSS / University Rankings

In August, the University achieved its higher ever result in the NSS, with results showing that over 91% of students were satisfied with the quality of their course, a significant increase of 2 percentage points on last year’s survey. This puts the University second equal in the Russell Group and second outright in Scotland in terms of student satisfaction. It also puts the University well above the sector average rates for UK universities of 86% and above the Scottish sector average of 87%.

Particular highlights include: 100% satisfaction rates in four subject areas: Dentistry; Geology; Molecular Biology, Biophysics and Biochemistry and Zoology; Dentistry, Geology and Teacher Training outright top in the UK; top or joint top in Scotland in 13 separate subject areas.

The NSS seeks the opinions of c265,000 final-year students at Higher Education Institutions across the UK. Students are asked to respond to over twenty questions on topics such as teaching, personal development, assessment and feedback, learning resources and the management of their University.

In my June report, I provided details about the latest UK league tables. Since then, the annual QS World Rankings have been published. The University was ranked equal 55th, a small drop from last year’s 51st position. In the THE World University Rankings we have risen from 117th last year to 94th this year. This is the first year that we have appeared in the top 100 Universities in both the QS and the THE league tables.

We have also received Sunday Times/Times University League Table 2015 which places us 26th, again a small drop, from last year’s 25th. As advised last year, this latter table merges two previously separate
league tables. We remain 3rd place in Scotland (behind St Andrews and Edinburgh) and are 18th in the Russell Group.

Along with 5 other institutions, the University has been shortlisted for the Times Higher Education “University of the Year” award for 2014. We had also been shortlisted in three other categories: Outstanding Support for Early Career Researchers; International Collaboration of the Year; and Outstanding Contribution to Innovation and Technology. The winners will be announced at a ceremony in November.

4. New arrangements for SMG & PAG

As Court members will know, at the moment SMG meets once per month, and PAG once per week, other than the week of an SMG. The membership of both groups is essentially the same, with the exception of the Deputy Secretary of Court who attends PAG meetings. In broad terms, SMG was set up to consider key strategic and policy issues with PAG positioned to handle ongoing business. The size of agendas and time scheduled for SMG and PAG meetings reflect this different emphasis and approach.

I have been conscious for some time however that we may not have fully exploited the benefits and potential of restructuring and the opportunity it presents to develop a more inclusive and less centralised approach to shaping and driving the university forward as a consequence of the reduction of over 40 departments to 19 Schools and 7 Research Institutes. This more compact structure offers greater opportunities to open up direct channels of communication between Heads of School, Directors of Research Institutes and Senior Management, notwithstanding the critical lines of communication within Colleges, their Management Groups and Schools/Institutes. My position was crystallised following feedback from the last staff survey which identified issues around the SMG’s effective engagement with the University. I have therefore decided to reconstitute PAG, expanding its membership to include the following:

• Members of SMG;
• Heads of School;
• Directors of Research Institutes;
• College Secretaries;
• the SRC President;
• University Services Leadership Team and the Director of Development & Alumni.

The new PAG will meet once per month (the first meeting is scheduled for 20 October) and will be a forum for communication and open discussion. By drawing in the Schools, RIs, University Services and student representation, I hope we can begin to build a more effective, inclusive and informed University community, and one that has a shared understating of our strategic aims and how together we can best maximise the potential of the University.

SMG will continue to have one formal meeting as now and two less formal meetings per month (SMG roundtable) to carry forward ongoing business in keeping with the old PAG.

5. Update on Transnational education (TNE) developments

University of Glasgow Singapore-Singapore Institute of Technology
In September the University hosted Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) President Tan Thiam Soon and discussed the present status and future of the partnership. Presently, the UoG School of Engineering and the School of Computing Science offer a range of programmes with SIT:
• **BEng (Honours) in Aeronautical Engineering** and **BEng (Honours) in Aerospace Systems**
  (delivered on the campus of Singapore Polytechnic)

• **BEng (Honours) in Mechanical Design Engineering** and **BEng (Honours) in Mechatronics**
  (delivered on campus at Ngee Ann Polytechnic)

• **BSc (Honours) Computing Science** (on the campus of Republic Polytechnic)

Partners agree that these programmes are of notable success, and President Tan stressed that UoG remains a partner of choice for SIT moving forward. This year, SIT achieved full autonomous status and will now offer its own degree programmes. Given these new conferral powers, and the mid-point review of the current agreement at the end of the 2015 academic year, partners will look to develop cooperatively a new agreement based on the development of new joint degree programmes and the transitioning of existing dual degree programmes into joint programmes. In principle, this will mean UoG is responsible for 50% of a two-year programme leading to BEng and a three-year programme leading to MEngTech. The arrangement would not disadvantage UoG financially. Where practical, SIT would like to complete the conversion of existing programmes to joint degrees for the academic year 2016-17. However, transitioning in 2017 and beyond would be acceptable where this better fits the needs of both parties.

SIT will propose a set of future programmes in time for the SIT graduation in October. Programmes provisionally discussed to date include joint awards in:

• **Civil Engineering**
• **Sensors & Telematics with Mechatronics**
• **MRO Engineering (Maintenance, repair and overhaul) & Aero Engineering**

Finally, SIT is scheduled to open its own campus in 2019 and partners see this as a positive for the continuing development of possibilities for joint research and student exchange.

**UoG-UESTC Joint Education Programme**

The UoG School of Engineering and the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC) in Chengdu operate a **BEng (Honours) Electronics and Electrical Engineering** Joint Education Programme (JEP). This programme is in its second year of operation and the student intake this year reached the per-year capacity of 240 students.

Last month UESTC Colleagues, including University Chairman Wang Zhiqiang, visited Glasgow to discuss a proposal to establish a new Joint Education Institute (JEI) based on three new dual degree undergraduate programmes:

• **Microelectronics with Electronics and Electrical Engineering**
• **Telecommunications with Electronics and Electrical Engineering**
• **Biomedical Engineering**

Based on the success of the current JEP, the Ministry of Education (MoE) is encouraging UESTC and UoG to apply for a JEI. Assuming UoG internal approval is given before the end of December 2014, partners aim to achieve Chinese MoE approval by March 2015. The current JEP would be consolidated in the new JEI at a subsequent date so that it does not negatively affect the maximum student recruitment targets likely to be approved by the MoE for a new JEI.
It was noted that a JEI will allow the partnership a greater degree of autonomy when it comes to the management and creation of new programmes. It is also envisaged that a JEI will allow greater possibility for collaborative research and student exchange.

While working to establish the JEI, partners will continue to improve the existing JEP, including working with the UoG Language Centre to improve English language training for JEP students as well as implementing mobility options for UoG-UESTC JEP students, including study abroad and 2+2 programme options.

**University of Glasgow-Nankai University**
The University of Glasgow-Nankai University Joint Graduate School is to be based on three taught International Masters Programmes:

- **International Masters International Relations (CoSS)**
- **International Masters Urban and Regional Planning (CoSS)**
- **International Masters Environmental Management (CoSE – with SIS Dumfries)**

Our initial plans were to launch the graduate school (formally a JEI) in Session 2014-15, but scrutiny by the MoE has been lengthy and it is likely that if the MoE approves the JEI in early October, we will aim for a first intake in 2015-16. Nankai Provost Professor Zhu Guanglei will visit Glasgow in early October, and two weeks later, I along with Professor Anne Anderson will visit Nankai University. At both visits discussions will be held on how to best take the partnership forward.

Beyond the Joint Graduate School, the two institutions have a history of successful collaboration. The University of Glasgow Confucius Institute is a partnership with Nankai University, and the partners run a successful 2+1+1+1 arrangement in Urban Studies. Additionally, during the upcoming visit to Nankai, partners will sign a MoA which will send Nankai graduates to the School of Interdisciplinary Studies’ Tourism, Heritage and Development MSc programme. Finally, Professor Jane Duckett, the new International Dean for East Asia, will soon work across the university to both establish and promote collaborative research with Nankai.

**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**

- 17 July, welcomed delegates to the Boyd Orr Centre for Population and Ecosystem Health Conference, and attended an evening Reception at which the Leader of the City Council also spoke. The Boyd Orr Centre was winner of the Queen’s Anniversary Prize 2013.

- The University is the lead for both AHRC Doctoral Training Partnership (DTP) and the Scottish Graduate School for the Arts and Humanities (SGSAH). I met with staff of the SGSAH (1 August) to hear their future plans for this new and exciting venture.

- 29 August: attended SFC Board meeting which included a workshop on new SFC strategic plan.
Formally welcomed over 2,000 delegates to the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) Conference and introduced the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning, Michael Russell, MSP who officially opened the conference. The ECPR, which ran from 4 – 6th September, is a major conference and it is to the University’s credit that it was able to host it this year. I also attended the conference dinner on the 5th.

9-11 September attended the UUK Annual conference and in addition to leading a session on Pensions, I took part as a Panel member in the discussion session entitled: Philanthropy: is it for all universities?

Attended Inspiring City Awards dinner on 11 September. The University had been shortlisted for an ‘Inspiring City Award’ in the Industry and Business category, for the impact of the developments at the New South Glasgow Hospital.

Joined with the Head of College, MVLS to host a dinner (14 September) for the CEO Illumina, a company which specializes in innovative technologies for studying genetic variation and function.

The University has been shortlisted for the THE’s University of the Year Award. Before a final decision is taken the Editor visits each of the shortlisted Universities. He came to Glasgow on 17 September, and he was hosted by the Senior Vice-Principal. I gave an introductory presentation on the University which was followed by a brief tour of key areas relevant to our case, where he had the opportunity to meet and talk to colleagues and students.

With MVLS, I hosted a visit for the Medical Research Council (MRC).

On 23 September, I met the Head of Sustainability, Technology Strategy Board (TSB)- now Innovation UK, and a group associated with the Future City Catapult. They were visiting the University to learn more about our academic work around the Future Cities agenda.

Attended a dinner at the RSE for Scottish Principals who are Fellows of the RSE to meet President Elect, Dame Jocelyn Bell Burnell.

On 30 September I will attend the launch of the Urban Big Data Centre and welcome guests and the keynote speaker Sir Alan Wilson. This will be followed by a dinner in the Lodging.

### 6.2 International Activities

- 17 July: I took part in the signing of an MoA with MVLS and the University of Malaysia (UPM) and attended a welcome meeting for Ugandan visitors from Kyambogo University.

- 25 July: I took part in a video conference with Hong Kong set up by SFC involving six Vice-Chancellors and other various senior people joining from Hong Kong.

- 25 July: I was invited and attended a dinner in Glasgow hosted by the President of Singapore, Dr Tony Tan Keng Yam. The dinner was attended by business and academic leaders.
• 27-29 July: I attended Santander Universities 3rd Global Vice Chancellors conference in Rio de
Janiero, Brazil

• 3 September: I hosted dinner in the Lodging for Professor Tan Thiam Soon, SIT President, & SIT
delegation. They were visiting the University to discuss potential development in course
provision between Glasgow and SIT.

• 18 September: I met with the VP Internationalisation from the University of Melbourne.

• Also on 18 September, I welcomed the Chancellor of BUCT (Beijing University of Chemical
Technology). He was visiting the University mainly to discuss articulation and research in
Chemistry and Engineering.

• I met (23 September) a group of around 30 University of Malaysia, potential PhD students who
were visiting the University as part of a fact finding trip to UK.

• 24 September: I hosted a dinner in the Lodging for the Chairman/Chancellor of UESTC.

• On 2 October I will host a dinner for Professor Zhu Guanglei, Provost of the University of
Nankai.

• On 6 October I will be hosting a meeting with the Asia Scotland Institute and Principal of the
University of Edinburgh.

6.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

• UUK Board meeting London (27 June).

• University Sector Advisory Forum (2 July).

• Chambers of Commerce Business Leaders' Event (4 July), Glasgow.

• Met with a representative of the Barcapel Foundation (4 July) to discuss potential support and
advice on Campus Development campaign.

• Russell Group Lunch with Chuka Umunna, Shadow Secretary of State for Business, Innovation
and Skills, and Liam Byrne, Shadow Minister for Higher Education in London (8 July).

• Delivered a welcome to the Association of Commonwealth Universities Conference (14 July).

• 16 July, I met the new Italian Consul General, Carlo Perrotta.

• Welcomed Fiona Hyslop MSP, Scottish Government Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External
Affairs, as the opening speaker to the conference LGBTI Human Rights in the Commonwealth,
(18 July).

• Attended the Official Opening of Scotland House & Team Scotland Flagbearer Ceremony,
Commonwealth Games 21st July 2014. The event was attended by the First Minister, Alex
Salmond, Councillor Gordon Matheson, Leader of Glasgow City Council and Michael Cavanagh,
Chairman of Commonwealth Games Scotland. Attended the Commonwealth Games Opening Ceremony (23 July).

- 22–23 July the University was the venue for the prestigious Commonwealth Business Conference. I participated as a panelist in Smart Cities – global opportunities session, and gave a brief interview to promote the work of SDI/Scottish Enterprise. In addition to meeting with a number of business leaders, I was able to briefly meet senior members of the UK and Scottish Cabinets.


- On 24 July I gave the welcome to a Commonwealth Future Cities Business Networking Event.

- I had dinner with Rt Hon Greg Clark MP, Minister for Universities and Science (24 July), and Rt Hon David Willetts MP, his predecessor.

- I attended a civic reception to celebrate the successful delivery of the Commonwealth Games (31 July), hosted by the Scotland Office.

- As part of the University’s engagement with the Referendum debate and our aim to reflect all sides of the argument, we hosted a Reform Scotland/Policy Scotland talk by Michael Russell MSP (21 August).

- 26-27 August: I attended the CASE Europe conference, held at the Edinburgh International Conference Centre. I chaired an Interactive Leadership Panel Discussion (Schools Track), and a Dragon's Den foundation session. I also attended CASE Europe Volunteers Dinner and 20th Anniversary Celebration.

- On 27 August I hosted a lunch with Xavier Michel from KAUST (King Abdullah University of Science & Technology) Saudi Arabia.

- Along with senior colleagues, I met with Scottish Enterprise and the Senior Director of Innovation and Enterprise, the Managing Director of Operations and the Business Infrastructure Director (1 September).

- I took part in teleconference with NCUB (4 September) and on 1 October will attend NCUB Board of Directors - Strategy Session in London.

- I hosted a dinner for the Australian Commissioner of the Productivity Commission (17 September).

- 24 September I gave a welcome address to the SCDI Executive Committee who were on campus for their Executive meeting.

- I attended the Scottish Funding Council - Strategic Development Meeting (26 September).

- On 6 October I will attend a dinner with the Committee of Scottish Chairs. Following the review of Universities Scotland's governance, the Convener of US and Chair of the Committee of
Scottish Chairs agreed that it would be useful for Principals and Chairs to have an annual opportunity for collective discussion.

- As Chair, Universities UK, Employers Pension Forum and USS Group, I continue to engage in various ways with the future of pension provision. I will chair a USS EPF meeting in London (7 October).

6.4. Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

- Graduations took place from June 26 to 4 July at Gilmorehill and at Dumfries on 9 July. In addition to graduating our students we gave honorary degrees to Professor Giuseppe Mancia, Professor Sir Richard Trainor, The Rt Hon Sir Geoffrey Palmer, Professor Iain Stewart, Professor Robert Boyd, Captain David MacKay, Professor Anne Glover.

- Attended the Stevenson Lecture in Citizenship and welcomed the speaker, Lesley Riddoch.

- Attended the Mackintosh Architecture launch and dinner 17 July.

- Attended and presented an update on the University at the General Council Half-yearly Meeting (19 July).


- Delivered two Open day welcomes on 3 September.

- Provided a welcome at the first of the Ceilidhs for International Students (8 September). Three Ceilidhs were run as part of the international students' Orientation Programme.

- Held a reception in the Lodging (17 September) to celebrate the University’s successful ELIR outcome, and to thank colleagues for the part they played in securing such a positive outcome.

- On the evening of 18 September I spoke at our International Staff Welcome Event which took place in the Hunterian.

- Attended and provided a presentation at a Development and Alumni Office Afternoon tea event (24 September) for supporters who had indicated their intention to make a Bequest to the University.

- I will be running a Principal's surgery on 3 October.

- I continued monthly meeting with the SRC sabbaticals.

7. Senior Management Group business

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

SMG Meeting of 24 June 2014

- Report on Staff survey
- Proposal for research review process
- Research Centres: Approval of Centre Application and Form for Centre Status
• Undergraduate Admissions Report
• Strategic Proposal for Course Pricing 2015/16
• Brand Messaging for Student Recruitment
• Report on Complaints Handling – Third Quarter Report

**SMG Meeting of 1 August 2014**
• Postgraduate Admissions
• Erasmus Funding
• Marketing Strategy Group Update
• Update on Genomic and Precision Medicine Scotland Meet
• Media Activity Report

**SMG meeting of 20 August 2014**
• Admissions update report
• International Outgoing Exchanges
• Estates Business Cases for Discussion
• Strategic Planning
• NSS survey results
• British University in Dubai
• GIC & Language Centre joint proposal for language teaching
• Fulbright – Glasgow Visiting Professors Update
UNDERGRADUATE

Non-RUK (Scottish and EU) Admissions

The Non-RUK intake target of 3117 for 2014 represents a reduction of 13% from 2013 when the comparable target was 3588.

EU student intake has dropped from 738 in 2013, to 621 in 2014 (117 students – 15.8% reduction), and Scottish student intake has dropped from 2859 in 2013 to 2553 (306 students – 10.7% reduction).

The EU reduction has been achieved despite a continued growth in applications from EU countries, from 5978 in 2013 to 6152 in 2014. This reduction is evidence that the tighter admissions policy for EU applicants has had an impact. Significantly tighter controls have been introduced for 2014/15 Admissions Cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 Registrations</th>
<th>2014 SFC Fundable Target</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; ENG</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>+57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY TOTAL</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>+57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MD 20/40

A total of 2,710 students have been admitted who are domiciled in Scotland. Within this total, 780 (28.8%) are from postcodes classified by the Scottish Government as areas of Multiple Deprivation (MD), with MD20 being the most deprived areas. The table below indicates that 394 students have been admitted from MD20 postcodes and 386 from MD40 postcodes.

Whilst 28.8% is a credible performance, this fell short of our SFC fundable target (833) by 53 students. Actions have been taken to improve our recruitment from these postcodes for the 2014/15 Admissions cycle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MD20 INTAKE</th>
<th>MD40 INTAKE</th>
<th>TOTAL MD INTAKE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL VERSUS TARGET</th>
<th>TOTAL SCOTTISH INTAKE</th>
<th>MD INTAKE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; ENG</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>+72</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY TOTAL</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RUK Admissions (England, Northern Ireland and Wales Fee Paying Students)**

Despite increased competition across the UK in 2014, the University’s RUK student intake (813) is approximately the same as in 2013, with nearly 150 students being admitted through RUK Clearing.

The 554 target represented a minimum target to be achieved with the Colleges having internal financial targets totalling circa 750 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 Registrations</th>
<th>2014 Minimum Intake Target</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>+153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; ENG</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY TOTAL</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>+259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International**

The undergraduate International Forecast (Plan) includes the New Student Intake, Continuing Students and Study Abroad Students. Accordingly, the table below summarises each of these elements individually and compares the total Student Cohort for 2014 with the Forecast. This data includes GIC students who have progressed to the University in September 2014, but excludes students from SIT and UESTC (these are excluded from both the student intake numbers and the 2014 Forecast). The table indicates that all Colleges have exceeded their international undergraduate targets.
### 2014 New Student Registrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2014 New Student Registrations</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Study Abroad Students</th>
<th>Total 2014 International Student Cohort</th>
<th>2014 Forecast</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; ENG</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>+47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY TOTAL</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>+107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT

The tables below summarises the predicted PGT registrations for 2014. Forecasts (Plans) are not prepared for Home students, but the International table shows the predicted intake versus forecast. At the time of writing this report, the registration process is not yet complete. This data represents a conservative outlook of the final position, and whilst the international outlooks are all close to plan it is hoped that the minor shortfalls portrayed in the tables may close over the next couple of weeks.

### HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2014 Predicted Registrations</th>
<th>2014 Forecast</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; ENG</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY TOTAL</td>
<td>2330</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INTERNATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 Predicted Registrations</th>
<th>2014 Forecast</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; ENG</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY TOTAL</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH

The tables below summarise the predicted PGR registrations during the 2014/15 academic year. The predictions include a significant number of ‘in-year’ registrations, as the majority of PGR students do not commence their studies/research in September/October.

The international Forecasts (Plans) include continuing PGR students, hence the table below separately analyses the ‘New Student Registrations’ from ‘Continuing Students’. Forecasts (Plans) are not prepared for Home students.

## HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 Predicted New Student Registrations</th>
<th>2014 Forecast</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; ENG</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY TOTAL</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Career</th>
<th>2014 Predicted New Student Registrations</th>
<th>Continuing Students</th>
<th>Total Predicted International PGR Registrations</th>
<th>2014 Forecast</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVLS</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; ENG</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY TOTAL</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>+37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF INTERNATIONAL ADMISSIONS – New Student Intakes

The table below summarises the predicted international new student intakes by academic career and provides comparative data for 2013.

The marginal reduction in the PGT intake is driven by the ASBS, where intake this year was deliberately constrained to ensure physical space and teaching capacities were not compromised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Career</th>
<th>2014 Predicted</th>
<th>2013 Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>+55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>+31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Total</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Court - Wednesday 8 October 2014

Report from the Secretary of Court

SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Court Strategy Day

Annex 1 (to follow) is a report on the key points arising from the Strategy Day held on 30 September.

A.2 Ordinance on Composition of Court

As Court members are aware, the Ordinance (with reference 206) did not proceed to the Privy Council in the summer. In July, the Governance Working Group on the Ordinance discussed the matter; details including its advice to Court are at Annex 2. The suggested next steps are included in the paper, and are that:

i) Court on 8 October should agree to withdraw Ordinance 206, and also agree that it would like to take forward a new Ordinance which will address the concerns raised by the Lord Advocate’s Office.

ii) A draft new ordinance should then be sent to the Privy Council for advice so that, before Court consults on the new ordinance, it will have assurance that the Privy Council considers that the new ordinance is legally competent.

A draft is attached at Annex 3 (this includes, for information, a second page showing how the existing ordinance on composition would change).

iii) Subject to having received feedback from the Privy Council, Court should then decide at its December meeting to initiate the statutory consultation process.

Is Court willing to agree this course of action?

A.3 Socially Responsible Investment Policy – Fossil Fuels

Following discussion at the June meeting, the working group was asked to present more fully the case for disinvestment from the Fossil Fuel industry, and to address concerns voiced by Court members.

There was an opportunity for discussion of this matter at the Court Strategy Day on 30 September. Annex 4 contains the working group’s second report (including recommendations) and previous papers on the matter by way of background, for further discussion at the Court meeting.
A.4 Conflict Minerals

At the June meeting, Court heard that the Students’ Representative Council had 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 5. Court agreed to defer discussion on next steps, given that the fossil fuel disinvestment item had not concluded.

As previously advised, 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?

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Nominations Committee Business

The Nominations Committee met on 30 September and agreed that recruitment to ‘external’ lay vacancies on the Audit, HR and Remuneration Committees will be taken forward by advertisement, with recommendations to Court to follow in due course. Recommendations relating to lay Court members filling some Court Committee vacancies, including vacancies on Nominations Committee itself, will also be made.

B.2 Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance

For Court’s information, Annex 6 is the response to a governance questionnaire from the Committee of Scottish Chairs, arising from the Code introduced in July 2013. The CSC has been monitoring implementation by all HEIs.

The Code envisages an annual self-assessment by each governing body of its compliance with the code. A proposal for this will be developed in the current session.

B.3 Ministerial Letter of Guidance to SFC

On 31 July, the Cabinet Secretary for Education issued his annual letter of guidance to the Scottish Funding Council (Annex 7). An item of particular interest to Court is the reference in Paragraph 10 of the letter to improving the gender balance on governing bodies.

B.4 USS Consultation

During the summer, the lay members of the Remuneration Committee agreed the text of a draft response to the Universities UK consultation on USS funding and benefits. The draft was circulated to Court members on 13 August, with comments invited by 31 August. The deadline to respond to UUK was 15 September.

Annex 8 is the University’s response as sent to USS. The overall message is that given the level of scheme deficit, the University agrees that there is a need for reform,
and believes that the proposed changes – including an estimated deficit reduction of £6bn - are the correct way to proceed if USS is to be sustainable into the future.

B.5 RUK Fees

Court may recall that further information on the RUK Fees paper was provided for the June 2014 meeting. There remained a question from Court, asking for further background information relating to the advice that the University would not offer a discount to the small number of RUK students who spent just three years at Glasgow. The Director of RIO has advised that no Scottish competitor institution reduces fees for those Rest of UK (RUK) students completing their degree in three years. For those RUK students entering the University via an Advanced Entry/Faster Route, all would automatically be entitled to the Excellence Scholarship as the entry requirements will be a minimum of 3As at A Level. The three year degree would cost £27k with a guaranteed £3k of financial support built in, therefore reducing the overall cost of the degree to £24k. The only Ordinary degrees that students are admitted to at Glasgow are the five Biological Sciences degrees, where numbers of entrants are very small, therefore the number affected by the cost of a three year degree is minimal. For these reasons it is not considered that the University should reduce fees for those RUK students studying for only three years.

B.6 Court Business 2014/15

Standing Orders for Court are appended at Annex 9. The appendices include details of Court committee dates for this session.

Annex 10 contains the Statement of Primary Responsibilities.

Annex 11 contains the Schedule of Court Business for the coming year, for reference.

The above items are also available on the Court website at http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/courtoffice/universitycourtandcourtmeetings/ along with other resources for Court members.

The attendance lists for meetings of Court and its committees for 2013/14 have been reviewed; there are no outstanding issues to report in connection with this.

B.7 Senate Assessors on Court

As Court is aware, Professor Miles Padgett demitted office following the May Court meeting, given his appointment as Vice Principal. Over the summer, Professor Nicholas Jonsson has stepped down as Senate Assessor wef 1 September; Dr Marie Freel will step down in early November following her appointment to a post outside the University.

Senate will appoint three Assessors to replace the above.

B.8 Honorary Degree Nominations

In line with the previously agreed arrangement with Senate to allow members of Court to submit observations on nominations for honorary degrees, the Clerk of Senate John Briggs will advise Court of the 2014/2015 nominations on a confidential basis. Members of Court should contact the Clerk of Senate should they have observations to make.
B.9 *Honorary Fellowship nominations*

Summary details will be provided at the meeting in relation to 3 nominations for Honorary Fellowships of the University, which Court is asked to approve. The nominations have been approved by the Honorary Degrees Committee.

B.10 *SFC Financial Memorandum*

Until now, the Scottish Funding Council has had a single Financial Memorandum covering all higher education institutions and further education colleges. With the changed legal status of the FE Colleges, separate Financial Memoranda were recently drafted and discussed with the sectors. The HE document now includes aspects of guidance that were previously included in other documents, for example: guidance on financial management; guidance on severance payments; and guidance on audit arrangements.

Further details, including a cover letter from the SFC enclosing the final draft, are at Annex 12.

B.11 *Genome Sequencing Equipment*

Under delegated powers, the Convener of Court, Principal and Secretary of Court have approved the University spending £1.6m on genome sequencing equipment. The University is part of a consortium - funded by the Chief Scientist Office, Cancer Research UK and the Medical Research Council - which will sequence cancer samples to create a world leading database to underpin ongoing research. The University has been asked to underwrite capital expenditure totalling £1.6m. This will be completely funded if the project develops as envisaged. However, at this point there is a risk that some shortfall may be incurred.
Court Strategy Discussion Day, 30 September 2014

Background

The purpose of the strategy day was for Court: to be briefed on, and to provide its early contributions to, the development of the University’s Strategic Plan 2015-2020; to consider progress on the Estate Strategy and provide views on a number of areas associated with this; to discuss a second report from the Socially Responsible Investment Policy working group (Fossil Fuels) ahead of the matter returning to the Court meeting on 8 October.

Action required at 8 October meeting: Court is asked to consider recommendations in section 2 below (University Estate Strategy)

1. University Strategic Plan 2015-2020

Court was briefed on the ongoing development of the Plan, which has involved wide consultation with stakeholders, including scenario planning; and on emerging principles from analysis of feedback. There will be further interactions with the University community ahead of a draft strategy being produced in December for consultation in the new year, with Court receiving the draft at its February 2015 meeting, with a view to its presentation for adoption in June 2015 following progress through the University committee structure.

Court discussion referred to the importance of a distinctive, positive and ambitious tone being set; to local and global engagement, and inclusiveness, being at the forefront of the University’s activities; to the need for clear focus; to promoting the city of Glasgow experience; to uniformly excellent services being required to partner academic provision; to the need for sustainability, which should involve imaginative thinking; and to consideration being given as to which external stakeholders should be involved as the consultation process progressed.

2. University Estate Strategy

1. Context

University Court considered the progress on the Estate Strategy, the challenges and the next steps. In particular views and comments were sought on:

- Challenges identified in progressing the Estate Strategy;
- Proposal to progress appointment of master planners and infrastructure consultants;
- Proposal to progress to briefing and full business case for the Teaching and Learning Hub; and
- The current draft strategy and whether Court would endorse the strategy so that it would create a framework for developing the business cases and master plans.

2. Pre-Read and Presentation

Court were provided with pre-reads of the draft Estate Strategy, draft Delivery Plan, notes of the April workshop and minutes of the Court Working Group.
The presentation reminded Court members of the opportunity of the Western Infirmary, demonstrated the links between the University Strategy and the Estate Strategy; a proposal for a Teaching and Learning Hub; a route map for the next 3 years and the challenges that delivery would need to face in particular:

- Length of development programme - pace and phasing;
- Timelines - REF; University Strategy;
- Willingness to change the way we do things;
- Maintaining current growth as we develop;
- Capability and capacity; and
- Sustainability - financial and environmental.

3. Feedback from the discussion

- Recognition and support that to successfully delivery the Estate Strategy the University had think about how to use the properties differently and to engage in a programme ensuring new ways of working introduced. This would need to be resourced, have the right managers and delivered with a structured programme approach.
- Support for the work developing the business cases and recognised the work put in by CMG. Also recognised the pragmatic approach of maintaining pace on the work whilst ensuring sufficient time to debate the critical issues and consult with staff.
- Supported the proposal to progress briefing and design of the Teaching and Learning Hub to full business case stage and encouraged that the University looked at best in class examples and consultation with users to really understand what they needed.
- Consider carefully the style and type of communication, consistency of language which reflects the moment and engages people. Communication should pick up more than just the University and must also think about the West End community and City Council. Recognised that in delivering the proposals that there would be disruption both to the University but also the West End and that early engagement and communication essential
- In maintaining the pace of the work and to maintain momentum it was proposed that the current draft strategy be adopted - it provided the framework needed to allow the next phases of work to progress.
- The benefit of having the Court Working Group was recognised and there was support that this working group was retained.
- Supported the proposal to progress the brief for the master planner and other advisors.
- Risk management essential and should be addressed.
- Recognised the need to deliver the strategy within the financial sustainable boundaries.
- In maintaining the pace a small number of key milestones needed.

4. Key Milestones 2014/15

a) Development of business cases - recommendation of phasing of the business cases with indicative costs, programme and funding arrangements. Prioritisation aligned to University Strategy Court Feb 2015. Revised capital plan presented to Court June 2015
b) Teaching and Learning Hub - Full business case to Court June 2015
c) Master planning and infrastructure consultants - appoint by March 2015
d) Development culture programme - shape in line with the development of the University Strategy, update Court as part of the University Strategy update February 2015

5. Recommendations

Court is asked to agree:

1. That the draft Estate Strategy is endorsed so that it can be used as a framework for the ongoing work and refined and developed into a brief summary document;
2. The Teaching and Learning Hub proposals developed to full business case stage;
3. The appointment of the master planners and infrastructure consultants;
4. The continuation of the Court Working Group; and
5. To note the key milestones identified, and that the next substantial report to Court will be in February 2015, when, following review by the Court Working Group, a series of recommendations will be presented on the business cases.

3. SRIP (Fossil Fuels)

Court members received a second paper from the working group, together with background papers, for informal group discussion ahead of formal discussion of the matter at the Court meeting on 8 October.

3.10.14
Draft Ordinance on Composition of Court

1 Introduction

Members of Court were advised by the Principal's email of 16 July that Draft Ordinance 206 on Court membership had not been approved by the Privy Council. As you will remember, it was agreed at Court that, should the Ordinance not be approved by the Privy Council, then the matter would be referred back to the Governance Working Group to advise Court on what action to take.

This paper explains why Draft Ordinance 206 was not approved. It also contains a recommendation from the Governance Working Group on next steps.

2 Why Ordinance 206 was not approved

Very late in the process of considering the Draft Ordinance 206, the Lord Advocate's Office identified a legal point that gave cause for concern. This was that, in modernizing its terminology - replacing 'assessor' with 'member' or 'representative' - the University might appear to be changing the nature of the relevant persons' positions on Court.

Particular concerns which were noted were that: a) the change might involve inconsistency with the terms of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, which has a reference to 'assessor' in Section 11; and that b) our current membership - as expressed in Ordinance 182 - refers to employee 'representatives' rather than 'assessors', which might support the view that assessors and representatives are different in nature.

This concern was raised by the Lord Advocate's Office, for the first time, on 1 July. As Court was keen to have the Ordinance considered by the Privy Council later that month, the University was asked to respond to the Lord Advocate's Office by close of play on 2 July. The Convener of Court, the Principal and the Deputy Secretary liaised and, through the University's lawyer, responded within a day, offering that the University would be willing to have the Ordinance submitted with the references to Assessor reinstated. However, the Lord Advocate's Office advised that the Ordinance should be submitted in its original form (i.e. including references to Member and Representative) since that was the text on which Court had consulted. In doing so, it was suggested that a commitment should be made to the Privy Council that in due course Court would submit a further draft Ordinance, whose effect would be to reinstate the references to 'Assessor'.

The University followed that advice, but the Scottish Universities Committee of the Privy Council then felt unable to recommend approval (by Her Majesty) of the draft ordinance because - in view of the concerns raised relating to 'member' and representative' - it considered the Ordinance to be defective.
3 Discussion by the Governance Working Group

In July, the Governance Working Group* considered the advice it should give Court on next steps. It considered three options:

1. Do not proceed with a new Ordinance. The Group did not think this would be acceptable to Court, given the importance Court has placed on conforming with the Scottish Governance Code.

2. Proceed with a new Ordinance in exactly the same form as before but involving no changes to terminology (i.e. retain the term 'Assessor'). This was the option favoured by the Working Group.

3. Proceed with a new Ordinance, taking the opportunity to address additional point(s) within it. In particular, the Group considered Court's expressed intention to terminate the post of Chancellor's Assessor and replace it by an additional co-opted member. On this point. It was recalled that Court had already in practice agreed a way of addressing this matter, by simply retaining Chancellor's Assessor as an honorary (and little-used) title for a post that will in fact be filled by co-option. While it was agreed that it would be desirable in due course to address this matter formally, the Working Group’s view was that, at this stage, and in order hopefully to ensure success in re-submitting the recent draft Ordinance, it would not be wise to introduce any additional element to it.

4 Recommended Next Steps

The Governance Working Group’s recommendation is that Court should, as soon as possible, initiate consultation on a new draft ordinance. This should be identical in substance to Draft Ordinance 206, as submitted to the Privy Council in May 2014, except that the proposed changes to the term ‘Assessor’ should be removed. Having taken advice from the Privy Council, this business would best be taken forward as follows:

.1 Court on 8 October should agree to withdraw Ordinance 206, and also agree that it would like to take forward a new Ordinance which will address the concerns raised by the Lord Advocate’s Office.

.2 A draft new ordinance should then be sent to the Privy Council for advice so that, before Court consults on the new ordinance, it will have assurance that the Privy Council considers that the new ordinance is legally competent.

.3 Subject to having received feedback from the Privy Council, Court should then decide at its December meeting to initiate the statutory consultation process.

* Members of Court involved in the working group discussion were: Dave Anderson, David Anderson, Alan MacFarlane, Margaret Morton, David Ross and Duncan Ross
ORDINANCE NO 182 [incorporating subsequent amendments approved by the Privy Council]

COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT

At Glasgow, the Twenty-third day of May, Nineteen Hundred and Seventy-nine

(Preamble)

1. The University Court of the University of Glasgow shall consist of:

(a) the rector;
(b) the principal;
(c) an assessor nominated by the City of Glasgow Council;
(d) an assessor nominated by the chancellor;
(e) five assessors nominated by the General Council;
(f) seven assessors, elected from among its members by the Senatus Academicus, of whom
at least three shall be readers or lecturers;
(g) the president of the Students' Representative Council for the time being;
(h) an assessor nominated by the Students' Representative Council who shall be a matriculated
student and whose term of office shall be one year;
(i) two representatives of the employees of the University of Glasgow, to be selected by such
methods as the University Court may approve, who shall themselves be employees of the
University of Glasgow;

(k) such persons, not exceeding five in number, none of whom may be a matriculated
student or an employee of the University of Glasgow, as may be co-opted by the University
Court;

provided always that no person may serve as an assessor under sub-paragraphs (c) to (f)
above while he or she is a matriculated student of the University.

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

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

In Witness whereof these presents are sealed with the Common Seal of the University Court of the
University of Glasgow, and subscribed on behalf of the said University Court as required by Ordinance of
the University Court No. 177. ALWYN WILLIAMS, Member of the University Court.

JAMES McCARGOW, Secretary of the University Court.

Approved by Order in Council, dated 19th December 1979.
ORDINANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW NO. [207]

AMENDMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. 182 (COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY COURT)

AT GLASGOW the 30th day of September Two Thousand and Fourteen

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

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

1 Paragraph 1 of Ordinance of the University Court No. 182 (Composition of the University Court) is hereby amended as follows:

(a) in (f) for “five”, “two” is substituted; and
(b) in (g) for “seven”, “six” is substituted; and
(c) in (g) the words “of whom at least three shall be readers or lecturers” are omitted; and
(d) in (k) for “five”, “nine” is substituted; and
(e) after (k) and before Section 2 “or she” is added between the words “he” and “is a matriculated student”.

2 This Ordinance shall come into force from and after 1 August 2015 provided that it has been approved by Her Majesty in Council prior to that date, which failing it shall come into force from and after the date of its approval by Her Majesty in Council.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF these presents are sealed with the Common Seal of the University Court of the University of Glasgow, and subscribed on behalf of the said University Court as required by Ordinance of the University Court No. 177

Member of the University Court

Secretary of the University Court
1 Summary and Recommendation

In June, Court discussed a paper from our working group, which was formed to consider the case for disinvestment from the fossil fuel extraction industry. A range of views was expressed, and the working group was asked to consider the matter further and report back.

The working group has reflected on the discussion at Court and has produced this current paper as a contribution to the follow-up discussion anticipated to take place at the October Court meeting. The paper reiterates the case for disinvestment and puts this in the wider context of the University’s response to climate change and commitment to reduce carbon consumption. The paper also discusses various reservations that have been expressed by Court members. This is a difficult issue. We recognize the sense behind the concerns expressed at the June meeting and acknowledge that unanimity of view at Court is unlikely. However, as the group tasked to consider this matter on Court’s behalf, our recommendation is that the University should indeed gradually reduce its investment in the fossil fuel extraction industry. We have reformulated our recommendation, which was felt by some members to be too prescriptive, and now RECOMMEND:

.1 that the University’s direct investment in the fossil fuel extraction industry should be managed in a controlled manner such that the value of such investments does not exceed the current level of 10% of the endowment portfolio for any appreciable time period; and

.2 that the current level of investment should be reduced to zero over the next 10 years, subject to Recommendation 3 and bi-annual re-evaluation of the financial and other impacts of the divestment policy on the University along with the scope for increased investment in renewable energy sources.

.3 that prior to executing Recommendation 2, a further examination of the financial impact of that Recommendation be conducted through dialogue with the Glasgow University Climate Action Society (GUCAS) and the University’s Investment Committee to provide assurance to Court as to the limited scale of the prospective financial impact.

The companies from which we are recommending disinvestment are those whose primary activity is fossil fuel extraction. The University’s current investment in these companies is valued at approximately £18M.
2 Why the working group recommends disinvestment

The working group was asked by Court to consider the case for disinvestment as submitted by the Glasgow University Climate Action Society (GUCAS). The GUCAS submission has been circulated separately for reference. Having reviewed it and discussed it with members of GUCAS, the working group decided, unanimously, to recommend to Court that the University should, over a period of time, disinvest from the fossil fuel extraction industry. The case put forward by GUCAS included a number of important arguments in support of disinvestment, which the working group found persuasive in arriving at their recommendation. Those arguments included the following:

.1 Continued consumption of fossil fuel at current rates will do serious damage to the planet

The Copenhagen Accord (2009) saw the world’s governments commit to take action to cap the rise in global temperatures at a figure 2% above the pre-industrial level. That 2% target was chosen on scientific advice as a dangerous threshold beyond which serious damage would be done to food and water supplies, to the sustainability of human environments, and to the ecosystem. The actions taken by governments to date are not addressing that target. The consumption of carbon based fuels continues to rise and, on current estimates, we will have reached a point in 15 years where it will no longer be possible to restrict the temperature rise to 2%.

.2 The fossil fuel industry is not meeting the environmental and social costs which will arise from its activity

Fossil fuel extraction companies are addressing the important task of generating supply to meet global demand. In doing so, they are operating profitably, and they therefore represent an attractive investment for the University’s funds. But the demand they are meeting cannot continue without doing serious damage to the environment. As a result, the industry is overvalued, with its profitability based on a false assumption that it is possible for the world to continue to burn carbon at current rates.

.3 Others will pay a heavy price for our consumption of carbon

Those of us who live in the developed world ought to be mindful of the dramatic impact that climate change may have on future generations and on poorer and more vulnerable communities throughout the world. Our descendants, and in particular those who live in poorer countries, may pay a heavy price for the benefits we currently enjoy through
consuming carbon at the current unsustainable level. There is a powerful ethical argument for the University to take action.

4 Social pressure is required to persuade governments to do more

Governments of course have a crucial role to play in addressing climate change. But government action to date has been inadequate. There is a need for greater social awareness and popular pressure if political parties and governments are to give this issue the priority it merits. In the United States, several cities and universities have made commitments to disinvest from fossil fuels. In the UK, the British Medical Association resolved in June 2014 to transfer their investments from fossil fuels to renewables. Several UK universities are considering similar action, but at this point none has made a commitment. As a respected institution, the University can play an important role in influencing popular opinion and government action.

3 Consistency with the University’s values and commitments

In 2009, the University signed the Universities & Colleges Climate Commitment for Scotland. This recognized the deep impact climate change could have on the world’s economy, society and environment, and supported the Scottish Government’s stated intention to reduce carbon emissions by 80% by the Year 2050. Consistent with that commitment, the University’s Carbon Management Plan aims to achieve a 20% reduction in the University’s energy consumption by 2015/16, a target that is being addressed through improved energy efficiency and a campaign to reduce consumption. The University has joined other public sector organizations in Scotland to procure 100% renewable electricity supplies for a substantial part of its estate. Its capital building programme is driving improvements through investment in energy efficiency and the achievement of BREEAM excellent standards for new build. It is implementing sustainable travel initiatives in the areas of cycling, public transport and electric vehicles. And it is promoting awareness of sustainability among staff (through green champions) and students (through GUEST, the Glasgow University Environmental Sustainability Team). It would be entirely consistent with this ethos if the University were to supplement its existing range of sustainability initiatives with a commitment steadily to disinvest from the fossil fuel industry.

4 Reservations raised about a policy of disinvestment

Some members of Court have expressed concerns regarding the recommended policy of disinvestment, either at the June meeting or in subsequent email correspondence. The following paragraphs identify and comment on the main points that have been raised.
1 The action proposed is not consistent with Court’s socially responsible investment policy

Court approved a Socially Responsible Investment Policy in 2009. Referring to it, several members of Court have asked whether investment in fossil fuels can really be considered to be ‘wholly contrary to the University’s value systems, either as reflected in the Mission Statement or the Strategic Plan or in regard to wider issues of social, environmental and humanitarian concern.’ In addition, it has been pointed out that the socially responsible investment policy states that, before deciding to disinvest from a company on ethical grounds, the Court working group should seek to initiate dialogue with the relevant company/ies via the fund managers.

There is an obvious truth that consuming carbon remains essential to normal life and that a connection can readily be made from that reality to investment in fossil fuel extraction. Stated that way, such investment could not easily be regarded as wholly contrary to the University’s value systems as they sit today. But, having identified the threat to the environment both today and in the future, action is being taken by the University to reduce its carbon consumption. The ethos underpinning such action represents an important part of the University’s value systems. Action which did not reflect or run counter to this important aspect of the University’s value systems could reasonably be argued to be wholly contrary to those value systems. We are not proposing a sudden disinvestment from fossil fuel companies, but instead disinvestment over an extended period, which would be consistent with the University’s existing commitment steadily to reduce its carbon consumption. The question of whether a matter is “contrary” or “wholly contrary” could be debated at length. We respect the need to pass the test in the Policy statement and that the words were crafted in that form for a purpose. We would counsel however that we do not allow a judgment on semantics to obscure the more fundamental reality. The term “wholly contrary” is an absolute and in this context is being applied to subjective matters in which very little is of an absolute nature. Accordingly, our view is that it would be contrary, and can reasonably be argued to be wholly contrary, to the University’s value systems to take no action on fossil fuel investment.

The second point raised above is that the socially responsible investment policy states that there should be engagement with the companies involved before any decision by Court to disinvest. While this could be a useful course of action in certain cases, it is not a practical way forward in relation to fossil fuel extraction (or indeed to tobacco manufacture), where it is the primary purpose of the company that is the concern.
Disinvestment will reduce the return on the University’s investments and will therefore harm future students

In making a case for disinvestment, the working group considered that, by reducing the options available to the university’s funds managers, its proposal might have a small negative effect on the University’s rate of return. That view seems, generally, to be held by members of the University’s Investment Advisory Committee. However, we would make four points.

• The scale of the loss would be manageable based on the advice we have received from the members of the Committee. If, for example, we were to assume a 0.25% deterioration in return on the £18M currently invested in fossil fuel extraction, then the annual loss to the University’s endowment income would be £45,000.

• It is arguable whether there would be any loss. There are examples of socially responsible investment funds - such as Portfolio 21 and NEI Ethical Canadian Dividend Fund - that have outperformed benchmarks after making the decision to disinvest from the fossil fuel industry.

• The fossil fuel industry may well be seriously overvalued at present, as it is not covering the social and environmental costs of its activities. Rates of return may therefore decline substantially in the years ahead so that any deterioration in return may be limited in timescale.

• Finally, we would argue that, if Court accepts the argument for disinvestment based on the University’s values, then it should agree to disinvest, even although this may involve reduced income in the short term.

Disinvestment could impact on funding opportunities with the fossil fuel industry

In reporting to Court in June, the working group investigated the extent to which the University currently benefits from funding from the fossil fuel industry. Current research funding is £350,000, which is 0.2% of the Research portfolio. Funding in support of the University’s development campaign is nil. Now, it is possible that future opportunities for financial support from the fossil fuel industry might be lost should Court agree to disinvest. Set against that, the University may find that some other funding opportunities are enhanced should it take a stance on fossil fuel industry disinvestment. As with the concern regarding a possible reduction in income from investments, the working group considers that the over-riding concern should be whether Court is convinced of the case for disinvestment based on the University’s values. If so, then it ought to disinvest.
.4 This would be a symbolic gesture only, with no practical impact

Reservations have been expressed about the University becoming involved in gesture politics, which may have no practical impact. We recognise this concern, and are aware that the University’s decision could be presented in a cynical light. However, we would argue that symbolism is important, particularly on the part of a respected institution like the University which has the ability to influence the thinking of its students, government and of the wider public.

.5 This action would be inconsistent and inappropriate in view of the benefit the University derives from the fossil fuel industry

Several members of Court consider that a decision to disinvest would not be responsible at a time when the University will continue to enjoy the benefits of fossil fuels. Indeed, it could be argued that it would be hypocritical for the University to disinvest from an industry on which it relies. Two, related, points have been made in this regard:

• that the University will continue to burn fossil fuels for many years to come, and indeed that it has just recently committed to a major investment in a gas-fired combined heat and power facility; and

• that the University benefits from the contribution the fossil fuel industry makes to the national economy, including to the tax revenues that help fund higher education.

These are undoubtedly important concerns. On the other hand, we have already committed in the Carbon Management Plan to reduce the University’s reliance on fossil fuels. In doing this, we have recognized that this will not happen overnight and that the University will continue to consume fossil fuels for years to come. A decision to disinvest steadily over a period of several years is consistent with the University’s commitment to reduce its carbon footprint over a period of several years. The University will be dependent on fossil fuels for many years to come, but it would be irresponsible not to take action over time to reduce our dependence.

.6 If the University decides to disinvest from fossil fuels then it will open the door to lobbying on a range of other issues

If Court agrees to disinvest from fossil fuels, will Court then be subject to lobbying in relation to other investments? Possibly, yes. But, in approving the socially responsible investment policy in 2009, Court provided a mechanism for considering submissions of this sort, and each submission should be considered on its merits. In the view of the working group, the case for disinvestment from the fossil fuel industry is a powerful one that merits support.
Finally, the working group’s recommendation to Court is that disinvestment should be made from those direct investments in companies whose primary activity is fossil fuel extraction. It has a specific list of the investments involved, which have a total value of approximately £18M. It has been asked whether this approach would really be effective in addressing its intended objectives, given that: a) funds invested in vehicles that encompass a mixed portfolio of shares may ultimately find their way into the same fossil fuel extraction companies; b) the companies identified are not necessarily engaged exclusively in the activity of fossil fuel extraction; and c) there are other companies, not on the list, which work with fossil fuels, albeit not primarily as extractors.

No proposal on disinvestment, however carefully framed, will be perfect, and similar reservations could also be expressed in relation to the Tobacco industry, in which the University has, as a matter of policy, not made direct investment for many years. The working group’s recommended policy on fossil fuels is similar in this respect to that already in operation for Tobacco; that the University should reduce its direct investment in companies whose primary activity is fossil fuel extraction. We think that is a practical definition that provides clarity for our investment managers.
Background to second SRIP group report: Previous papers on SRIP (Fossil Fuels)

Secretary’s report to Court 12 February 2014:

A.3 Socially Responsible Investment Policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

In accordance with the Socially Responsible Investment Policy [annexed] a working group will be established to consider this representation and advise Court. The working group will comprise: two lay members of Court, one Senate assessor, one SRC representative on Court and the Secretary of Court.
Secretary’s report to Court 25 June 2014:

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] 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.

[Annex]

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.
Additional paper for 25 June 2014 Court meeting:

To Members of Court

Socially Responsible Investment

Item A.1 of the Secretary’s Report to Court, together with Annex 1, discusses the views of the group Court asked to consider a representation made by the Glasgow University Climate Action Society in terms of the University’s Socially Responsible Investment Policy.

Since the group last met, it has received comments from members of the Investment Advisory Committee on the impact that disinvestment in Fossil Fuel extraction might have on the health of the University’s investments. It has also checked the extent to which the University benefits from financial support from the Fossil Fuel extraction industry.

Members of the Investment Advisory Committee have expressed a range of views. If there is a consensus, it is that disinvestment should be over a lengthy period, and that the University might expect there to be a small reduction in portfolio returns. The working group also considered that disinvestment should be over a lengthy period and that a modest risk to financial returns existed. However, the group heard other evidence that was more encouraging, and it noted that one of the University’s two brokers currently places less than 5% of its investment portfolio with the Fossil Fuel industry. Turning to the level of investment by the Fossil Fuel industry in the University, our research funding from the industry is small, being less than 0.2% of the University’s research holdings.

The conclusion of the Working Group is that it supports the ethical case for disinvesting from the Fossil Fuel industry, that it recognises this would involve a modest risk to the financial return on the University’s investments, and that it believes this risk can be effectively managed by disinvesting over a substantial period of time.

The working group therefore recommends that Court ask the Investment Advisory Committee:

1. to cap the University’s investment in the Fossil Fuel industry such that it will not rise above the current level of 10% of funds invested;

2. to reduce this level of investment to 5% by June 2019, and to zero by 2024.

3. to require the University’s fund managers to identify strategies to mitigate the financial risk associated with this instruction;

4. to require the fund managers also to consider investment in green energy, where this is consistent with achieving the financial targets set by the University; and

5. to monitor the managers’ response to these requirements and to report to Court in 2 years' time.

DN, 23.6.14
June 2014 minute of Court meeting

CRT/2013/52. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2013/52.1 Socially Responsible Investment Policy – Fossil Fuel

At the February meeting, Court had approved the setting up of a working group to consider representations submitted by the Glasgow University Climate Action Society (GUCAS), via the SRC, for the University to divest from fossil fuel industry companies in accordance with the University’s Policy on Socially Responsible Investment (SRIP). The working group had 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 had met on 16 May to consider the document provided by GUCAS and to hear representations from four of its members. Since then, the group had contacted the Investment Advisory Committee IAC for its views on potential disinvestment in fossil fuel extractors (oil/gas/coal extraction), which was the area which the GUCAS members who attended the meeting had clarified was the focus of the campaign. Court heard that IAC members had expressed a range of views; if there was a consensus, it was that disinvestment should be over a lengthy period, and that the University might expect there to be a small reduction in portfolio returns.

The working group had itself also considered that disinvestment should be over a lengthy period; and that a modest risk to financial returns existed. The group had however noted that one of the University’s two brokers currently placed less than 5% of its investment portfolio with the fossil fuel industry. The level of investment by the fossil fuel industry in the University in terms of research funding and donations from the industry was small. The conclusion of the Working Group had been that it supported the ethical case for disinvesting from the fossil fuel extraction industry, that it recognised this would involve a modest risk to the financial return on the University’s investments, and that it believed that this risk could be effectively managed by disinvesting over a substantial period of time. It had made recommendations to Court accordingly.

At the meeting, Court noted from the working group’s members that the case for climate change being a fact had been taken as made, that the group had been strongly persuaded by the quality of the arguments presented by the GUCAS, and that for the University to take a lead in the area of disinvestment from the fossil fuel extraction industry would be a positive symbolic step. It would also see the University taking a lead as an early supporter of the proposal, which it was understood was being considered by a number of institutions worldwide. While it had not received formal representations from bodies that were opposed to what GUCAS was suggesting, the group had considered potential downsides, in particular the potential loss of income both from investments and funding, but had concluded that on balance it would recommend progressive disinvestment and that instructions should be given to fund managers to this effect.

In discussion, mixed views were expressed by Court members. Concerns were raised as to whether alternative arguments had been examined as part of the process; Court heard in response to this point that details of University funding from the fossil fuel extraction industry
had been sought and the IAC had been consulted for its views. Reference was made to the terms of the SRIP, namely that “the key criterion against which specific cases would be considered would be whether the activity complained of and substantiated by the concerned group, was wholly contrary to the University’s value systems either as reflected in the Mission Statement or the Strategic Plan or in regard to wider issues of social, environmental and humanitarian concern”; it was questioned whether this criterion could be said to be the case here, for example in the context of the University recently having recently approved a gas-powered Combined Heat & Power system. Against this, reference was made to the University’s commitment to carbon reduction via its Carbon Management Plan. It was also confirmed that the terms of the SRIP had indeed been considered by group, and reflected in its recommendation that a phased disinvestment take place, the decision having been taken that the GUCAS proposal did not fit neatly on one side or the other of the criterion, but that environmental damage was nevertheless a key challenge for the current times: it was argued that the idea of not reducing the impact of fossil fuel extraction in this wider global context could indeed be considered as ‘wholly contrary’ to the University’s value systems.

Court heard views that ensuring the maximum returns from investments was vital for funding scholarships. The University’s portfolio could be negatively affected by the proposed disinvestment, since few companies had such good yields as the fossil fuel companies in question, and were also riskier investments. It might also be difficult properly to clarify which companies could be classified as extractors. Such companies might also in time take the lead in developing alternatives to fossil fuels. Concerns were also expressed about the effect on University funding, although it was noted that the present level of both philanthropic donations and direct research funding from the industry was small. It was commented that the reverse might in fact apply, that other companies might be positively encouraged to support the University if it disinvested in the fossil fuel industry, since the move could add value to the University’s attractiveness to funders.

It was agreed that more information was needed to inform a decision, and that as such the matter should be reviewed further by the working group over the summer, with specific proposals to be presented and discussed further at the October 2014 meeting of Court. In particular, information would be provided to link the GUCAS concerns about investments in the fossil fuel industry to the SRIP criterion of this being ‘wholly contrary’ to the University’s value system. Greater clarity would also be provided on the potential risks and impact on University income, which needed to be quantified as best as possible, and should include consideration of the potential difficulty in accepting funding from fossil fuel extraction companies in the future. Individual Court members were invited to submit details of any other points for consideration by the group.

It was noted that the basic case about climate change being a fact would not be re-considered by the group and would be taken as given.
Policy on Socially Responsible Investment  (October 2009)

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

(i) to continue to commit to SRI within their investment policies; and

(ii) to continue to use the Ethical Investment Research Service (EIRIS) (or a similar service) to monitor the behaviour of companies in SRI.

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

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

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

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

1. The key criterion against which specific cases would be considered would be whether the activity complained of and substantiated by the concerned group, was wholly contrary to the University’s value systems either as reflected in the Mission Statement or the Strategic Plan or in regard to wider issues of social, environmental and humanitarian concern.

2. Expressions of concern should be related to specific companies whose activities or values appear, on the basis of clear evidence, to be so far removed from the University’s core values as to give grounds for serious concern. Cases would only be considered if brought forward by the SRC as the recognised student body, or a recognised trade union, or via the University’s committee structure.

3. Cases would be considered by a Court group in the first instance. The group will comprise 2 lay members of Court, a Senate Assessor, an SRC representative from Court and the Secretary of Court. The group would be expected to take into account the current extent of the fund managers’ engagement with the company with respect to the concerns raised. It would be for the group to decide whether there were sufficiently strong grounds to warrant engagement with the company through the mechanisms established by the fund managers where this was not already in hand, or to request strengthening of that engagement if already active. The group would ask the Investment Advisory Committee or the Pension Scheme Trustees to communicate with the fund managers about these issues.

4. If a situation arose in which such engagement did not assuage serious concerns raised about a particular company, it might be concluded by the Court on the recommendation of the Court group that it should disinvest in the company. The Investment Advisory Committee or Pension Scheme Trustees would be requested to make the financial consequences of such a decision clear to the group during the course of its deliberations.

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

An annual report will be made to Court via the Finance Committee in respect of the investment funds.
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/conflictareas/congo/overview/conflict-minerals
from the Congo or nearby areas;\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{8}; and

\textit{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.}

\textbf{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\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{6}http://banking.senate.gov/public/_files/070110_Dodd_Frank_Wall_Street_Reform_comprehensive_summary_Final.pdf
\textsuperscript{7} http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/march/tradoc_152227.pdf
\textsuperscript{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
Governance questionnaire for Committee of Scottish Chairs

Question 1: Gender balance of governing body

In the following table, please enter numbers for males and females in each of the categories of governing body member, for both of the dates given. Scroll right to see all the categories.

Simply leave blank any categories that are not applicable at your institution and feel free to make use of the Additional Information box to deal with any further complications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of governing body members by category and gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st July 2013</td>
<td>M 1 F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sept 2014 (anticipated)</td>
<td>M 1 F 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information (optional)**

The proportion of women members of Court was 28% in July 2013.

As at September 2014, it will be 43%

As at September 2014, we have 2 vacancies on Court. When they are filled, the proportion of women will be; either 40%, or 44%, or 48%.

Notes on Q1

The census dates of 1 July 2013 and 1 Sept 2014 have been chosen to give a realistic indication of changes made since the introduction of the Code, since many of these will have been made with the new Academic Year in mind.

For the purposes of this work, ‘co-opted/appointed’ refers to any member appointed directly by Court, and not elected by one of its constituent bodies (e.g. the local Council or student union).

Question 2: Details of Chair

‘Chair’ should be interpreted as the person who normally chairs the regular business of court meetings.

In institutions with a Rector, the ‘Chair’ for these purposes is normally the Senior Lay Governor and not the Rector.

Chair’s term of office: start date 1.1.14
Chair’s term of office: end date 31.7.16

Question 3: Actions on diversity

Please check the boxes below, as appropriate, to indicate actions that you have taken / policies that you have in place and actions that you intend to take.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Already done</th>
<th>Plan to do this (e.g. with next vacancy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing references to diversity in vacancy adverts</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising vacancies in media targeted at women (e.g. Women on Boards)</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising vacancies in media targeted at any other under-represented group</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointing women to court/board committees</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing requirements for board-level experience</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making contact with relevant communities (e.g. business groups centred around a particular minority)</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional equality monitoring encompasses governing body membership</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with / consulting Equality Challenge Unit</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4: Vacancies arising, past and future

| Total number of vacancies for co-opted/appointed members in academic session 2013-14: | 3 |
| Number of these filled by women: | 3 |
| Number of vacancies for co-opted/appointed members expected to arise in AY2014-15 (including Chair where applicable): | 3 |
Question 5: Gender goals

Has your governing body set specific numerical goals for gender (and/or other) diversity among its membership?  N (delete as appropriate)
Has your governing body set non-numerical / qualitative goals for gender (and/or other) diversity among its membership?  N (delete as appropriate)

Please state these diversity goals here (in full or in summary):

Is your governing body and/or a relevant committee still working on diversity goals, or planning to do so?  Y/N (delete as appropriate)
If yes, please give details:

Yes, in the context of an annual review of progress on governance, including diversity on Court. Also, through considering the output of the Equality Challenge Unit study on diversity of governing bodies. A member of Court will participate on the Advisor Group for the project.

Question 6: Remuneration Committee remit and monitoring

"The policies and processes used by the remuneration committee shall be determined by the governing body, and the committee's reports to the governing body shall provide sufficient detail to enable the governing body to satisfy itself that the decisions made have been compliant with its policies." (Main Principle 15)

Please detail how your governing body's policies and procedures meet this requirement, as this is another issue that may well attract external scrutiny.

Please detail the nature (not the content) of the instructions and/or guidance given by the governing body to the remuneration committee (e.g. general committee remit versus detailed parameters for particular kinds of decisions):

Court approves, and has recently updated, the general remit of the Remuneration Committee. It has for several years received annually a full minute from the Remuneration Committee explaining the way in which Rem Comm has undertaken its work, the parameters it has examined in making its decisions on remuneration, and, in aggregate terms, the decisions it has made on remuneration for members of the senior management group.

How often is this done/reviewed?  Annually, October

Please detail how the governing body satisfies itself that the remuneration committee's decisions are compliant with its policies:

Receipt of annual report as above.

How often does this occur?  Annually, December

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate/Academic Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other academic staff representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic staff representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-opted / Appointed / Lay members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify in notes column)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ministerial Letter of Guidance to SFC
The Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning has today written to the Scottish Funding Council setting out his guidance for the Academic Year 2015-16. This represents a change in the timing of the letter of guidance, which is intended to help inform outcome agreement negotiations. A copy of the letter is attached to this circular.

The indicative overall HE budget is as projected in 2013 spending review settlement. A 1% ‘efficiency gain’ is expected, as originally outlined in the 2013 letter of guidance.

Key elements of the guidance include:
- SFC support for action on gender balance, both among students on certain courses and within governing bodies and senior management. The SFC is asked to use outcome agreement negotiations to influence issues of gender balance in participation in HE.
- SFC involvement in enhancing HE governance and, specifically, “work[ing] with the sector to maximise the impact of the new powers available through the 2013 Act”.
- Exploration of targeted relaxation of consolidation limits to allow for more recruitment to address skills needs or widening participation goals.
- Development of a strategy to grow the number of graduates with practical language skills.
- In-principle support for expanding PGT study, with publication of the Scottish Government’s proposals on this in summer 2014.
- Exploration of how emerging areas of research excellence can be supported, financially and otherwise (e.g. a mentoring scheme).
- Review of approaches to KE and commercialisation in order to outperform international competitor countries on innovation.

Universities Scotland has received a press enquiry about the letter of guidance and has issued the following line:
“The letter is validation of the key role that every one of Scotland’s 19 higher education institutions has in supporting the economic, social and cultural values and priorities for Scotland. The sector continues to progress on delivery of outcome agreements on widening access and articulation. It is committed to transparent and collegial institutional governance. It is committed to producing skilled graduates, ready to take their place in the work-force; and produces world leading research, knowledge and innovation which contributes to Scotland’s economic success. We look forward to the guidance in this letter being implemented in a way which respects institutions’ responsible autonomy to decide how they can best contribute to the common good.”

Best wishes,

Daniel Wedgwood
Senior Policy Officer, Resources & Governance
31st July 2014

Dear Alice,

SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL (SFC) – LETTER OF GUIDANCE 2015-16

Ministerial Letter of Guidance to the Scottish Funding Council

Introduction

1. This letter of guidance to the Scottish Funding Council issues at a different point in the year to which the Council will have become accustomed. I write now, because I recognise the importance of setting out my expectations to inform your outcome agreement negotiations with institutions for the 2015-16 academic year.

2. I welcome the progress you have made with outcome agreements. As these enter their fourth year, they demonstrate clearly how our universities and colleges are improving the quality and inclusiveness of their offering, and the relevance of that offer both to learners and the wider economy. By focusing on outcomes, I expect you to make funding decisions that will enable and encourage institutions to challenge themselves to deliver learning, research and knowledge exchange in a way that will support our national priorities. This letter will help you and the institutions you fund to consider fully how your plans will support these expectations.

3. Scotland is, of course, approaching a momentous decision. If the people of Scotland vote for independence in September’s Referendum, I expect the SFC to play a key role with my officials in securing continuity of funding for research and supporting negotiations for new arrangements with the Research Councils. Independence would also provide new opportunities to extend Scotland’s global reach and I would wish SFC to be proactive in establishing new relationships
within these islands and overseas, seeking to further enhance the international excellence and reputation of our HE and FE systems.

4. The SFC and the higher and further education sectors have already shown their capacity for reform and improvement. I am delighted that the college sector is demonstrating the positive results for learners of our unprecedented efforts to regionalise and restructure. I expect you to build on this with a further improvement in positive outcomes for students. Meanwhile, our universities are renowned for the excellence of their teaching and research, and their prominent position in world rankings bears this out. You should enable them to continue this success, which contributes to the growth of Scotland’s economy and our international reputation, while ensuring that access is widened further.

**Funding and high-level objectives**

5. A strong and effective higher and further education sector, delivering social and economic benefit for Scotland, is a key overarching objective for the Scottish Government. That is why, notwithstanding financial constraints and pressures, funding levels have been maintained as set out in indicative spending plans for financial year 2015-16.

6. I expect to grant £525.7m of college programme funding, £1,062.5m of university programme funding and £36m of college and university capital funding in 2015-16. These indicative figures will be finalised in due course in the 2015-16 Budget. And while I have increased funding for both colleges and universities for the next financial year, I expect you to continue efforts to find efficiencies - specifically, and as indicated in last year's letter for 2014-15, it remains essential that the SFC works with the university sector to ensure a minimum 1% real terms efficiency saving in 2015-16.

7. Since many of your agreements with institutions now span three years, it is important that I reiterate my high-level strategic objectives from last year, namely for:

   - Highly efficient and effective regional structures for colleges, including structures in multi-college regions
   - High-quality, effective learning
   - Access to education for people from the widest range of backgrounds
   - Learning which prepares people well for the world of work and successful long-term careers, and in doing so supports our ambitions for economic growth
   - Internationally competitive and impactful research, and
   - Effective knowledge exchange and innovation including excellent university/industry collaboration.

**Strategic objectives – developing our young workforce and addressing gender balance in governing bodies**
8. In addition to these, I have two new strategic objectives that will cut across the activities you fund. You should make it an immediate priority to consider how to play your part in the extensive programme of activity which the Scottish Government will drive in order to meet the challenges set out in Sir Ian Wood’s report on Developing Scotland’s Young Workforce. The second strategic objective is to encourage action through outcome agreement dialogue with colleges and universities that addresses the underrepresentation of women on the governing bodies of colleges and universities, at senior levels and gender balance among student intakes for some key subjects.

Wood Report

9. The final report from Sir Ian Wood’s Commission was issued on 3 June. The ambition here is no less than to create a world-class system of vocational education in Scotland, contributing to a significant reduction in youth unemployment. The report calls for an education system that is better integrated across schools, colleges, and workplaces, and which offers choices that allow young people fully to realise their potential, contributing to Scotland’s economic growth. I know the SFC has already begun to work with partners to consider implementation. I welcome that effort, which should be reflected in clear, costed and time bound implementation plans, developed, tested and delivered with partners at a regional and national level. You are aware of the programme management arrangements my officials are establishing: it goes without saying that your efforts must be anchored in that process.

Gender balance

10. I look to you to consider how the SFC can support practical action to improve the gender balance on governing bodies in both sectors. For regional colleges and regional strategic bodies, as an immediate priority ahead of the 2015-16 academic year, I want you to take the opportunity presented by the ending of the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013 transitional arrangements for incorporated colleges, to address the current underrepresentation of women on college boards. In the HE sector, I want you to discuss with the sector how women’s representation on governing bodies and in senior positions can be improved. I also want a renewed focus on reducing gender segregation in participation: too many college and university courses are dominated by either men or women. I refer later in the guidance to the specific Wood Commission recommendation on this for colleges which I support. But I want the SFC to use the outcome agreements negotiations in both colleges and universities to contribute to improvement.

Outcome agreement process

11. As indicated earlier, I expect the developing Outcome Agreement process to provide a mechanism for ensuring that Scotland’s further and higher education institutions are contributing to sustained progress on our national priorities. It is important that these Agreements are informed by the entire community of a
college and university including staff, students and unions. At the same time, while focused on what will be delivered for SFC investment, there should also be scope for institutions that wish to do so, to situate their outcome agreements within the wider context of what they are seeking to achieve as expressed in their institutional strategies and missions.

**Institutional governance**

12. The SFC should support regional strategic bodies in the three multi-college regions to discharge their funding and other responsibilities efficiently and effectively. In addition, as a result of the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013, I would ask you to ensure that colleges and universities have suitable arrangements for ensuring student interests are represented by a students’ association.

13. In terms of the higher education sector, the SFC has a pivotal role to play in working with universities and representatives on the University Sector Advisory Forum to enhance HE governance. Refinement of governance arrangements in our Higher Education Institutions will help embed a modern, democratic and accountable higher education sector. I look forward to hearing more about how the SFC will work with the sector to maximise the impact of the new powers available through the 2013 Act.

**Higher Education Institutions**

14. The higher education sector has a significant impact on the economy and on the prosperity and well-being of Scotland’s people. In the coming year I would like to see further efforts to support access to learning, skills, research and innovation.

**Access and Learning**

15. I am encouraged by an increased focus in the university sector on widening access. However, mindful of the duties and opportunity afforded by new legislation in the 2013 Act, the SFC should continue to drive further progress on widening access to university, particularly for students from more disadvantaged backgrounds and areas, and in relation to medicine. I expect that the number of additional funded places to support widening access, articulation from college to university and key sector skills to be maintained at current levels. However, these additional places must act as a catalyst for further action by universities to mainstream widening access in their recruitment practices and outcomes, opening their doors to a student body that is representative of all of Scotland’s communities. Underpinning the effort on access must be enhanced partnership working with schools, colleges, regional strategic bodies and others. I expect the SFC to work with all stakeholders to make productive connections in this area.

16. At the same time, I am keen that we maintain and continue to improve retention rates particularly among those universities performing less well. As part of an improved learner journey for everyone engaged in study in Scotland, I want to see an improvement in the level and quality of support for students who need more
assistance to successfully complete their course. In developing your work on access and retention I expect SFC to work with the sectors to make more effective use of ‘in year’ data to track progress more effectively.

17. The SFC and universities need to be alert to the opportunities and implications of new technologies and new ways of learning. Looking ahead, I think that the potential of open educational resources must be capitalised upon. I’m excited by the new Open Educational Practices project led by the Open University in partnership with the Universities of Strathclyde, Edinburgh, Glasgow and UHI and look forward to hearing of early progress made. I would like the SFC to consider how activity in this area can be further encouraged to enable a blended learning experience involving online materials and other, more traditional, forms of teaching.

18. Access to online learning is an important issue for rural areas of Scotland. Higher education institutions have an important role to play in the cohesion of often fragile rural communities. I would like the SFC to continue its work with my officials to address the developmental requirements of universities working in rural and remote parts of the country. As part of an overall commitment to removing barriers to learning, geographical location should not act as an inhibiting factor affecting the learning journey.

Skills

19. One of the key outcomes from higher education is producing skilled graduates who are well-placed to make a contribution to Scotland’s economy and society. I want the SFC to continue to engage universities in helping to drive forward progress with Scotland’s Skills Investment Plans (SIPs). The range of SIPs, including key growth areas such as ICT, identify a need for a steady flow of high quality graduates as essential to sustainable economic growth. In the coming year, I would like the SFC to explore where targeted relaxation of current consolidation limits might assist increased undergraduate recruitment by universities to meet key skills needs, including ICT, and in support of widening access priorities. I do not want universities to be penalised when they respond well to helping deliver key priorities.

20. Universities also have a key role in training students for our multi-lingual world. Scottish Ministers have made a commitment to create the conditions to enable all children to learn two languages in addition to their mother tongue by 2020. In support of this commitment I would like the Funding Council to consider the relevant recommendations in the SG Language Working Group Report and develop with the sector a strategy for growing the number of graduates with practical language skills. In developing this strategy I would also like you to consider the role that the college sector might play in supporting the development of language skills.
21. I recognise the increasing premium being placed on postgraduate qualifications and in summer 2014, the Scottish Government will communicate initial findings from our review of support for taught postgraduate study. I view increased opportunity to take up postgraduate study as a key contribution to making Scotland more competitive. As part of this endeavour, I want the SFC to work with my officials to support efforts for increasing the uptake of post-graduate study to the benefit of students, institutions and the economy.

Research

22. I expect the SFC to continue to focus its core funding on internationally competitive and impactful research. I look forward to the outcome of the latest UK-wide Research Excellence Framework (REF) at the end of this year which will provide an important and internationally recognised benchmark of quality, influencing future funding decisions. I fully expect to see that our universities will have at least maintained, and potentially improved, their competitive position within the UK in the 2014 REF.

23. I welcome the SFC’s review of its funding model for distributing core research funding and supporting research postgraduates in partnership with the sector. This should continue to support a focus on research excellence wherever it exists.

24. At the same time, if we are to ensure that every university is a research as well as a teaching university we need to think about new and creative ways of supporting research across the sector. In that context, I would also like SFC to consider, in collaboration with my officials, how it might support universities which are currently less research active but where there is evidence of emerging excellence and where Scotland might develop a competitive edge. For example, a scheme that supports mentoring by world-leading researchers and placements into leading research groups in research-intensive institutions would have considerable merit. This would allow those researchers with the potential to develop internationally competitive bids for funding to benefit from the knowledge and experience of those who do this on a regular basis and would assist emerging research talent wherever it is found in Scotland. I would also like SFC to explore how, over the next few years, new and emerging areas of research excellence might best be funded.

25. The SFC should continue to consider how best the collaborations and networks established through the research pools are sustained and developed. This should include working with Scottish Government, Scottish Development International, Universities Scotland and its HEI members, the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the British Council as part of Connected Scotland. The new Connected Scotland initiative will mean Scotland can target its carefully aligned, strategic, evidence based and market-facing offer and ask to the world, enhancing further the value and impact of our research, transnational education and staff/student mobility. Connected Scotland will explore and exploit opportunities to enhance the global value of higher education as an economic growth sector within the Scottish
Government’s International Framework priority nations and regions. I look to the SFC to continue to demonstrate leadership, particularly in promoting Scotland’s research opportunities, by participating fully in the Connected Scotland partnership to maximise international connections and collaborations.

Knowledge Exchange and Innovation

26. It remains critically important that our world class research is translated into economic growth and public good. I recognise that this can only be achieved by effective collaboration with partners working together towards common aims.

27. I particularly welcome the SFC’s support of Innovation Scotland and developments that promote academia-industry interactions in support of Scotland’s economy, including Easy Access IP, Interface, and the Innovation Centres. Our universities perform well on a number of performance indicators when measured as a function of research expenditure including spin outs, patents and licenses. However, I am keen that we consider additional and innovative approaches to exploitation of the academic research base. Our underpinning model for spinning-out companies from universities, our approaches to IP ownership and equity share, and our mechanisms for rewarding academics that operate in this space are similar to those in use in many other countries. However, I am not yet convinced that the benefits for academics, universities, businesses, the economy and the people of Scotland are being fully realised.

28. I believe it is time for us to review the approach. We should consider if the model we are using is the most effective for the extremely competitive and global business environment in which we operate. Working with my officials, the Innovation Scotland Policy Forum, Enterprise Agencies, Industry Leadership Groups, universities and key stakeholders, SFC should seek innovative new approaches to exploiting our research base and incentivising those who adopt them. Our goal must be securing a level of performance that places Scotland ahead of our international competitors, and reinforces our reputation as an innovative nation that nurtures entrepreneurial academics and facilitates company creation, company growth and international competitiveness.

29. I would encourage the SFC to focus the Innovation Scotland Policy Forum on actions that contribute to economic growth through the interactions of business and academia, and to use resources that support knowledge exchange to support institutions that are most effective in this endeavour.

30. Scotland CAN DO is our national statement of intent towards becoming a world-leading entrepreneurial and innovative nation. I know SFC is already actively engaged with partners in delivering this, with initiatives such as the Converge Challenge, the Scottish Institute for Enterprise and the more recent Bridge2Business. While entering into enterprise may not be appropriate for all, I welcome actions to promote an entrepreneurial mind-set in all students. I look to SFC to continue to work with our universities – as well as our colleges – in this area.
31. The development of new innovation centres is a ground-breaking and exciting initiative which builds on the experience of collaboration across Scotland while responding to the demands of businesses. Continuing to monitor and evaluate the development and impact of the first innovation centres will be critical, ensuring that the approach continues to be demand-led. SFC should support cross-sectoral collaboration among the first eight innovation centres and be ready to respond to opportunities to develop additional innovation centres where there are demand-led opportunities that will benefit Scottish industry and the economy. I recognise that there are some key sectors where the innovation centre model cannot be applied directly, such as in textiles, and I welcome alternative approaches to stimulating innovation in these areas.

32. The development of both research pools and innovation centres provides Scotland with a sound platform for engagement in Horizon 2020. I look to the SFC to work with Scotland Europa and other stakeholders to harness the opportunities Horizon 2020 offers as well as elsewhere in Europe.

33. Exploiting the outcomes of university research is also a key opportunity for the public sector. We recognise the need to ensure that Scotland has capability and capacity to respond to challenges such as the impact of natural phenomena. I would like the SFC to consider how a Scottish resilience centre of excellence might be established, harnessing the capacity of the research community and other partners across Scotland.

34. Lastly, I recognise and value the diversity of our HEIs and wider research community and want the SFC to make the most of the collaborative opportunities open to it by working with all of the HEIs. SFC should continue to recognise the particular strengths and needs of small specialist institutions such as the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland and Glasgow School of Art and the impact they have on culture, both within Scotland and internationally. Similarly, the Royal Society of Edinburgh can bring added value to partnership working across a wide range of areas and SFC should continue to support the RSE in its contribution to the priorities set out above.

**Colleges**

35. As I acknowledge elsewhere, the SFC has been at the forefront of very considerable change across the sector over the last two years. Given the rate of progress, I expect the programme of reform to be largely complete by 2015-16, with every college in Scotland in a strong position to meet the needs of learners and employers in their region, consistent with SG priorities. In particular, I will be seeking regular assurances about the quality of mergers and your role in offering appropriate challenge and support to help colleges fully embed the changes underpinning the highest quality learning experience for students. These should be consistent with the critical success factors on which SFC post-merger
evaluation is focussed – including leadership and governance, staff and student communications and engagement, and systems development and integration.

36. Delivering the Government’s commitment to maintain student numbers, deliver Opportunities for All and increase youth employment remain top priorities in 2015-16. In doing so, SFC should work with Skills Development Scotland (SDS) to ensure employability provision improves outcomes for unemployed people by delivering high quality training which responds to their needs, adapts to local employer demand and complements the activities of employability partners. In negotiating the outcomes necessary to achieve this, you should pay particularly close attention to colleges’ plans in response to the Wood Commission and delivery of new activity and targets, while maintaining a broad and balanced skills offer to meet regional needs. Early adopter and wider activity in 2014-15 will provide the basis on which I expect colleges to scale up and broaden delivery. Success will depend on a set of mature partnerships - and I would therefore ask the SFC, with SDS, to consider the strategic role it might play in this respect, in particular ensuring that Skills Investment Plans and Regional Skills Assessments inform the development of Outcome Agreements.

37. In addition to the funding in 2015-16, as set out in paragraph 5, there is scope significantly to enhance the range of provision colleges deliver through the 2014-20 European funding programme. You should therefore continue to collaborate with the Scottish Government, colleges, SDS and relevant partners to maximise the funding available in order to respond to Scottish Government priorities and complement other funded provision.

Learner outcomes: continuous improvement

38. Given progress to date, my expectation is that outcome agreements will continue to drive improvement, the alignment of college delivery to SG priorities and greater efficiencies. You should therefore ensure that the SFC, and colleges themselves, have the capacity and capability to take outcome agreements to the next level: robust use of intelligence – about supply, demand and performance - and a process providing appropriate challenge and support to institutions will be essential.

39. Building on improvements so far, through your negotiations, I want you to ensure colleges continue to set stretching targets for access, retention and progression – including to university. On the latter, we continue to place a high priority on articulation from college to university, particularly by learners from more disadvantaged backgrounds and areas. But better outcomes for all learners with protected characteristics are also important. You should therefore ensure that, consistent with their statutory duties, colleges have robust equality impact assessments and that they use these to identify priority areas for improvement. I expect such areas to be explicit in 15-16 outcome agreements. Recognising the needs of specific learner groups, I want you to maintain the funding model and funding levels for provision for English for Speakers of Other Languages in 2015-
16, working with Education Scotland, COSLA and other relevant stakeholders over the course of the year to ensure its sustainability in the medium and long terms.

40. As I said earlier, with reference to Sir Ian Wood’s Report, I want you proactively to address with colleges and their partners the issue of gender segregation. While I fully recognise this is a complex, systemic challenge, demanding focused and sustained effort, I believe there is scope for change and improvement in the short and medium terms. Using the Wood report and the focus on STEM as a catalyst, I would ask that, with the sector, you consider evidence of imbalances and best practice, and develop plans for redressing these, where it is clearly in the interests of learners and employers to do so.

41. In support of better outcomes, I would ask you to improve the distribution of further education student support in order to minimise the need for in-year reallocations. Additionally to assist people wanting to stay in, or return to, education or to study part-time, I would ask you to again deliver inflationary increases to college bursaries and childcare support.

Quality assurance

42. Given the priority I attach to high quality learner experiences and outcomes, I would ask you to work with the sector and Education Scotland to review arrangements for quality assurance and enhancement. In doing so, I would like you to consider the relevance of validated self-evaluation, moving quickly to co-design, develop and test new models. Any new approach should ensure closer integration between relevant ES and SFC teams and the systems and processes that inform and support continuous improvement. And it should ensure the proportionate elements of independent, external quality assurance to ensure the appropriate degree of accountability for colleges as public bodies.

Funding and accountability

43. The principle and practice of focusing funding on the regions with the highest need, whilst providing stability is already well established. For that reason, and as in previous years, you should ensure that no region that is currently meeting its targets loses more than 1 per cent of its funding year on year. Additionally, you are making progress in making the funding system simpler and more transparent, shifting from measuring delivery in wSUMs to credits – with a parallel running exercise in several regions in 2014-15. Subject to the evaluation of this exercise, I would like to see this fully implemented in 2015-16. The new system should ensure that funding for students with additional support needs is properly targeted and flexible.

44. I note the valuable work the SFC has done with colleges to mitigate the effects of ONS reclassification of incorporated colleges as public bodies. I expect you to ensure there are appropriate management and monitoring arrangements in place.
and specifically to continue to monitor transfer of funds between colleges and Arms-Length Foundations.

**Corporate expectations**

45. I am delighted that you have appointed a new Chief Executive to lead the organisation through this critical stage of internal and external reform and inspire performance at the highest standards. I expect you will give your senior management a clear mandate to challenge the status quo and effect the changes needed to build strategies and partnerships that deliver your corporate aims.

46. More generally, your Chief Executive’s role as accountable officer for the public funds granted to colleges and universities is a crucial one. I expect you to use your powers fully to ensure institutions adhere to the guidelines you set for high standards of stewardship, reporting and accountability for that funding. Equally, you should ensure the SFC has the necessary capacity and capability to plan, manage and monitor change at a time when the public rightly expects the highest standards of propriety from publicly funded institutions and those who lead and manage them.

47. Part of your corporate challenge is to demonstrate success. In this your work to become a producer of Official Statistics (OS) is paramount. You should intensify your efforts to rationalise and align your statistical outputs and improve analytical capacity and capability within the organisation allowing stronger analysis of progress against outcome agreements and supporting effective, evidence-based decision making. Equally, in your communications, I urge you to be attuned to the wider context of our national reforms and use your publications and engagements to demonstrate how you are helping to deliver national outcomes.

48. The Scottish Government has set clear and ambitious targets for carbon emissions reductions in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act. I note the commitments made by both colleges and universities towards these targets, in the form of the Universities and Colleges Climate Commitment for Scotland. I welcome the investment made recently by SFC to help reduce the carbon footprint in the university sector. However given the Government’s ambitions in this area, as set out most recently in ‘Climate Ready Scotland: Scottish Climate Change Adaptation Programme’ which was laid before Parliament in May 2014, I expect SFC to make further progress to reduce the carbon footprint of both sectors, including working with the newly merged colleges.

49. In 2015-16 my expectation is for broader and more purposeful partnerships as we explore how we build the right educational choices around all our learners with further and higher education at the centre. I want you to use and create opportunities to work with the Strategic Forum partners (Scottish Enterprise, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, Skills Development Scotland and Visit Scotland) and other partners such as Education Scotland, COSLA, local authorities, employers and my officials, to coordinate your initiatives to maximise impact and
efficiencies. In building closer partnerships, I expect you to find ways to remove barriers to student success and help make our education system work for all and contribute to Scotland’s economic growth.

Conclusion

50. This has been an important year that has clearly established the foundation for action and the range of my ambition. To meet this challenge, you and other partners should work with my officials and generate tangible progress for learners. I must reiterate my thanks to the SFC for its work to implement my strategic objectives and I look forward to making considerable progress in 2015-16 on the key issues I have identified. I am copying as below.

MICHAEL RUSSELL
Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning

Copies:
Stewart Maxwell MSP, Convener of Scottish Parliament Education and Culture Committee
Henry McLeish, Chair, Colleges Scotland
Shona Struthers, Acting Chief Executive of Colleges Scotland
Liz McIntyre, Convenor of Scotland’s Colleges’ Principals’ Convention
Professor Peter Downes, Convener, Universities Scotland
Alastair Sim, Director, Universities Scotland
Rory Mair, Chief Executive, COSLA
Bill Maxwell, Chief Executive, Education Scotland
Damien Yeates, Chief Executive, Skills Development Scotland
Grahame Smith, General Secretary, Scottish Trades Union Congress
Mary Senior, Scottish Official, University and College Union
Larry Flanagan, General Secretary, Education Institute for Scotland
Dave Prentis, General Secretary, UNISON Scotland
Pat Rafferty, General Secretary, UNITE Scotland
Harry Donaldson, General Secretary, GMB Scotland
Gordon Maloney, President, NUS Scotland
Lena Wilson, Chief Executive Scottish Enterprise
Alex Paterson, Chief Executive, Highlands and Islands Enterprise
The University of Glasgow supports UUK’s proposals on the future benefits structure of the USS. In view of the current level of scheme deficit, there is clearly a need for radical reform, and we believe that the changes proposed (involving an estimated deficit reduction of £6bn) are of the right order if the USS is to be sustainable into the future. An important aspect of the proposals is that they do not require an up-front cash injection and that they retain the employer’s contribution in the range 16-18%. These measures are important in making the scheme affordable, but with a continuing substantial commitment by the employer.

The current defined benefit structure is not affordable and the required changes will inevitably be unfavourable for many scheme members. While we have not been able to weigh the relative merits of the approaches considered by the Employers Pensions Forum, we believe the proposed hybrid approach provides a model that will continue to offer attractive features to scheme members. In particular, the proposal to maintain a defined benefit element will, we believe, be important in allowing members, and especially those on lower incomes, a greater degree of certainty regarding their future pension entitlement.

While therefore recording our general support for the proposed changes, we do have some concern at the increasing complexity of the pension arrangements. This arises largely as a result of proposals which we support: i.e. to retain a defined benefit element, and to offer flexibility in respect of voluntary contributions. However, in further discussions on the future of the scheme, it will be important to keep sight of the need to avoid further complexity.

With reference to particular aspects of the consultation paper:

• **Background**
  
  We strongly support the intention to retain employer contributions in the 16-18% range. Subject to maintaining contributions within this range, we support also the intention to de-risk the Scheme’s investments.

• **Past Service / closure of final salary section**
  
  We agree that the final salary section must close, and support the proposals on the calculation of benefits for past service and on CPI indexation.
• **Core Defined Benefits up to a salary threshold**

We support this as a constructive element of these proposals, and agree that the Defined Benefit calculation should be on the existing CRB scale. We support the proposed threshold mechanism as a way of regulating the cost of the Scheme, and also the intention that the threshold should be set at as high a level as is affordable, so as to maximize the number of staff whose salaries will fall fully within it.

• **Member contributions**

The proposal on member contributions, including future cost-sharing, is consistent with that currently in place for the CRB section of USS. We agree with that approach.

• **Additional flexible DC pot**

We think that the additional flexibility provided for employer-matched contributions up to the salary threshold is an attractive element of these proposals, and that it will be welcomed by many scheme members. The opportunity for additional member contributions, both below and above the salary threshold, is also welcome.

• **DC Benefits above the Salary Threshold**

The changes proposed will be unfavourable for higher earners. In this regard, we would stress our concern above that the Defined Benefit threshold should be set as high as is affordable so as to maximize the number of staff whose salaries fall fully within it. That being done, we support a continuing employer’s contribution to DC benefits in respect of earnings above the threshold level. Inevitably, the amount available for the employer to invest in DC benefits will be related to the level of threshold for the DB element. However, a 12% employer’s DC contribution would represent a substantial continuing benefit for high earners, and we support that proposal.
Universities Superannuation Scheme

An integrated approach to scheme funding

The USS paper of July 2014 sets out clearly the responsibilities of the USS trustee and the factors it must take into account in considering the funding levels and investment strategy of the Scheme. This paper is timely given the focus there will be in the coming months on the future of the USS.

The discussion on the technical tests that the trustee will employ in reviewing the Scheme’s funding is informative and we welcome the clarity with which USS has set out its approach. We have no observations to make on the technical tests, but would like to comment briefly on the two of the three guiding principles that have been adopted by the trustee for scheme funding.

*Principle 1* states that, over the period for which there is visibility of the covenant (estimated to be 20 years) there should be no increase in USS’s reliance on the covenant of the sector and that, where opportunities arise, reliance on the covenant should be reduced if possible. We strongly support this principle. In this context, we note that the investment strategy of the Scheme must be managed carefully so that the desired transition to a lower risk portfolio will be achieved as part of a package of measures that will not increase reliance on the employer covenant.

*Principle 2* refers to stability of contributions, stating that there should be a high probability that the employer contribution rate will not exceed 18% over a three-year period and a very high probability that it will not exceed 21% over the same period. Our strong view is that the employer contribution rate should be kept to a maximum of 18%, and we are concerned at the reference to 21%, which seems to reflect the conclusion of the Ernst & Young covenant review. It should be noted that any increase in the contribution level above its current rate will involve hard choices at each member institution, with direct implications for levels of employment and for the quality of higher education provision.
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STANDING ORDERS FOR COURT AND COURT COMMITTEES

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

2 A senior lay member of Court (‘the Convener’) shall be appointed, following an open recruitment process, approximately a year ahead of any vacancy occurring for this position. The Convener shall undergo an annual appraisal involving a consultation with all members of Court.

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

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

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

6 The Court shall commission an effectiveness review of its operation every 3 years, alternating between light touch and extensive in scope, always with the assistance of an external facilitator, who shall be different on each occasion.

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

8 With the exception of ex-officio members:
   - members should normally be appointed to Committees for terms of four years;
   - no member of a Committee should normally serve for more than two terms consecutively;
   - a Committee shall have the right to remove as a member of the Committee persons who do not attend meetings on a regular basis (less than 60% attendance), provided that the person whose membership is proposed for termination shall have the right to be heard in his/her own defence by the Committee.

9 The Nominations Committee shall recommend to Court individuals to be co-opted on to Court; it may also recommend other individuals for Court to appoint as members of its Committees. Committees may, subject to Court approval, co-opt individuals with specific expertise as members in order to deal with specialist items of business. Nominations Committee will promote equality and diversity considerations in its recruitment activities for Court and its committees.
10 If a Committee establishes a working group, it should clearly define its remit and the timescale within which it should work. The working group should be wound up when its function has been fulfilled.

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

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

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

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

15 The agenda and papers for meetings of Court and its Committees should normally be circulated not less than 7 days in advance of the meeting. Papers for Court will focus on key issues requiring Court’s consideration and, where applicable, will be accompanied by a summary; if necessary, background papers will be made available on-line for reference. Papers should only be tabled in exceptional circumstances.

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

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

18 Court shall hold 5 regular meetings plus one Strategy Day and one Induction Day in each academic year and, if business requires it, a special meeting may be called from time to time. In addition, briefing sessions may be arranged on matters of importance. Appendix B is a schedule of meetings of Court and of its Committees in 2014/15.
Court members are encouraged to consider attendance at suitable training events, which will be brought to members' attention by the Court Office. Court members are also encouraged to observe committees where they would be interested in knowing what business the committees discuss and how the meetings are conducted.
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CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF COURT

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

Members of Court should:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These principles were set out by the Committee on Standards in Public Life
Appendix B

Schedule of Meetings of Court and its Committees 2014/2015

Court
Wednesday 8 October 2014
Wednesday 17 December 2014
Wednesday 11 February 2015
Wednesday 15 April 2015
Wednesday 24 June 2015

Audit Committee
Monday 1 September 2014
Tuesday 4 November 2014
Wednesday 18 February 2015
Monday 18 May 2015

Estates Committee
Monday 1 September 2014
Monday 3 November 2014
Wednesday 7 January 2015
Monday 16 March 2015
Monday 18 May 2015

Finance Committee
Wednesday 17 September 2014
Wednesday 12 November 2014
Wednesday 14 January 2015
Wednesday 25 March 2015
Wednesday 27 May 2015

Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee
Tuesday 16 September 2014
Wednesday 10 December 2014
Wednesday 11 March 2015
Wednesday 3 June 2015

Human Resources Committee
Monday 15 September 2014
Monday 17 November 2014
Wednesday 21 January 2015
Thursday 26 March 2015
Thursday 28 May 2015

Nominations Committee
To meet as required

Remuneration Committee
To meet as required
The primary responsibilities of the University Court, as the governing body of the University, are:

**General**

To be satisfied that appropriate mechanisms are in place:

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

**Strategic Planning**

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

**Exercise of Controls**

13. to make clear and to review regularly the executive authority and other powers delegated to the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, to other senior officers and to other bodies of the University including the Senate and Committees of Court, such authority and powers to be set out in a Schedule of Delegated Authorities;

14. to ensure the proper use of public funds awarded to the University, observance of the terms of the Financial Memorandum between the University and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and compliance with the University’s Outcome Agreement with the SFC;

15. to establish and monitor effective systems of internal control and accountability throughout the University;

16. to oversee the University’s arrangements for internal and external audit and to approve the University’s annual financial statements;

17. to ensure that arrangements are in place for the proper management of health and safety in respect of students, staff and other persons affected by University operations;

18. to be the University’s legal authority and, as such, to ensure that systems are in place for meeting all the University’s legal obligations, including those arising from contracts and other legal commitments made in the University’s name.

**Effectiveness and Transparency**

19. to ensure, through the appointment of co-opted lay persons in accordance with the Statutes, and through liaison with the University’s General Council with regard to its Assessors, a balance of skills and experience amongst the membership of the Court sufficient to meet its primary responsibilities;

20. to ensure that the proceedings of the Court are conducted in accordance with best practice in higher education corporate governance and with the principles of public life drawn up by the Committee on Standards in Public Life;

21. to ensure that procedures are in place in the University for dealing with internal grievances, conflicts of interest and public interest disclosure;

22. to monitor its own performance and that of its Committees, with a formal evaluation of effectiveness undertaken not less than every five years.

*Adopted by the University Court: 9 October 2013*
## ANNUAL SCHEDULE OF COURT BUSINESS

### (September/ October)
- **Strategy Discussion Day**

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

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

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

#### February
- Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
- SRC annual report
- Draft Outcome Agreement for next year from Vice Principal
- Finance KPIs
- Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)

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

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

#### June
- Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
- Strategic Plan (annual update) including KPIs
- Capital Programme (annual update for approval)
- Budget Overview for forthcoming year/Financial Forecasts
- Report on Investments (Finance Committee)
- Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
- Estates KPIs
Circular 40/14

22 September 2014

New SFC Financial Memorandum: revised version

Following detailed feedback from US members and subsequent discussions, the SFC has issued a revised draft of its new Financial Memorandum for HE institutions. This is attached below. The SFC intends this to be the final draft of this document, which is expected to come into force in early November, replacing the current Financial Memorandum and a number of other regulatory and guidance documents.

An earlier draft was presented to US and the Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) by SFC and was circulated to US members as US Circular 20/14. As outlined in that circular, the SFC’s stated intention was not to change the Financial Memorandum substantially, but rather to combine and consolidate a number of existing regulations and guidelines into a single document. However, some sections of the earlier draft caused concern in the sector, generating significant feedback from institutions and from the CSC. This was relayed to the SFC and discussions were held involving senior SFC and US officers and the Convener of the Secretaries’ Group, informed by additional consultation on technical issues with the Conveners of UHRS (HR Directors) and SUFDG (Finance Directors). The attached version of the Memorandum incorporates a number of changes made by the SFC in response to the sector’s feedback and these discussions.

In light of these changes, the SFC is not anticipating further comment on this intended final draft. If you should nevertheless have substantial remaining concerns, please contact Universities Scotland (through dan@universities-scotland.ac.uk) in the first instance.

Daniel Wedgwood
Senior Policy Officer, Resources & Governance
Financial Memorandum with Higher Education Institutions: Post-Consultation Draft

17 September 2014
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FINANCIAL MEMORANDUM

Introduction

Purpose of this document

1. This Financial Memorandum (FM) sets out the formal relationship between the Scottish Further and Higher Education Funding Council (SFC) and higher education institutions (HEIs) and the requirements with which HEIs must comply as a term and condition of grant from SFC.

Scope of this document

2. This FM applies to all HEIs in Scotland.

Definition

3. In this document the term ‘institution’ is used in place of ‘higher education institution’. The term ‘chief executive officer’ refers to an institution’s Principal.

Compliance with the Financial Memorandum

4. The responsibility for ensuring that the institution complies with this FM rests with the governing body. Questions about the interpretation of the FM may be raised with officers of SFC at any time.

5. The SFC’s interpretation of this FM shall be final. However, where the institution’s interpretation of the FM differs from that of SFC, the SFC will seek, wherever possible, to reach agreement in a spirit of partnership with the institution.

Effective date

6. This FM shall take effect from 1 November 2014.

Structure of this document

7. The FM is in two parts:
   - Part 1: defines the relationship between SFC and the institution and the responsibilities of each for the proper stewardship of public funds.
   - Part 2: contains the Requirements that apply to all institutions.
Part 1: The relationship between SFC and the institution

Responsibilities of the Scottish Funding Council

1. The Scottish Funding Council is the national, strategic body with responsibility for funding further and higher education, research and other activities in Scotland’s colleges, universities and other higher education institutions. Its funding decisions support the Scottish Government’s national priorities.

2. SFC is a Non-Departmental Public Body (NDPB) of the Scottish Government and undertakes its functions under the terms of the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act 2005, as amended by the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013. In particular, SFC may make grants, loans or other payments to the governing bodies of institutions for the provision of further education, higher education, research and related activities.

3. The legislation also confers certain duties and responsibilities on SFC, including securing coherent, high quality further and higher learning provision by institutions, and the undertaking of research.

4. Under the terms of the 2005 Act, SFC may attach terms and conditions to the payment of grant made to institutions. It is a condition of grant payment from SFC that the governing body and its designated officers comply with the requirements set out in this FM.

Accountability

5. SFC is accountable to the Scottish Government for the use of public funds provided to it under the terms of the relevant legislation.

6. The Chief Executive of SFC has also been appointed Accountable Officer under the terms of the Public Finance and Accountability (Scotland) Act 2000 and is responsible and accountable to the Scottish Parliament for ensuring that funds provided to SFC are used for the purposes for which they have been given, and in ways that comply with the conditions attached to them. The Accountable Officer has a personal responsibility for the propriety and regularity of the public finances provided to SFC, and for ensuring that funding is used economically, efficiently and effectively.

Assurance

7. In order to meet his or her responsibilities, the Chief Executive of SFC must be satisfied that the governing body of the institution meets the requirements of this FM as a condition of receiving grant from SFC. SFC will therefore seek financial management and other information from the institution but, as far as possible, will rely on data and information that the institution has produced to
meet its own needs. If further information is required, SFC will make a specific request in the context of its commitment to efficient regulation.

8. Where SFC has concerns or insufficient information to provide the assurance required, it will, in the first instance, seek to resolve matters with the chief executive officer of the institution. Where this has not proved possible, or in the case of significant concerns, SFC’s Accountable Officer will inform the chair of the governing body and the institution’s chief executive officer in writing – and without delay – and will specify what action is required to address these concerns.

9. Where circumstances warrant it, SFC’s Accountable Officer may suspend the payment of any or all grants to the institution. SFC may also use its powers to attend and address a meeting of the governing body.

**What the institution can expect of SFC**

10. SFC will conduct its affairs to high standards of corporate governance and public administration. It will maintain a complaints procedure and a separate appeals process for funding decisions.

11. SFC will act reasonably on the basis of the fullest available evidence and objective analysis. Subject to any legal requirement to observe confidentiality, it will be open and transparent with the institution, and with other stakeholders, and will give, or be prepared to give, a public justification of its decisions.

12. SFC recognises that the institution is an autonomous body. SFC will not substitute its judgements for those which are properly at the discretion of the institution. In particular, SFC will seek to maximise the discretion of the institution to use grants provided to it by SFC.

13. In discharging its responsibilities, SFC will seek to make regulation efficient and meet the principles for Better Regulation of Higher Education in the UK.

14. SFC will seek at all times to work in a spirit of partnership with the institution, including maintaining regular dialogue with the institution and, where appropriate, its representative bodies. The aim of that partnership will be to help the institution deliver its strategic priorities through the agreement of an Outcome Agreement with SFC, and ensure that SFC can deliver its priorities and undertake its statutory and other functions. SFC recognises that the institution may also undertake activities, and have to comply with legislation and regulation, which may fall outside the scope of this partnership.

15. SFC will allocate and pay grant to the institution in accordance with current published policies and procedures. The institution will be consulted in advance
and given reasonable notice of any significant change to these policies and procedures and of significant changes in overall funding levels.

**SFC’s governance requirements of the institution**

16. The SFC must be able to rely on the whole system of governance, management and conduct of the institution to safeguard all funds of the institution deriving from the Scottish Government and achieve the purposes for which those funds are provided.

17. SFC expects the governing body to meet the principles of good governance set out in the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance. SFC also expects the governing body to ensure that:

- Public funds are used in accordance with relevant legislation, the requirements of this FM and only for the purpose(s) for which they were given. Strategic grant funding should only be used for the purpose for which it is provided by SFC
- Subject to any legal requirement to observe confidentiality, the institution will be open and transparent with the SFC and other stakeholders, and will give, or be prepared to give, a public justification of its decisions in relation to the use of public funds
- The institution strives to achieve value for money and is economical, efficient and effective in its use of public funding
- There is effective planning and delivery of the institution’s activities in accordance with its mission and its Outcome Agreement agreed with SFC
- The institution plans and manages its activities to remain sustainable and financially viable. An institution is being managed on a sustainable basis if, year on year, it generates sufficient income to cover its costs and allow a margin of surplus for investment in its infrastructure – physical, human and intellectual – at a level which enables it to maintain adaptive capacity necessary to meet future demands. However, SFC recognises there could be strategic circumstances that result in the institution making a planned deficit over a short period of time; for example, strategic investment for growth, where the return on investment is not realised immediately
- The institution has a sound system of internal management and control, including an audit committee, an effective internal audit service, and adequate procedures to prevent fraud or bribery
- The institution has an effective policy of risk management and risk management arrangements
- The institution has regular, timely, accurate and adequate information to monitor performance and account for the use of public funds. Such information will be made available to SFC on request, as necessary, for the exercise of its functions and to gain assurance
The institution is engaged actively in continuously enhancing the quality of its activities and involves students and other stakeholders in these processes.

18. As well as being accountable directly to the governing body for the proper conduct of the institution’s affairs, the chief executive officer is also accountable directly to SFC’s Accountable Officer for the institution’s proper use of funds deriving from the Scottish Government and its compliance with the requirements of this FM.

19. The chief executive officer of the institution must inform SFC’s Accountable Officer without delay of any circumstance that is having, or is likely to have, a significant adverse effect on the ability of the institution to deliver its education programmes, research and other related activity, including delivery of its Outcome Agreement with SFC. He or she should also notify SFC’s Accountable Officer of any serious weakness, such as a significant and immediate threat to the institution’s financial position, significant fraud or major accounting breakdown, or any material non-compliance with any requirement of the FM.

Revisions to the Financial Memorandum

20. SFC will make changes to the requirements in this Financial Memorandum only after consulting institutions or their representative bodies.
Part 2: General Requirements

1. Unless otherwise stated, the following general requirements apply to the institution.

Financial Memorandum

2. It is a condition of grant payment from SFC that the governing body and its designated officers comply with the requirements set out in this FM.

Fundable Body criteria

3. In undertaking its functions, the governing body should keep under review and have in place satisfactory provision in relation to the list of matters set out in section 7 (2) of the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act 2005, as amended by the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013.

Outcome Agreement

4. The institution should deliver its Outcome Agreement with SFC.

Payment of SFC Strategic, Capital or other Grants

5. Where the SFC makes a payment to the institution of a Strategic, Capital or other grant, the institution will be required to comply with any additional requirements attached to the grant as well as with this FM.

Research

6. The institution must use the SFC Research Excellence Grant (REG) funds for research purposes only, targeting their REG allocations predominantly on world-leading and internationally excellent research.

Business, Innovation and Skills and SFC research capital

7. Research capital funding from the UK Department of Business, Innovation and Skills and matched funding from SFC should be used by institutions to focus on maintaining excellent departments with the critical mass to compete globally and the expertise to work closely with business, charities and public services. All expenditure should be aligned to the institution’s estate strategy.

Small Specialist Institution Grant

8. In order to continue receiving payment of the SFC Small Specialist Grant, Small Specialist institutions (SSIs) must retain small and specialist status.
Changes to grant payments

9. If the Scottish Government revises its payment of grant to SFC, then SFC reserves the right to make in-year adjustments to its payment of grant to the institution. In this case, SFC and the institution may renegotiate the institution’s Outcome Agreement.

Repayment of grant

10. If the institution fails to comply with the requirements of this FM, and any other specific terms and conditions attached to the payment of grant from SFC, it may be required to repay SFC any sums received from it and may be required to pay interest in respect of any period during which a sum due to SFC in accordance with this or any other condition remains unpaid.

11. If, in the reasonable opinion of SFC, any provision set out in this FM is not observed by the institution, SFC will be entitled, in respect of the payment of grant from SFC:

- In the case of funding by way of grant: to require immediate repayment of any and all grants or any part or parts of any grants at any time after the SFC becomes aware of such failure to observe (without prejudice to further demands until the whole of all sums made available by way of grant shall have been paid in full)
- In the case of funding by way of loan (notwithstanding the terms of any agreement attached to the same): to require immediate repayment of the whole or part of each such loan at any time after SFC becomes aware of such failure to observe (without prejudice to further demands until the whole of all sums made available by way of loan shall have been repaid in full).

12. The institution should also note SFC’s guidance on the process for managing outcome-based funding decisions, which is available on SFC’s website.

Public sector pay policy

13. The institution should have regard to public sector pay policy set by the Scottish Government.

Tuition fees

14. Where applicable, the institution should charge student tuition fees at the levels set by the Scottish Government under either the Student Fees (Specification) (Scotland) Order 2006 or the Student Fees (Specification) (Scotland) Order 2011, whichever is applicable. However, the tuition fee levels set by the Scottish Government under the student Fees (Specification)
(Scotland) Order 2011 do not apply to students who do not have a relevant connection with Scotland or are not excepted students within the meaning of the Education (Fees) (Scotland) Regulations 2011.\(^1\)

**Capital finance**

15. As a condition of SFC’s Framework Document with the Scottish Government, SFC is required to "make provision for the monitoring and control of borrowing by institutions to protect the public investment in institutions and to maintain accountability for the use of exchequer funds". In order that SFC can discharge this requirement, it has in place a threshold for capital finance above which the institution requires SFC consent to undertake any new borrowing.

16. The governing body of the institution, in line with the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, will as a matter of course satisfy itself that all of the following requirements on capital finance are met:

- The institution can demonstrate its ability to repay the finance, and to pay interest thereon, without recourse to requesting additional grant from SFC
- The institution can demonstrate that its ability to maintain financial and academic viability will not be impaired as a result
- The institution can demonstrate the value to be generated by the transaction, whether it involves refinancing, or purchase of any new investment or assets, the acquisition of which is to be financed by the borrowing
- The institution can demonstrate that any such new investment or asset acquisition is in accordance with the institution’s strategic plan and, where appropriate, its estate strategy

17. For the purposes of this document, ‘capital finance’ includes borrowing, finance and operating leases, and other schemes, such as private finance initiative projects, non-profit distribution projects, loan support projects and revolving credit facilities where borrowing is the substance of the transaction, in line with relevant accounting standards.

**When the Council’s formal consent is required in respect of capital finance arrangements**

18. The Institution shall obtain prior written consent from SFC before it undertakes a level of capital finance where the annualised costs of all capital finance (being the sum of the servicing and capital repayment costs of each loan or other

---

\(^1\) When it comes into force, this requirement will be amended by section 4 (fee cap: students liable for higher education fees) of the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013.
arrangements spread evenly over the period of the relevant loan or arrangement) would exceed four per-cent of

- Total income as reported in the latest audited financial statements; or
- The estimated amount of total income for the current year, if that is lower.

19. In assessing total capital finance commitments, the institution shall ignore low-value financial commitments, provided that the combined annualised servicing costs of such financial commitments do not exceed 0.5% of total income.

20. A revolving credit facility should typically be considered in the same way as an overdraft facility; for example, in terms of the institution’s maximum exposure over the term of the facility. An even annual cost of capital finance is assumed, unless the institution can demonstrate otherwise. The institution is required to provide the annualised cost of the capital finance calculation with any request to SFC for borrowing consent.

21. The institution shall also seek consent from SFC before raising capital finance on the security of assets in which the Scottish Government has an interest. For the purposes of this document, such an interest exists where the institution has used funds provided by the Scottish Government to acquire an interest in or to develop any land, building or other asset, and where those funds were provided subject to a condition which has the effect of requiring the institution to obtain Scottish Government’s consent before raising capital finance on the security of those assets.

22. The Scottish Government has directed that SFC will exercise their functions in relation to any such interests.

23. In seeking SFC’s approval, the institution should demonstrate to SFC, in writing, its compliance with the requirements set out above.

Disposal of exchequer funded assets

24. In disposing of exchequer funded assets, the institution should follow the guidance in the relevant procedure notes on the SFC website as amended from time-to-time.

Granting of security

25. As a result of a condition in SFC’s Framework Document with the Scottish Government, the institution is required to seek SFC’s prior written consent if it intends to offer as security for a loan any land or property which has been provided, improved, or maintained with the aid of grant.
Contingent commitments

26. As a requirement of the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act 1992, the institution is required to seek SFC’s prior written consent if it intends to lend or give a guarantee, indemnity or letter of comfort. The value of the guarantee should be equal to the total contingent liability over the term of the guarantee. In all cases, the institution must take steps to restrict the contingent liability to a minimum and should undertake a careful appraisal of the risks before accepting any contingent liability.

27. The institution should also provide assurance that, in the event of the contingent liability arising, it can be met from within the institution’s own resource, or that appropriate insurance cover has been arranged.

28. However, SFC’s written consent is not required for such arrangements if:
   - An actual or effective value is less than 4% of total income as reported in the latest audited financial statements or of the estimated amount of total income for the current year if that is lower; or
   - The indemnity is of a standard type contained in contracts and agreements for ‘day-to-day’ procurement of goods and services in the normal course of business.

Severance payments

29. The institution should adhere to the following principles when taking decisions about severance payments, including settlement agreements:
   - The actions of those taking decisions about severance payments, and those potentially in receipt of such payments, should be governed by the standards of personal conduct set out by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (the Nolan Principles)
   - The governing body should take account of SFC’s expectation of the institution in this FM regarding the use of public funds

30. Based on the principles above, the following requirements should be met:
   - Institutions should have in place a clear policy on severance payments
   - Severance packages should be consistent with the institution’s policy and take into account contractual entitlements, for example, salary and period of notice, and any applicable statutory employment entitlements. This means that, when entering into employment contracts, remuneration committees should take care not to expose the institution to excessive potential liabilities
   - The institution’s policy should include a formal statement of the types of severance arrangements that should be approved by the Remuneration
Committee or equivalent and approved formally by the Governing Body. These should include any severance package that is proposed for a member of the senior management team, in recognition of the particular level of accountability that is attached to senior management positions, and also any severance package that would exceed a maximum threshold agreed by the governing body.

- Where a severance package exceeds the maximum threshold agreed by the governing body, the institution must consult with SFC’s Accountable Officer prior to approving the proposed severance package.
- The remuneration committee or equivalent, when overseeing and approving severance arrangements for staff, should ensure that all decisions are recorded.
- Negotiations about severance packages and payments should be informed, on both sides, by legal advice where appropriate.
- When a severance arises following poor performance on the part of an individual, any payment should be proportionate and there should be no perception that poor performance is being rewarded.
- Final year salaries should not be inflated simply to boost pension benefits.
- Notice of termination of appointments should not be delayed in order to generate entitlement to payments in lieu of notice.

31. The institution should ensure its internal auditor includes a regular review of systems for the determination and payment of severance settlements in their strategic audit plan.

32. The institution must seek the view of its external auditor if it plans to make what it considers to be any novel or potentially contentious severance payments, including those that exceed the maximum threshold agreed by the governing body.

33. The institution’s external auditor must review severance settlements. Such a review will normally take place after settlements have been agreed (normally as part of their financial statements audit) and should be carried out by senior audit staff because of the complexity and sensitivity of the issues. If final settlements do not materially conform to the terms of this FM, auditors should report the facts to the institution in their management letter, and inform members of the governing body. The auditors should also recommend that the institution informs the SFC immediately.

34. Where there are settlement agreements, and it is felt that a confidentiality clause is necessary, this should not prevent the public interest being served and must be consistent with the Institution’s whistleblowing policy.
Audit and accounting

35. The governing body must appoint an Audit Committee and ensure the establishment and maintenance of effective arrangements for the provision of internal and external audit.

36. The Audit Committee must produce an annual report to the governing body of the institution.

Accounts direction

37. The institution shall follow the SFC’s current Accounts Direction in the preparation of its annual financial statements.

Internal audit

38. The institution must have in place an effective internal audit service. The operation and conduct of the internal audit service should conform to the professional standards of the Chartered Institute of Internal Auditors.

39. The institution must inform SFC when an internal auditor is appointed and must inform SFC immediately if the internal auditor is removed before the end of their term of office.

40. The internal audit service should provide the governing body and senior management of the institution with an objective assessment of adequacy and effectiveness of risk management, internal control, governance, and value for money.

41. The internal audit service must extend its review over all the financial and other management control systems, identified by the audit needs assessment process. It must cover all activities in which the institution has a financial interest, including those not funded by SFC. It should include review of controls – including investment procedures – that protect the institution in its dealings with organisations, such as subsidiaries or associated companies, students’ unions, and collaborative ventures or joint ventures with third parties.

42. The head of internal audit must produce an annual report for the governing body on its activities during the year. The report should include an opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the institution’s risk management, internal control, and governance. The report should be presented to the institution’s audit committee and a copy sent to SFC.

Value for money

43. The institution must have a strategy for systematically reviewing management’s arrangements for securing value for money.
44. As part of its internal audit arrangements, the institution must obtain a comprehensive appraisal of management’s arrangements for achieving value for money.

External Audit

45. The external auditor should be entitled to receive all notices of and other communications relating to any meeting of the governing body which any member of the governing body is entitled to receive. They should also be entitled to attend any such meeting and to be heard at any meeting which they attend, on any part of the business which concerns them as auditors.

46. The external auditor must also be entitled to attend the meeting of the governing body or other appropriate committee at which the institution’s annual report and financial statements are presented.

47. The external auditor is expected to attend, as a minimum, any meetings of the audit committee where relevant matters are being considered, such as planned audit coverage, the audit report on the financial statements and the audit management letter. It is the responsibility of the secretary to the audit committee to notify the external auditor of such meetings.

48. The external auditors, notwithstanding responsibilities to their clients, are expected to co-operate fully with any enquiries or routine monitoring that the SFC undertakes.

49. The institution must not in any way limit SFC’s access to the institution’s external auditors.
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Cover Sheet

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

Action Requested

A Items – for action
None

B Items – for noting

CA/2014/04. Capex application: South Glasgow Hospitals University Corridor
The Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting approval to proceed with the design and construction phases of the refurbishment of the University Corridor premises at South Glasgow Hospital. Finance Committee noted that the £3m required for the refurbishment was covered by a grant agreed by the Scottish Government.
Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/05. Capex application: Gilmorehill Infrastructure Improvements
Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for £4.25m of funding to undertake infrastructure works on the Gilmorehill campus, taking advantage of the district heating CHP installation planned during 2014/2015. These works would include the replacement of life-expired high voltage cabling on both the south and the north side of University Avenue and installation of new cabling ducts for IT, as well as replacement of secondary heating systems within Graham Kerr, West Medical and Davidson buildings. The Committee noted that all of these works would replace infrastructure that was in urgent need of replacement.
Finance Committee approved the application.
CA/2014/06. Capex application: Chemistry Mass Spectrometer
Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for £0.5m to provide a new state-of-the-art facility for Mass Spectrometry (MS) in the School of Chemistry. The Committee noted the considerable demand for MS data. The existing equipment was obsolete and under pressure within the School and also more widely due to collaborations across WestCHEM (the joint Research School of Chemistry for the West of Scotland).

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/12. Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2014
The Director of Finance provided a report on the overview of performance to 31 July 2014. The Committee noted that the University achieved an operating management surplus of £16.9m which was £12.9m ahead of budget. The movements which contributed to the improved surplus included tuition fees at £5.6m ahead of budget and salary savings of £5.9m.

Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 July 2014. The Director of Finance reported that total debt stood at £26.94m, representing an increase on year-on-year comparisons from £24.76m at July 2013. The level of student and sponsor debt was significantly lower in July 2014 than July 2013, while there had been an increase year-on-year in overall commercial debt.
University of Glasgow
Finance Committee
Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 17 September 2014
in Melville Room, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:
Mr Graeme Bissett, Mr Ken Brown (Convenor), Mr Robert Fraser, Mr Nick Holland, Ms Margaret Morton, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Dr Duncan Ross

In attendance:
Mrs Ann Allen, Prof Neal Juster, Ms Fiona Quinn, Dr Dorothy Welch

Apologies:
Mr Paul Brady, Mr David Newall, Ms Breffni O’Connor, Mr David Ross, Dr Don Spaeth, Mr Iain Stewart

The Convenor noted that Dr Don Spaeth had joined Finance Committee on a temporary basis as Senate Assessor but had given apologies. The Committee welcomed the Deputy Secretary to the meeting, deputising for the Secretary of Court.

CA/2014/01. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 28 May 2014

The minutes of Finance Committee held on 28 May 2014 were approved with one amendment:

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

‘QMU returned a surplus of £29k (against a £20k forecast – an increase of £56k on the previous year’s £27k’

To be amended to:

‘QMU returned a surplus of £29k (against a £20k forecast – an increase of £56k on the previous year’s £27k deficit)’

CA/2014/02. Matters arising

CA/2013/57. Bank Tender

The Director of Finance provided an update on the Bank Tender, noting that only one valid tender had been received and the University’s new banker would be appointed in due course subject to finalising Terms & Conditions. The Director of Finance was satisfied that the chosen bank could provide all services and functionality required and noted that Finance Committee approval would be sought in due course to open new accounts.


Gerald Eve (chartered surveyors) had been appointed as valuer, to undertake a one-off revaluation of fixed assets as at 31 July 2014.

CA/2013/71. Tay House Refurbishment: Capex Application
The Committee noted that the project team was moving to reduce the budget. Car parking costs were likely to be reduced from the original estimates.

**CA/2014/03. Conflicts of Interest**

No new conflicts of interest were reported.

**CA/2014/04. Capex application: South Glasgow Hospitals University Corridor (paper 5.1.1)**

The Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting Finance Committee approval to proceed with the design and construction phases of the refurbishment of the University Corridor premises at South Glasgow Hospital. This would allow decant of the Roundhouse site in preparation for the construction of the housing for the 7 tesla MRI scanner (Capex application May 2014). The Director of Estates noted that the University was working in close partnership with the NHS on the project and confirmed that the £3M required for the refurbishment was covered by a grant agreed by the Scottish Government.

It was clarified that the Scottish Government grant had been sought and agreed specifically for this purpose and therefore the remainder of the funding package for the project as a whole was unaffected.

Finance Committee approved the application.

**CA/2014/05. Capex application: Gilmorehill Infrastructure Improvements (paper 5.1.2)**

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for £4.25m of funding to undertake infrastructure works on the Gilmorehill campus, taking advantage of the district heating CHP installation planned during August 2014 till November 2015. These works would include the replacement of life-expired high voltage cabling on both the south and the north side of University Avenue and installation of new cabling ducts for IT. The works would also involve the replacement of secondary heating systems within Graham Kerr, West Medical and Davidson buildings. The Committee noted that all of these works would replace infrastructure that was in urgent need of replacement.

There was a question from the Committee seeking to establish the likelihood of further additional requests of this kind, and querying whether approval of this application would set a precedent. The Director of Estates noted that an infrastructure strategy was being put in place, as part of the Estate Strategy, with the aim of improved forward planning in terms of coordinating works across the estate. It was confirmed that this project had been considered in the context of the wider campus development.

Finance Committee approved the application.

**CA/2014/06. Capex application: Chemistry Mass Spectrometer (paper 5.1.3)**

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for £0.5m to provide a new state-of-the-art facility for Mass Spectrometry (MS) in the School of Chemistry. The Committee noted the considerable demand for MS data. The existing equipment was obsolete and under pressure within the School and also more widely due to collaborations across WestCHEM (the joint Research School of Chemistry for the West of Scotland). Around 15 academic groups and 150 researchers regularly require access to MS facilities.

The Committee noted that other sources of funding/equipment sharing had been explored but with no success. The Senior Vice Principal outlined the restrictive nature of RCUK funding for equipment.

Finance Committee approved the application.
CA/2014/07. Finance Committee Remit (paper 5.2)

Finance Committee noted that each Committee of Court was required formally to review and approve the committee’s remit annually. The Committee suggested updates around the following areas:

- Monitor cashflow, as well as income and expenditure
- Under the second bullet point, to include any other reports requiring Finance Committee sign-off (for example, TRAC return)
- Acknowledge strategic role of the Committee

There was a query from the Committee seeking to clarify the mechanism and authority for setting investment policy, specifically the respective roles of the Finance Committee and the Investment Advisory Committee. The Deputy Secretary would discuss this with the Secretary of Court with a view to clarifying the remit.

The Committee noted the opportunity to address how GU Holdings related to the Finance Committee remit. It was agreed that this would be addressed in the near future by the Secretary of Court and the Senior Vice Principal.

An updated remit would be brought to the next meeting of Finance Committee.

CA/2014/09. Endowments Investment Reports (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee noted the endowments investment reports.

There was a query from the Committee regarding clarification of the figures on the summary sheet. The Group Financial Controller would revert to the Committee on this point.

The Committee requested that information on the total shareholder return be added to the reports. There was also a suggestion that the objectives of the two fund managers could be reviewed, with a view to bringing them into alignment with one another.

CA/2014/10. Minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee 16 May 2014 (paper 6.3)

Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee from 16 May 2014. The Committee had observed a number of grammatical and drafting errors in the minutes and requested improvement.

CA/2014/11. Sustainability Proposal

The Director of Finance presented a suggested model to monitor the sustainability of the University, which had been developed in response to a requirement of the Scottish Funding Council (SFC). The SFC had requested from all universities and colleges an annual statement, signed off by the governing body, confirming that the institution’s finances were sustainable; no guidance had been given on how that should be achieved or on the format of reports that might be considered. The model is a cash-flow forecast, based on certain assumptions about cost inflation, growth in student numbers and borrowing profiles. It was stressed that the model was work in progress and had been produced over a 20-year horizon, and looking at differing assumptions about borrowing levels. The Committee noted that the two main variables driving the model are assumptions about fee income growth for non-regulated students (postgraduate and international, split into student FTEs and fee inflation) and assumptions about general fund salary cost inflation.

Finance Committee welcomed the proposal, agreeing that the suggested approach would help to give good visibility and control as the campus development progressed and would provide a tool – for internal use – to monitor the University’s cash position.
The Committee agreed that discussion was required to decide on what might be shared with SFC.

The Director of Finance agreed that going forward Finance Committee would receive updates to the model as part of the normal budgeting cycle, and also on an ad-hoc basis as required when large individual items of expenditure were approved.

CA/2014/12. Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2014 (paper 7.1)

The Director of Finance provided a report on the overview of performance to 31 July 2014. The Committee noted that the University achieved an operating management surplus of £16.9m which was £12.9m ahead of budget. The movements which contributed to the improved surplus included tuition fees at £5.6m ahead of budget and salary savings of £5.9m. There was a reduction of £0.7m in the full year outlook from P11. The Committee noted that the £16.9m management accounting surplus equated to a statutory accounting surplus of circa £20.6m after adjusting for pensions, endowments and contribution from subsidiaries.

At year end the University had £159.6m cash in bank which was £36.9m higher than the full year outlook, primarily due to the timing of payments and receipts.

The Committee noted that more detailed commentary would be welcome in terms of the context of the movements in the surplus, for example in terms of the very significant investment in salaries leading up to the REF and the resultant movement in this line.

The Senior Vice Principal acknowledged the large difference between actuals and budget, and noted that there would be some changes in the budget setting process going forward.

CA/2014/13. Debtors Report as at 31 July 2014 (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 July 2014. The Director of Finance reported that total debt stood at £26.94m representing an increase on year-on-year comparisons from £24.76m at July 2013. The vast majority of debt balances were current or within 30 days of age.

The level of student and sponsor debt was significantly lower in July 2014 (£3.08m) than July 2013 (£4.57m). £2.22m was owed by students while £0.86m was sponsor debt. It was noted that the top ten sponsor balances represent 77% of all sponsor balances outstanding.

The Committee noted an increase year-on-year in overall commercial debt (£20.6m as compared to £17.2m in 2013).

The Veterinary and Small Animal Hospital debt balance was £1.28m at July 2014, as compared with £1.49m in July 2013, with 80% of total debts (£1.02m) insured.

CA/2014/14. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 12 November 2014, 2pm.
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Report from the Audit Committee

Brief description of the paper
The paper contains Audit Committee minutes from a meeting held on 1 September 2014, for information.

The Committee welcomed its new chair, Dr Paul Brady.

The Committee received: updates on the pensions schemes and on the development of the Estate Strategy; the draft Internal Audit plan 2014/15 including the methodology used to compile the plan, which the Committee approved; reports on recent internal audits of contract management, international activity, departmental compliance, budgetary control and data assurance (Performance and Development Review for Academics); a briefing on IT penetration testing and on a new Statement of Recommended Practice (SoRP) to address the FRS 102 new financial reporting standard; update reports on actions against recommendations from prior internal audits; details of the University risk register; annual updates on the University’s corporate structure and on any research misconduct cases (none); and brief updates on the development of a new SFC financial memorandum and on HE governance issues.

Prepared by Deborah Maddern
26.9.14
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Audit Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Monday 1 September 2014
in the Melville Room

Present:
Dr Paul Brady (Convener) (PB), Ms Heather Cousins (HC), Mr Jo Elliot (JE), Mr Neil Menzies (NM)

In attendance:
Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young) (KB), Mr Jim Bishop (Ernst & Young) (JB), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance) (RF), Mr Nick Holland (Group Financial Controller) (NH), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk) (DM), Ms Lindsey Paterson (PWC), Ms Lorna Stafford (PWC), Dr Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary) (DW); Mr Colin Campbell (PWC) (for item 6); Mr Sandy Macdonald (Director of IT Services) (for item 6) (SMcD)

Apologies: Mr Hamish Guthrie (HG), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal) (AM), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court) (DN)

AUDIT/2014/1. Minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2014

The minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2014/2. Matters Arising

.1 Pension Schemes

Agreement had been reached with the trustees of the UGPS with respect to addressing the UGPS deficit, to involve a cash injection and payment of the balance over a period of years until the deficit was closed; there would also be a review of these arrangements on the occasion of each triennial review of the scheme.

With regard to the USS deficit, a financial management plan would be put in place following consultation; the plan 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

.2 Language Centre - IELT

Reconciliation of funds had been undertaken and the matter was closed.

.3 Audit Committee remit

A table showing the methods by which each aspect of the Committee’s remit was addressed was noted. Details about the Committee’s role in the oversight of whistleblowing and allegations of fraud would be added.

DM

AUDIT/2014/3. Estate Strategy - Update

PB explained that the context of the Committee’s interest in the strategy arose from the potential for high borrowing and the potential risks involved in the development of the Western Infirmary site and the wider University campus, and the need for the project to
be within a framework of good governance, including proper resourcing of management capability, with risks suitably identified and managed.

The membership and remit of an Estate Strategy Working Group, that has been formed by Court to advise it on the development of the Estates Strategy, was noted. An update was also noted to the effect that, in recent months, Court had approved the vision and guiding principles for the strategy; a Campus Development Framework had been submitted to, and approved by, the City Council; and detailed understanding had been gained of the Western Infirmary site.

Court had been briefed on the Estates Strategy at a half-day workshop session in April, with agreement that clarity was required on the perceived business priorities that the Estate Strategy should serve. A range of borrowing options had also been discussed by Court in April. Business cases had been developed by University senior managers over the summer. In the course of September, the cases would be reviewed by the Working Group, and progress would be reported to a Court Strategy Day on 30 September and to the regular meeting of Court on 8 October. It was noted that key issues were to ensure that capital costs were properly estimated and to ensure that building proposals fitted into the University teaching and research portfolio.

Audit Committee would next meet on 4 November, and would receive a fuller briefing on the Estates Strategy, including the proposed arrangements for project management and governance, the scale of investment being considered, and the funding mechanisms proposed. In the meantime a decision time line would be provided to Committee members. A briefing on the estate strategy was scheduled for the committee for February 2015 and would if possible also include the chair of the Finance Committee as well as the chair of the Estates Committee and Director of Estates & Buildings. In addition, PB would meet the chairs in the coming months.

DW/DM/PB

PWC would be involved where appropriate from an internal audit perspective.

AUDIT/2014/4. Internal Audit Plan 2014/15

A paper from PWC had been circulated, setting out the risk assessment and internal audit plan, including a summary of PWC’s approach to undertaking the risk assessment. This had involved considering an ‘audit universe’ of auditable units, understanding the University’s corporate objectives and (updated) risks, and subsequently developing an audit requirement rating. A Strategic Plan had been drafted following this, covering the auditable units - under broad headings of Risk and Governance, Value for Money, General Assurance Financial Controls, Risk-based Internal Control reviews, and Computer Audit - and indicating the timing and frequency of audits that would be undertaken in the coming year and in 2015/16.

It was noted that discussions had been held with DN, DW, RF, NH and PB ahead of the plan being provided to the Committee. The plan would also be reviewed by the Senior Management Group in October.

It was agreed that in relation to the proposed audit of Health and Safety, a reference to performance improvement would added to the description. The optimal spread of audits across the year’s quarters would also be discussed with management. The Committee approved the Plan subject to these areas being addressed. It was agreed that future plans should be presented at the May meeting of the committee.

PWC
AUDIT/2014/5. Internal Audit Update

Six reviews had been completed since the last Audit Committee. Three areas were planned for review in the next quarter. No reports were classified as critical risk.

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

**Contract Management**

The combined control design and operating effectiveness report on Contract Management within Estates and Buildings was rated as high risk due to the number and ratings of individual findings. A summary of the high risk finding was that situations had arisen whereby suppliers with an annual spend exceeding the threshold operated outside formal framework agreements because while the individual amounts involved did not exceed procurement limits, but the total expenditure over a forty eight month period did. The Committee agreed that this was not acceptable, particularly in light of previous concerns expressed by members about compliance matters within Estates and Buildings, and that SMG should be informed of the Committee’s view accordingly. It was noted that the matter of addressing the recommendations was already in hand and changes were being implemented. It was agreed that implementation of the recommendations should occur as soon as possible. An update would be provided to the November meeting.

**International Activity**

It had been recommended that revision of formal structures and mechanisms should be undertaken to ensure the effective delivery of the University’s internationalisation strategy, so that: activity was directed across the University; responsibilities and reporting lines were clarified across the institution; action relating to partnerships which were not delivering benefits to the University was taken; effective operation was assured within the comprehensive framework for academic collaborations.

**Departmental Compliance**

The review of the use of financial management information had found that it was generally controlled and distributed in a segregated manner by the Finance Directorate and College Heads of Finance, with Schools not involved directly in this process. However there were some examples where localised practices were in operation to generate practical financial management information at a School/Research Institute level. The Committee noted that this was generally so that information could be reworked for local use, including forecasting, and was not creation of new data, therefore in terms of the control environment it was not considered high risk.

**Budgetary Control**

Overall, the review indicated a good level of budgetary control arrangements.

**Data Assurance: Performance and Development Review for Academics**

The purpose of the review had been to assess the automated data transfer process in operations that supported the preparation of Academics’ PDR documents. The review had concluded that the automated transfer of data to create PDR documents was complete and accurate, with no issues requiring action by management.

AUDIT/2014/6. IT Penetration Testing

The Committee received a briefing on IT penetration testing. University management was liaising with PWC with regard to the timing of future testing. An update on the area would be provided to the Committee for its February 2015 meeting.

DN/DW

SMcD
AUDIT/2014/7. FRS 102 and new SoRP

In March 2014 the Financial Reporting Council had issued a new Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) for the sector, which was to update current accounting practice for a new reporting standard FRS 102. The changes to the SORP would mean that there were changes required to the presentation of the Financial Statements and also to the results, depending on accounting treatment choices that were available.

The first year that the University would required to prepare accounts using the new SORP was for the year ending 31 July 2016. However, the University would have to restate the prior year comparatives, which would mean restating the final balance sheet for the year ended 31 July 2014.

The key changes in the SORP related to: the requirement to bring the University’s share of the deficit recovery plan for USS on to the balance sheet; consolidation of the Income & Expenditure Account and the Statement of Total Recognised Gains & Losses into one, which would become the Statement of Comprehensive Income; moving towards recognising income based on meeting performance conditions rather than over the life of a grant (mainly affecting capital grants); treatment of assets in terms of their constituent parts and a transitional provision that allowed selected assets to be revalued and have their useful lives reviewed and updated; and any gains or losses made on endowment investments and on pension deficits being recognised in the surplus in the Statement of Comprehensive Income rather than through the Statement of Total Recognised Gains & Losses. It was noted that the latter area could lead to significant movements in the surplus year on year. A focus on cash flow and forecasts would ensure that a clear financial picture was maintained.

The Committee noted that the Finance Committee had approved a number of actions in line with requirements and options under the SORP.

AUDIT/2014/8. Implementation of Outstanding Priority 1 and 2 Recommendations

Finance Office

Since the last meeting, no new audit actions had arisen, 8 actions against audit reports had been partially implemented and 21 were being progressed, many of which would be addressed by the rollout of the new Research Management System. A briefing for the Committee on this project was scheduled for the November 2014 meeting.

Departments other than the Finance Office

Key points to note from audit reports were:

Audit reports 2013/14

The report on the audit of risk management had identified 5 medium category findings with target implementation dates ranging from 30 April 2014 to 31 January 2015. These included an action to revise and update the risk management policy and recommendations about the annual risk workshop process.

The HMO licences report had identified 2 medium category findings with target implementation dates later in 2014.

Audit reports 2012-13

Scholarships Management (6 remaining actions). The report had recommended a fundamental review of scholarships policy and management, including: consistent policy in the assessment and approval of scholarships and a central system of managing scholarships. Work in addressing these recommendations was being taken forward by the Director of the Recruitment & International Office with completion planned for September 2014.
UK Bribery Act Compliance (3 remaining actions). The actions would be addressed by October 2014, including international agents undertaking anti-bribery training and a risk workshop event to review risks in this area.

*Audit Reports pre-2012/13*

There were four recommendations outstanding from older audits. In each case completion depended on systems development. Two related to the Staff Development audit, and awaited new functionality on the HR/Payroll System. One, from the Value for Money audit, awaited the implementation of a College Workload Model. The final recommendation was on Student Applications and involved development of a CRM enquiry management system.

It was agreed that reports in both Finance and non-Finance areas would make it clear if target dates for completion changed, and that if outstanding actions were no longer relevant, then the Committee should be advised.

**DN/DW/NH**

**AUDIT/2014/9. Risk Management – Risk Register**

The University Register was noted. It was noted that following facilitation of the Senior Management Group (SMG) risk workshop on 23 April 2014, PWC had circulated a revised list of risks for potential inclusion in the strategic risk register. Following liaison with SMG the risks had been prioritised and were undergoing further consideration.

The Committee commented that consideration should be given to including succession planning for key staff, within the register.

**DN/RF**

PWC’s planning for facilitation of College risk workshops was ongoing and it was expected to hold workshops as part of the agenda at College Management Group (CMG) meetings in November. An update on planning progress would be provided at the November Audit Committee.

**PWC**

**AUDIT/2014/10. Corporate Structure**

Details of the corporate structure had been provided and were noted.

In terms of the arrangements in Singapore, it was noted that Agresso was used for financial transactions and that governance arrangements included oversight by University officers and bodies including Senate. A paper would be provided to the Committee for its next meeting.

**DW**

With regard to Glasgow Student Villages, a paper would be provided on the structure, to include risk management details, for the next meeting.

**RF**

**AUDIT/2014/11. Research Misconduct 2013/14/Related University policies**

A report had been provided. No formal investigations relating to research misconduct had been undertaken during the 2013/14 academic year for University of Glasgow staff. The Committee noted that a Concordat to Support Research Integrity had been published in 2012 in response to an increasing international focus on the importance of good research practice. The Committee also noted that the Code of Policy and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research had been updated,
to include reference to the College Research Integrity Advisers. Short workshops on research integrity had been piloted for PhD students over 2013/14 and would become mandatory for new students and postdocs.

Details of current University documents relating to the general area of management of potential fraud had been provided and were noted, being the compliance section of the University’s financial regulations, the policy on Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblowing)), and the Research Misconduct Policy. DN would continue to update the Committee on any relevant cases.

AUDIT/2014/12. Updates on SFC Financial Memorandum and HE Governance

Scottish Funding Council’s Financial Memorandum

In recent years, the Scottish Funding Council had had a single Financial Memorandum covering all higher education institutions and further education colleges. With the changed legal status of the further education colleges, separate Financial Memoranda had now been drafted and were being discussed with the sectors, the HE document now including aspects of guidance that had previously been included in other documents, for example: guidance on financial management; guidance on severance payments; and guidance on audit arrangements. The Committee would be further updated at the November meeting.

DN

Higher Education Governance

Following a 2012 review of higher education governance, the Scottish HE sector had develop its own Code of Good HE governance practice, the task having been addressed by the Committee of Scottish Chairs, through a working group which had published the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance in July 2013. Meanwhile, the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013 placed a new duty on universities to comply with principles of good governance, as determined by the Funding Council. The Funding Council had indicated that, at this time, it viewed the new Code as embedding those principles. The Committee of Scottish Chairs was monitoring compliance with the Code. The Cabinet Secretary was considering further legislation on higher education governance. The Committee would be kept updated.

DN

AUDIT/2014/13. Any Other Business

There was no other business

AUDIT/2014/14. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 4 November 2014 at 2pm in Room 251 Gilbert Scott Building.
Other meetings for the 2014/15 session:
Wednesday 18 February 2015 at 2pm in the Melville Room
Monday 18 May 2015 at 2pm Venue TBC

Prepared by: Deborah Maddern, Clerk to Committee, deborah.maddern@glasgow.ac.uk
Court - Wednesday 8 October 2014

Report from the Estates Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Estates Committee held on 1 September 2014 are attached.

Action Requested

Court is asked to:

Note the progress made on the Estate Strategy (EC/2014/4.1 refers);

Note and endorse Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications in respect of:
Gilmorehill Infrastructure Improvement Works in the sum of £4,256,188 incl. VAT (EC/2014/5.3.1 refers); and
Refurbishment of University Corridor at South Glasgow Hospital in the sum of £3m incl. VAT (EC/2014/5.3.2 refers).

Note the remainder of the minute.

Originator of the Paper
Lynn Duncan
Clerk to Estates Committee
18 September 2014
UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW  
Estates Committee  
Minute of the meeting held in the Estates and Buildings Conference Room on  
Monday 1 September 2014

Present:  Mrs A Allen, Professor S Beaumont, Mr R Fraser, Dr S Inch, Professor N Juster, Professor K Lury, Ms M Morton (Convener), Professor A Muscatelli, Ms B O’Connor, Mr A Seabourne, Dr D Welch

In Attendance: Mrs N Cameron, Mrs L Duncan, Mr N Harris, Mr R Kilpatrick, Mr R Smith

Apologies: Professor J Briggs, Professor F Coton, Dr M Freel, Mr D Milloy, Mr D Newall

EC/2014/1 Minute of the meeting held on 19 May 2014

The minute was approved as an accurate record, subject to the substitution of “first” for “final” in the last sentence. (EC/2013/36.1 refers)

EC/2014/2 Matters Arising

EC/2014/2.1 Estate Strategy Progress Report (Western Infirmary Transfer - EC/2013/34.1 refers)

The Committee noted that a further update was expected from the Health Board on 9 September 2014.

EC/2014/2.2 Projects (Lease of Premises at Olympia Building, Glasgow EC/2013/37.3.2 refers)

The Committee noted that occupation of the premises was expected to commence late in academic year 14/15.

EC/2014/3 Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2014/4 Strategies and Performance

EC/2014/4.1 Estate Strategy Update

The Committee noted that development of the Strategy was based on a series of previously approved work streams which would shape and inform the final Strategy. The work streams were noted as: Estate Strategy Vision; Campus Development Framework; Use of Space and Space Principles; and Maintenance Strategy.

The Committee noted the Court workshop in April 2014 had identified a need for clear focus on strategic University issues and where the Strategy could make the most strategic impact and thereby help the University achieve its ambitions.

The Committee noted that a Court Working Group had been established with the aim of providing support for the University’s senior management toward the finalisation of the Strategy. The Committee noted Paper 4.1 (Appendix 1) Court Working Group Terms of Reference. It agreed that the Terms of Reference would be updated to include the University’s appointed external advisor in the Gateway Review process.

The Committee noted the proposed structure for the Strategy: Strategic Framework; Gilmorehill Development; and Gilmorehill Delivery Plan and Affordability. It noted that the Strategic Framework (abbreviated) would be available to a wider audience and the public but that market sensitive information in other sections of the paper would remain confidential.

Business Case Development - The Committee noted that over the last three months there had been intense focus on defining business priorities which had resulted in development of a series of business
cases each of which define opportunities for: co-location and better alignment of facilities with College structures; development of function-specific hubs (Research, Teaching and Learning Hub and Social Hubs); and development of a resilient infrastructure.

The Committee noted that ten business cases were being developed and noted Paper 4.1 (Appendix 3) which outlined a high-level Vision for each case.

Identified benefits from fully developed business cases would be both quantitative, through increased income and reduced costs, and qualitative, through enhancing the University’s reputation, student experience and internationalisation.

The Committee noted that Finance colleagues were considering affordability of proposals, including the impact of delivering the Strategy at pace, and how developments would support the University’s financial sustainability. Options appraisals had been undertaken to ascertain ways to utilise the Estate for income generation and outputs from this had informed business case development. Estates and Buildings was investigating opportunities for developers in non-core property which was surplus to requirements including consideration of alternative uses for many of the period houses which the University occupies. A detailed review of the opportunity for private-sector rented investment had also been undertaken.

The Committee noted that SMG would consider all business cases in detail and would consider the strategic impact of each case, how it would drive the University’s ambition and the interdependencies of each case. The Committee agreed that a clear process must be established for how decisions would be taken on the priorities and the ranking process.

Procurement and Deliverability - The Committee noted that it had been agreed by Estates and Buildings and Procurement colleagues that the Procurement Strategy must be flexible and efficient, offer value for money and given the scale and complexity of the development, must contain specific elements including: risk management (cost, time and quality); attractiveness to the best consultants and contractors; market trends; delivery within timeframes; flexibility; and quality.

It had been proposed that greater use would be made of alternative forms of contract, including design and build, which reduce the University’s risk profile and offer best value. The use of collaborative strategies, including frameworks, alliances, NEC3 contracts and incentivisation was also being considered.

Court will have the opportunity to discuss the business cases and the draft Strategy at the Annual Court Strategy Day on the 30 September 2014 and again at the meeting of Court on 8 October 2014.

On approval of the Strategy, Estates and Buildings would begin detailed development of proposals and business plans, procurement and delivery options.

The Committee recommended that dialogue should continue with current consultants and contractors in order to learn lessons from previous and current projects and that learning should be applied in future developments and development planning, and that advice should be sought from other appropriate sources in order to inform the future strategy and its delivery.

The Committee agreed that it would comment on the content and structure of the draft Strategy via email over the course of the coming weeks.

EC/2014/4.2 Carbon Management Update

The Committee noted the report and that work continues to identify and deliver the 14/15 programme of carbon reduction projects.
EC/2014/5 Projects

EC/2014/5.1 Approved Projects Status (RAG) report

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

EC/2014/5.2 Project Exception Report

EC/2014/5.2.1 CP09/319 – Centre for Virus Research
The contractor did not achieve the handover date of 14 August 2014 and this was now anticipated on 25 August 2014 although it was noted that this would not impact on the occupation date of 15 September 2014. It was reported that the contractor's anticipated final account would exceed the approved project budget. A full analysis examining the reasons for the delay and overspend would be undertaken and a report prepared for consideration by the Committee at its meeting on 3 November 2014.

EC/2014/5.2.2 CP11/433 CP09/305 - GUU/Stevenson
The contractor had reported a one week programme delay attributable to ground issues although had confirmed that the delay could be mitigated and would not affect the project completion date.

The Committee was assured that discussion had taken place with the Contractor to ensure that it was prepared for the influx of large numbers of students around the site area, particularly during Fresher’s Week and that site operations would have minimal impact.

EC/2014/5.2.3 CP10/386 – Lift Replacement (Boyd Orr Building)
Two lifts completed and operational. Remaining unit part of triplex and the goods lift would be completed by 28 October 2014. The Committee noted that the time delay was due to the need to core the lift shaft, installation of new power supplies, power shutdowns and asbestos removal works in areas previously inaccessible which have all required continuation of business-as-usual teaching and learning activities. The Committee noted the delay posed no impact to cost.

EC/2014/5.2.4 LM12/535 – Kelvin Building Resilience
Project on hold. Discussions had taken place with Blade Room, a company who provide modular/flexible data-centre solutions. Possible locations for siting a modular data centre were identified and an informal discussion with Glasgow City Council (Planning) had taken place. If this solution were adopted it would free up much needed space within the Kelvin Building that currently houses the Scot Grid facility. The longer term solution of a large data centre to have all such IT equipment was also being developed as part of the Estate Strategy.

EC/2014/5.3 Project Approvals

EC/2014/5.3.1 Gilmorehill Infrastructure Improvement Works
The previously approved CapEx application to replace the life-expired steam heating system would involve installation of large heating pipes across the Gilmorehill Campus and would require extensive ground excavation. Such extensive excavation works would provide an opportunity to accelerate other infrastructure replacement works and achieve associated financial savings in the longer term.

The Committee noted the proposal to undertake additional infrastructure works including replacement of life expired high-voltage cabling on the south and the north side of University Avenue, installation of new IT cabling ducts and replacement of secondary heating systems within Graham Kerr, West Medical and Davidson buildings.

The Committee approved the project in the sum of £4,256,188 incl. VAT.
EC/2014/5.3.2 Refurbishment of University Corridor (South Glasgow Hospital)
As part of the University strategy to develop an internationally competitive centre in medical imaging, funding was received for the acquisition of a 7 tesla MRI scanner. A CapEx application for acquisition of this and other imaging equipment, along with the necessary supporting infrastructure, was approved by Capex Committee in May 2014. At that time, it was noted that agreement had been reached with the NHS on the use of the "Roundhouse" site to accommodate the scanner. However in order to make this space available, the NHS requested that the University refurbish the "University Corridor" premises at South Glasgow Hospital to enable decant of staff from the existing Roundhouse building. The May 2014 CapEx application assumed the refurbishment would be carried out using £3m of funding received by the University from the Scottish Government in Feb 2014 which was provided to support the demolition and construction of facilities for the 7T scanner.

Further discussions have taken place with the NHS and it is proposed that the University proceed to engage contractors to design and carry out the necessary University Corridor refurbishments within the £3m funding available.

Estates Committee approved the application in the sum of £3m incl. VAT.

EC/2014/5.4 South Glasgow Hospital (SGH) Phase 2 Update

The Committee noted the update in relation to the current and proposed development of imaging facilities at South Glasgow Hospitals, the context in relation to the £3m CapEx application for refurbishment of the SGH University Corridor at SGH, and the current position of the design of the “Imaging Centre of Excellence (ICE)”.

EC/2014/6 Estates Operating Matters

EC/2014/6.1 Critical Path

Noted.

EC/2014/6.2 Project Governance Update

The Committee noted the progress made in respect of establishing new Project Governance arrangements for Estates and Buildings. These include: establishment of a Project Governance Board, convened by the Director of Estates; a process for New Project Requests (NPR) intended to establish a formalised agreement between a University ‘client’ (College/School/Department) and Estates and Buildings; Project Reports for all Estates and Buildings projects >£100K and Operations programmes >£500K (subject to further clarification) with monthly RAG reporting; Stage Gate Reporting; Programme Office; and Project KPIs.

EC/2014/6.3 Operating Plan 2014/15

The Estates and Buildings Operating Plan 2014/15 was noted.

EC/2014/7 Any Other Business

EC/2014/7.1 Estates Committee Remit

The Committee approved continuation of its current agreed remit:

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

EC/2014/8 Schedule of Meetings for 2014/15

Monday 3 November 2014
Wednesday 7 January 2015
Monday 16 March 2015
Monday 18 May 2015

All meetings will take place in the Estates and Buildings Conference Room at 9am.
Brief description of paper
The minute of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Monday 15 September 2014 is attached for information.

The HR Director provided an update to the HR Committee highlighting a number of substantive areas including an update on proposed changes to USS; the co-location of University Service areas; early career researcher development; internationalisation; gender pay; performance pay and reward; an update from an equality and diversity perspective on applications for Athena SWAN recognition; and recruitment.

The Committee received two presentations from the HR Director providing an update on Staff Survey outcomes and an update on the People & Organisational Development Strategy with particular emphasis being placed on the action planning and subsequent implementation.

The Committee received an update on Policy matters and were given advance notification that two policies would be presented for the Committee’s approval in November. These were Review of casual and zero hours employment practices and Shared Parental Leave.

Action required
Court is asked to note the draft minute of the HR Committee meeting on 15 September 2014.

Richard Claughton
Deputy Director of HR & Clerk to the HR Committee
25 September 2014
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Human Resources Committee
Minute of meeting held in Room 251, Gilbert Scott Conference Suite
on Monday 15 September 2014

Present: The Principal (AM); Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), Mrs A Allen (AAL), Mrs C Barr (CB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Mr R Clauthon (RPC), Mrs H Durnell (HD), Professor C Forde (CF), Professor R O Maolalaigh (ROM), Dr D Spaeth (DS), Mrs D Welch (DW).

Attending: Mrs E Rae (Minute), Ms Selina Woolcott (SW) (item HR/13/53).

Apologies: Mr D Newall (DN)

HR/13/48 Opening Remarks & Apologies
DA opened the meeting and noted apologies from Mr D Newall (represented by Mrs. Dorothy Welch, Deputy Secretary of Court). DA advised that Prof N Jonsson had stepped down from Court and subsequently would no longer serve on the HR Committee. Currently no replacement had been appointed for Alan MacFarlane but it was hoped this would be resolved prior to the next Court meeting.

HR/13/50 Minute of the Meeting held on 3 June 2014
The minute was taken as read and approved by the Committee.

HR/13/51 Matters Arising from 3 June 2014
Matters arising were covered in the HR Director’s report or other agenda items.

HR/13/52 HR Director’s Report
CB provided an overview of the HR Director’s report, highlighting a number of substantive areas including an update on proposed changes to USS; cultural transformation particularly around the co-location of University Service areas; early career researcher development; internationalisation; gender pay; performance pay and reward; an update from an equality and diversity perspective on applications for Athena SWAN recognition; and recruitment.

In relation to changes to the USS scheme, CB reported that the University was broadly supportive of the changes proposed (and had formally responded as such to the UK consultation on the subject). The results of the triennial valuation of USS will be considered by the Trustees in September. The committee noted that all HEIs had been challenged by UCU nationally with regard to the proposals seeking an affirmative assurance to the contrary. The University had responded outlining an inability to accede to their request. DA invited CB to keep the committee informed of future developments.

Following CB’s update on the planned relocation to Tay House, DA asked CB for an indication of staff feedback resulting from the move. CB commented that, whilst a number of challenges and questions had been raised, staff in HR were generally very positive. In terms of implications for service provision, a dedicated touchdown space had been requested for HR to maintain a presence in Gilmorehill.

In relation to the Early Careers Researcher Development Programme, CB advised that good progress had been made in identifying a target audience for mentoring and a fuller update was scheduled for November. It was agreed that Simon Wilson, Head of HR for Science & Engineering would be invited to attend for that item.
The committee welcomed an update on the Scotland Handbook and CB circulated mocked-up content boards for information. All but two Scottish HEIs had now committed to the publication targeted at International students and their families, and CB expressed her thanks to Tracey Stirling, Recruitment Manager, and her team for progress on this initiative.

DS enquired about the relationship between the ECDP and the new Lecturer Development programme and suggested that, within the academic community, there may be a perceived lack of communication between the two. CB clarified for the committee that the previous Academic Probation scheme (PGCAP) had determined the achievement of 60 credits. As part of a consultation process, the introduction of a 40 credit programme was deemed more appropriate and accreditation on that basis is underway now. However, for those on a teaching track there is still a requirement for 60 credits and objective setting within teaching roles would become increasingly important.

CF asked for an indication of how well received the newly established 1 - 5 PDR performance ratings had been and CB advised that more substantive discussions were now possible between reviewers/reviewees than before. Clearer links to capability and performance management could now be effected. Other members of the committee supported this view.

ROM enquired whether Russell Group benchmarking was available to inform our promotion percentages and CB advised that this was not readily to hand but the perception was that we were broadly in line.

The committee noted that no drop in recruitment statistics had been evident post-REF. The Principal suggested this was due to increased numbers of staff to support increased student numbers and increased funding rather than an increase in turnover.

**HR/13/53 Staff Survey Update**

CB presented a summary of the Staff Survey results and an update on the substantive progress which had been made to date in relation to their dissemination. A small working group comprising four SMG members has been established and College/School level presentations had been given to relay outcomes, areas of good practice and areas for improvement.

CB summarised that the key focus areas of the emerging action plan could be categorised as cultural transformation initiatives; effective structures and team working; improvement of leadership capability and an increase in visibility; engagement and involvement and effective communications.

SW focussed her update on the HSE stress risk assessment elements of the survey which were categorised as demands; control; change; role; relationships and support (both management and peer). The data identified areas of improvement since the last survey but also a number of areas where further investigation may be needed.

**HR/13/54 People & OD Strategy Update**

CB presented an update on the substantive progress which had been made to date in relation to the People & Organisational Development Strategy action plan. In total, 70 individual actions made up the strategic action plan and approximately 60% of those actions had been completed or were significantly underway.

Adjustments had been made to the HR management team structure and were outlined by CB who advised three senior managers (down from 6 in the previous structure) now reported to the HRD. The various changes outlined represented a reduction in headcount of seven staff with the savings being used to invest in the new professional strategic roles.
**HR/13/55 Policy Update**
RPC provided an update on areas of HR policy which are currently under review.

**HR/13/56 Review of Casual and zero hours employment practices**
RPC advised that whilst it was important for the University to have a flexible workforce it should act, wherever possible, to reduce the unpredictability of hours for our staff and managers. RPC invited the committee to review the paper and approve the general approach which he intended to take in regard to framing a new Extended Workforce policy. RPC advised that he had consulted with Finance, the Trade Unions, Heads of School and many others.

EC stated that he was supportive of the direction this matter was taking, however was keen to ensure that the policy was not too restrictive and recognised the different challenges the University has in this area.

The committee confirmed its support for the evolving policy framework and noted that following further union consultation the Extended Workforce policy would be presented to SMG prior to seeking approval at the November HRC.

**Action – RPC**

**HR/13/57 Maternity & Paternity – Shared Parental Leave**
RPC provided a summary of the legislative changes re shared parental leave being introduced in December for expected births from early April 2015. Furthermore, he explained the background to an amendment to the maternity leave policy to provide additional clarity for staff on open ended contracts with a funding end date. The committee noted the paper and the general approach which he intended to take in regard to framing a new Shared Parental leave policy which would be presented for approval in November.

**Action – RPC**

**HR/13/58 KPIs: Sickness Absence**
The committee received an update on sickness absence statistics and noted that there had been an improvement in the quality of the data being provided. No specific concerns were expressed about the levels of absence but all agreed that continuous monitoring was essential as the cost to the University is very high. DA asked for the Reasons for Absence chart to be further broken down. He also requested that expanded Russell Group benchmarking data be fed into future reports where this was available.

**Action: RPC**

**HR/13/59 HRC Sub-Committee Update**

**HR/13/60 JCCN (Joint Committee of Consultation and Negotiation):**
The minute of the meeting of the JCCN held on 5 June 2014 was noted. DS stated that this first meeting of the Group had been very positive. DA wished the JCCN future success and hoped that it would help continue positive relations with our Trade Union colleagues.

**HR/13/61 Recognition Agreement:**
The draft agreement between the University of Glasgow and the recognised Trade Unions clarifying the single table approach to future consultation and negotiation was noted. This will now proceed to signatures.

**HR/13/58 Any other business**
DA thanked CB, RPC and team for input to the September Committee.

**HR/13/59 Future dates of next meeting**
The next meeting of the HR Committee was noted as Monday 17 November 2014 at 10am – 12.15pm in the Melville Room.
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Report from the Meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee
held on Tuesday 16 September 2014

Brief description of the paper

The paper contains the draft Minute of the meeting held on 16 September 2014, for information.

The Committee received: an update on the stress indicator section of the staff survey; reports from Occupational Health and the Safety & Environmental Protection Services; a report on the take-up of the Employee Assistance programme; and details of a survey of directors of professional services in relation to routes for staff to raise health and safety issues.

Following a review of the effectiveness of the Committee, a subgroup of the Committee is being formed to discuss changes to its operation.

Action required

For information purposes only
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University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Tuesday 16 September 2014 at 10:00 AM in the Senate Room

Present:

Mrs Ann Allen, Mrs Christine Barr, Ms Mae Boyd, Dr Gordon Duckett, Mr David McLean, Mr John F Malcolm, Dr Catherine Martin, Dr John O'Dowd, Mr Paul Phillips, Mr Deric Robinson, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Selina Woolcott, Ms Louise Bowden, Mr Liam King

In Attendance:

Ms Debbie Beales, Dr Dorothy Welch

Apologies:

Mr James Gray, Mr David Newall, Ms Julie Ommer

HSWC/2014/1 Convenors Business

The Committee were informed that in the absence of David Newall (due to illness) Dr Dorothy Welch would convene the meeting. Dr Welch welcomed the new SRC rep, Liam King, to the Committee.

HSWC/2014/2 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 28 May 2014

The Minute of the meeting held on Wednesday 28 May 2014 was approved.

HSWC/2014/3 Matters arising

HSWC/2014/3.1 Staff Survey (verbal update Ms S Woolcott)

Ms Woolcott updated the Committee on the results of the stress indicator section of the staff survey using a PowerPoint presentation. This survey had taken place in March and April of this year and included a slightly modified version of the question set from the Health & Safety Executive (HSE) stress survey indicator tool. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that the results were currently only available at College level which she shared with the Committee along with a breakdown by job family. Once all Colleges had received their breakdowns the results would then be filtered to School level and released to Schools (University Services had already received their breakdown by Unit). The survey results would be helpful in prioritising and drawing up action plans to address issues flagged in the survey. The management teams at local level, with support from HR would put these action plans into place.

HSWC/2014/4 OH Report (Paper 1)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that overall activity had continued to increase, especially for the MVLS College, creating significant additional workload for the Unit. The main reasons for this were fitness to practice appointments and elective immunisation paperwork for medical students which
would only continue to rise as well as health surveillance for staff. On the matter of management referrals, the most common reason was musculoskeletal which was unusual as the most common reason was usually mental health issues. Due to the cessation of self-referral appointments these statistics would no longer be included and it was too early to say whether this would have a knock on effect on the number of management referrals. UCU raised concerns that some information concerning stress levels, bullying/harassment and management issues could be lost in the absence of a self-referral mechanism. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that management-referrals would still be monitored to see if figures suggested that these cases were now being captured through that route. The Committee discussed the change from self-referrals at OH to drop in sessions at the Counselling & Psychological Service (CAPS). The Committee agreed that the number of drop ins should be recorded as well as the reason.

HWWC/2014/5 SEPS Report (Paper 2)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that Dr Steve Johnson had joined SEPS as the new full time Environmental Adviser, replacing the previous part time post. Dr Johnson had agreed to produce a document listing his first impressions of the University's current environmental set up which would be ready for the HSWC meeting in March 2015.

Mr McLean also updated the Committee on the audit programme being conducted by SEPS. 19 Units had been audited so far with various actions required from each. All 19 Units had been written to by SEPS, listing the required actions, with 13 replies so far. Any non-responses would be revisited before the December HSWC meeting to ensure that all replies were received. SEPS would collate the responses and decide when an action was considered closed. 10 more audits were due before the end of the year and the Committee would be updated on these at future HSWC meetings.

Mr McLean informed the Committee that there would be a change in explosives regulations on 1 October 2014. SEPS had circulated this information to all relevant Units asking for them to list what explosives were held in the University and where they were located.

Finally Mr McLean presented the accident stats for the last quarter and these contained no unusual anomalies.

HWWC/2014/6 EAP Report (Paper 3)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that whilst uptake was down on the same period last year, it was up from the previous quarter. It was possible that this was due to the cessation of the self-referral service at OH. As well as the launch of the drop in service for staff at CAPS which had replaced self-referrals, proposals had been drafted for a wider range of in-house mental health support for staff. Other proposals would progress once the new head of service for CAPS came into post in October.

HWWC/2014/7 Review of HSWC (Paper 4)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that she had sent out a short survey to the Committee and that 9 members (out of 20) had responded. She asked that the Committee provide feedback on the proposals in the Paper that had been circulated by 30 September 2014. The Committee agreed that a sub group be formed to take forward any changes to the workings of the Committee and that they should meet as soon as possible.
HSWC/2014/8 Review of local safety groups within US (Paper 5)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that, following concerns raised by UCU Safety Reps about the clarity of routes available for staff to raise H&S issues, she had sent a short survey to Directors of professional services. She had received 12 out of 13 responses and would discuss the matter further with USMG in September. Ms Woolcott would keep the Committee updated on any progress made.

HSWC/2014/9 Employee Liability Activity Report (Paper 6)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that, as it was impossible to completely anonymize this report, it was not for circulation out with the Committee.

HSWC/2014/10 Any Other Business

There was no AOB.

HSWC/2014/11 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HSWC will be held on Wednesday 10th December 2014 at 10am in the Melville Room

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales
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University Court – Wednesday 8 October 2014

Communications to Court from the meeting of Council of Senate held on 2 October 2014

(All matters are for noting)

1. Draft Ordinance 206: Composition of University Court

The Secretary of Court provided an update on draft Ordinance 206, which concerned the composition of the University Court. The Council of Senate has discussed the draft Ordinance at its meeting on 17 April 2014. The draft Ordinance proposed amendments of Court’s composition with the primary aim of ensuring a clear lay majority on Court. 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 draft Ordinance had proposed a reduction of the number of Senate Assessors on Court from the present seven to five. The Council had resolved to reject the reduction proposed in the draft Ordinance. A proposal by the Council that the number of Senate Assessors should be six had been accepted by Court.

The Secretary of Court reported that the Privy Council had rejected the draft Ordinance, not on a substantive issue, but on an issue of terminology. It was likely that a revised draft Ordinance, which would require a fresh consultation exercise, would be developed for consideration by Privy Council later in the Session. Meanwhile the number of Senate Assessors on Court would remain at seven.

2. Senate Assessors

The Clerk of Senate reported that, as the Council was aware, a vacancy had been created by the resignation of Professor Padgett following his appointment as Vice-Principal. It was also reported that since the Council met in June, two further Assessors had intimated their intention to resign as Assessors: Professor Nicholas Jonsson and, from November, Dr Marie Freel. As the proposed revision to the composition of Court had not been approved, Senate would continue to appoint seven Assessors, in line with the current constitutional position and that the Senate Office was taking forward the appointment of successors to Dr Freel and Professors Padgett and Jonsson.

In the event of the draft Ordinance providing for six Assessors is approved by the Privy Council by summer 2015, it was agreed that, to align with the new composition of Court,
Senate would not appoint a successor to Dr Don Spaeth, who was scheduled to stand down on 31 July 2015.

3. Development of Policy and Questionnaire for Course Feedback

The report from the Course Feedback working group had been submitted to the Education Policy & Strategy Committee (EdPSC) in June 2014. The Working Group had been established following the recommendations of a previous EdPSC working group, which had considered the use of Evasys software, which provides automated means of collating feedback/survey results. The remit of the Course Feedback working group had been to consider policy and practice on course feedback for the University. The policy was intended to, inter alia, ensure that the University would be able to demonstrate at audit that the process was working effectively. The working group had also been asked to consider the relationship between course evaluation and teaching quality. The group had also been tasked with the development of a standard questionnaire for the University, which was to include a small number of core, compulsory questions, but provide the scope for the inclusion of additional optional questions. The working group’s report had been very warmly received by EdPSC.

Dr Helen Puchase, Convenor of the working group, provided an overview of the recommendations. She reported that, after extensive discussions, the proposal was for five core questions, three closed and two open, and that it was recommended that only data from these core questions be reported institutionally. It was considered that this would provide sufficient information for institutional audit purposes.

It was reported that, although the remit of the working group was not specifically to consider Evasys Software for administration of the questionnaire, as the use of Evasys was in pilot phase, the working group proposed that the questionnaire was also piloted in conjunction with Evasys in the Evasys pilot Schools.

In discussion at the Council meeting, members raised the issue of data permissions and the fact that the recommendations made by the working group regarding these potentially had implications for teaching staff. One point made was that the primary purpose of course evaluation was to support teaching quality, and that there was an argument that it was more important for the data about a member of staff be made available to the Course Director, than the line manager. It was highlighted that in some instances line managers were not directly involved in the management of teaching. Dr Purchase reported that the working group were mindful of the variations across Schools within the University and had attempted to use a form of wording that was appropriate across the University. It was clarified that the intention of the phrase ‘where appropriate’ had not been to mean in exceptional cases only.

It was reported that staff involved in the redesign of one course had not had access to the course feedback for that course from previous years. A member of staff who had previously taught on the course concerned had refused access to the data. Members of the Council
put the view that the data should be made available for appropriate purposes, including the further development of courses. Dr Purchase stated that the recommendation of the working group was that consideration be given to who has access to the data and that the wording of the recommendation had aimed at judicious application of discretion.

Concerns were raised about dealing with the reliability of data for small group teaching where the views of one or two students could have a significant impact on the overall data. Dr Purchase stated that the group strongly recommended that quantitative data should be reported as a frequency rather than a mean, as was often the tendency, in order to address the issue of small cohorts of students as best as possible. It was also recommended by the working group that a narrative be associated with each set of data to provide context such as small groups of students.

The issue of reluctance of students to complete course feedback questionnaires was also raised and it was noted that there was a tendency for those who view the course or teaching very positively or very negatively to respond, leading to some concern that the data could therefore be biased. It was pointed out that the report addressed student willingness to complete surveys by recommending that questionnaires be administered in class as this was more likely to result in a better response rate.

Concerns were also voiced about the workload implications, in terms of handling the additional questions, and to a greater extent, regarding the recommendation about producing a feedback report. It was argued that this would create significant additional work for members of staff who were already under pressure and often had inadequate administrative support. Dr Purchase reiterated that the expectation was that in the main, questionnaires would involve the use of the core five questions only. The additional sets of questions had been developed for optional use. It was acknowledged that there was indeed extra effort required in closing the feedback loop, but the working group had felt very strongly that this was absolutely necessary. It was also recognised that students would be more likely to respond to future course feedback requests if they could see that issues raised by previous cohorts were being responded to effectively by staff.

Professor Fearn stated that, in his view, access to the data should not be too restrictive as some Schools might want to be more open about the data: for example, it might be made available to the Director of Learning and Teaching, or to students. The latter point was also made by other members, and Dr Purchase reported that the working group had considered this issue and had taken the view that qualitative data was of greater benefit to students.

Dr Hersh voiced concerns that care was required to ensure that access to data did not disadvantage students. Concern was also raised about security of the online data and potential for hacking. She also expressed the view that the questionnaire was skewed to quantitative rather than qualitative data, and that qualitative data was more valuable when the purpose was to identify areas for change or improvement. Dr Hersh also noted that other means of gathering feedback in addition to questionnaires were being used effectively.
and that there was a danger that these alternative approaches were would be less favoured if most attention was on the proposed questionnaire. Professor Guthrie responded that a fundamental point of the recommendations made by the Working Group was not to rely solely on the proposed questionnaire; rather, the report highlighted that many other methods of obtaining feedback were currently being utilised and the report recommended using a variety of methods.

Professor O'Donnell noted that there were sometimes teething problems with new or amended courses, and suggested that it was consequently necessary to have transparent mechanisms that allowed honest reflection on the success or otherwise of the new course.

Dr Moira Fischbacher-Smith, who had convened the original Evasys working group, reported that the administrative staff who had been involved in the Evasys pilot were very supportive of the use of Evasys and considered it to be advantageous to other methods used for operating a questionnaire-based feedback processes.

The Principal thanked the working group and members of the Council for their contributions to the discussion. It was agreed that the proposed pilot of the questionnaire should proceed as recommended and that the working group report back on the findings of the pilot exercise.

4. Convener’s Business

4.1 Referendum Outcome

The Principal paid tribute to staff and students for the way in which they had conducted themselves around the Referendum, demonstrating mutual respect in a passionate way. He also noted that the University had played a strong role in promoting debate about the Referendum through an impressive number of lectures and other events on the matter.

The Principal reported that proposals for further devolution would, but the nature of the promises, have an impact on Higher Education, for example Research Councils and the proposed move to more alignment with Scottish priorities. Although it was not expected that funding of Higher Education was likely to be reviewed in the short term, it was anticipated that this would occur in the longer term.

The University was mindful of the potential unintended consequences of the outcome related implications and therefore it was recognised that there was a need to consider ways in which the University might be affected. Council of Senate was assured that there would be engagement with Government and the relevant agencies regarding the impact of changes.

4.2 Staff Survey
The Principal reported that the Director of Human Resources would provide a more detailed overview and update at the December meeting of Council of Senate, but highlighted some key points identified by the survey. The level of participation had been good, with a response rate of 60% - significantly higher than for previous staff surveys. The fact that an independent company had been employed to conduct the survey was thought to have impacted positively on the response rate and also meant that the data could be used to benchmark against other universities. The results of the survey indicated that 90% of staff considered the University of Glasgow to be a great place to work. Other positives were related to equality and diversity, job satisfaction, line manager interaction and being supported. The key issues highlighted in the survey were work load pressures, that SMG does not communicate well with the University community and how the institution values the contribution of colleagues. The Principal reported that, partly in light of the survey findings, he had amended the composition of the Principal’s Advisory Group to now include the Heads of Schools, Directors of Research Institutes and of a small number of Services and the President of the SRC. The Advisory Group would meet monthly, starting in October. The Senior Management Group would continue to meet monthly on a formal basis and have more informal weekly meetings.

### 4.3 THE University of the Year Shortlist

The Principal reported that the University had been shortlisted for the THE University of the Year and has also been shortlisted in three other categories:

**Outstanding Support for Early Career Researchers**

Shortlisted for Glasgow's programme for enterprising arts researchers, ‘A Creative Enlightenment’. The four day, Arts and Humanities Research Council-funded, programme intended to bring together arts researchers from across Scotland, providing opportunities to think creatively about how they can apply their skills and experience beyond the PhD, particularly in relation to being self-employed or starting a social enterprise or charity.

**International Collaboration of the Year – sponsored by SGH Martineau LLP**

Shortlisted in this category for the ‘Lifelong Learning in Palestine project’. A two-year EC Tempus-funded initiative led by Glasgow aimed at embedding lifelong learning within the academic mission and ethos of Palestinian Education Institutions. The concept of cradle-to-grave learning was of particular relevance in the Palestinian territories where political, social and economic factors create obstacles to learning traditionally linked to universities.

**Outstanding Contribution to Innovation and Technology**

This category recognises technology developed at Glasgow which had enabled a step-change in medical devices, through the creation of a novel acoustic hologram ‘toolbox’. This innovative technology has led to a series of breakthroughs in areas as diverse as diagnostics, drug delivery and blood clotting. The low cost, low power devices are disposable, meeting three major industry requirements.
Congratulations were extended to all concerned.

4.4 National Student Survey (NSS) 2014

The Principal reported that, in NSS 2014, the overall satisfaction for the University was 91.3%, an increase from 89% in 2013. This represented the University’s highest rating since it began participating in the NSS in 2006. This result reflected the hard work and dedication of staff at the University, and the Principal drew particular attention to those subject areas that have seen significant increases in satisfaction from last year.

4.5 League Tables

The Principal reported that the University of Glasgow has been rated amongst the top 100 universities in the world, according to Times Higher Education World University Rankings. Glasgow ranked 94th, up 23 places from 117 the previous year. In terms of subject rankings, the University of Glasgow was 61st for Arts and Humanities, 57th for Clinical and Pre-Clinical Health and 47th for Life Sciences. In the QS World University Rankings, the University was ranked 55th, a drop from 51st the previous year.

5. Honorary Degrees 2015

Senate received the report from the Honorary Degrees Committee concerning recommendations for the conferment of honorary Degrees in 2015. The Clerk of Senate will provide a report to Court at its meeting on 8 October 2014.

6. Senate Guest Night Dinner

The next Senate Guest Night Dinner would be held on Thursday, 13 November 2014 at 7.00pm in the Senate Room. Further details on the evening, including a reply slip, would appear shortly on the Senate Office website and also be circulated by e-mail in due course.

Members of Senate or Court who wish to nominate persons for consideration as official guests of the Senate at this or subsequent Senate Guest Nights should write to the Clerk of Senate. Members of Senate and Court are also encouraged to contact the Clerk of Senate with suggestions for speakers at subsequent Senate Guest Nights.

The Clerk of Senate reminded the Council that all members of Senate had a standing invitation to attend Senate Guest nights and events such as Commemoration Day and Graduations.

7. Remembrance Sunday and First World War centenary

The Clerk of Senate advised that this year’s Remembrance Service would be held in the Bute Hall on Sunday, 9 November at 10.45am.

The University marked Remembrance Sunday each year. In 2014, the event would also commemorate the centenary of the start of the First World War and the part played in the War by our students and staff, 761 of whom lost their lives.
There will be an academic procession at the event. Those who wish to join the procession are requested to assemble in the Hunterian Museum by 10.30am. Academic Dress is required for those in the procession - gown and hood plus dark tie (conventional, not bowtie) for men.

Staff, students and their families and friends are all very welcome to attend. Please go to https://uogremembranceservice.eventbrite.co.uk to register your attendance.

It is also important that all wishing to join the procession should email Staffgowns@glasgow.ac.uk by Friday, 31 October 2014. (Please note that this is to inform us of your intention to attend - unfortunately, we are unable to provide gowns for the Remembrance Service.)

Please contact Amber Higgins in the Senate Office ( Amber.Higgins@glasgow.ac.uk) if you have any queries.

It was also reported that, over the course the First World War, the University of Glasgow lost 761 staff, students and alumni. In commemoration to each of the 761, on the anniversary of their deaths, a cross would be planted in the University’s Garden of Remembrance situated by the Main Gate. The first fatality suffered by the University community was Captain Harry Ranken, who was posthumously awarded the Victoria Cross for his bravery. A ceremony had been held to mark the event on 25 September, at which members of Captain Ranken’s family had been present. The Lord Provost of the City of Glasgow had also been present, and had formally presented the University with a carved commemorative paving stone. This would be installed in the University Chapel.

The Clerk of Senate expressed thanks to the Moira Rankin Senior Archivist and Lesley Richmond Deputy Director and University Archivist /Senior Research Fellow and to Dr Tony Pollard from the School of Humanities for their work on the University’s Great War Project.
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Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Institution-led Review of Quality and Governing Body Statement of Assurance for AY 2013-14

Cover Sheet

Brief Description of the Paper

A copy of the University’s draft annual report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) on institution-led review of quality for AY 2013-14 is attached. The contents are specified by the SFC. The statement summarises review activity undertaken by the University of its provision for students, i.e. Periodic Subject Reviews (PSR), Graduate School Reviews and the University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP) carried out in respect of student-facing University services. Information concerning review activity carried out at the University by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies is also included.

The deadline for submission of the report was 30 September, and the Council requests that we confirm to them when the report has been approved by Court in the event that Court does not meet until after that date. The draft nature of the statement has been duly reported to SFC.

Court has duly approved the annual report for the last several years. Court will recall that a new requirement, the ‘Statement of Assurance’ was introduced in 2013. The prescribed text is quoted below and should be signed off by the Chair of the Governing Body with an indication of when it was endorsed.

“On behalf of the governing body of [University of Glasgow], I confirm that we have considered the institutions arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for AY 2013-14, including the scope and impact of these. I further confirm that we are satisfied that the institution has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision. We can therefore provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at this institution continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.”

Action Required

Court is requested to approve the draft report and endorse the statement of assurance above.
How we assure the effectiveness of arrangements for maintaining academic standards and quality

Under the terms of its constitution, at the University, Senate has responsibility for teaching. This has been understood as meaning responsibility for academic standards and quality. Senate employs a range of mechanisms to ensure standards and quality are maintained. The main methods used are:

- The external examiner system
- The annual monitoring of all courses
- The periodic review of programmes by subject (involving external subject experts)
- The periodic review of the Graduate Schools
- The scrutiny of all new courses and degree programmes
- Gathering and analysing feedback from students

Many of the University’s degrees are also accredited by professional or statutory bodies and these degrees are reviewed by the relevant body on a cyclical basis.

The findings from the range of mechanisms detailed above are analysed and responded to by committees at School, Research Institute, College and Senate levels. This includes normally annual consideration of ways to enhance the effectiveness of the mechanisms themselves and of the committees that receive and consider them also. The framework of these arrangements is detailed in the University’s Academic Quality Framework, which may be found at: [http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_127773_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_127773_en.pdf)

The University’s quality arrangements must also conform to the terms of the Scottish national Quality Enhancement Framework. Details of this may be found at: [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/SCOTLAND/ABOUTUS/Pages/Quality-enhancement-framework-in-Scotland.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/SCOTLAND/ABOUTUS/Pages/Quality-enhancement-framework-in-Scotland.aspx)

Compliance with the Quality Enhancement Framework is assessed at the four-yearly Enhancement-led Institutional Reviews (ELIRs).

The ELIR reviews check (in detail) compliance with the terms of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education published by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). This Code includes detailed provisions for each of the main quality assurance mechanisms we employ. ELIR reviews also check compliance with national Subject Benchmark Statements and with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework.

The University has received the best result possible in each of the reviews it has undergone. Court will be aware that the most recent ELIR took place earlier in 2014. This exercise resulted in an excellent outcome. The reports from the 2014 ELIR may be found at: [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007794](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007794)

The QAA also checks the University’s compliance with the requirements of the annual report to the Scottish Funding Council. No notes of concern have been received on these reports since they began to be required.

As a separate measure, the Secretary of Court also maintains a rolling programme of reviews of service departments within University Services. In compliance with the requirements of the Scottish national Quality Enhancement Framework, the panels for these reviews include a student member as well as external representative(s).

Quality arrangements and monitoring of external requirements are managed for the University by the Senate Office.
Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Progress of Institution-led Reviews conducted in 2013-14

1. Introduction
The University’s annual report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) includes a summary of Periodic Subject Reviews (PSR); reviews by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB); Graduate School Review and University Services Administrative Review Programme. Below is a report on each process.

2. Periodic Subject Review (PSR)
The University’s process of internal subject review is known as Periodic Subject Review (PSR). The process for PSR is consistent with the SFC’s guidance on the characteristics of institution-led review (e.g. they are conducted on a cycle of not more than 6 years; include a student member and at least one external member on the review panel).

More detailed information on the PSR process is available at: http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/periodicsubjectreview/

The PSR process is under continuous review and development since it was first established in 2002—3. However, during Session 2013-14, the PSR process underwent a major review, following the end of its second six-year cycle (2008-14). This was a reflective and critical evaluation and included consultation with the Student Representative Council, Vice-Principal for Learning and Teaching, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, Deans of Learning and Teaching, Heads of Subject/School from previous reviews, the Director of Learning and Teaching Service, the Postgraduate Research Strategy Manager, and focus groups with staff members from the Senate Office/ADU and Student Panel members. The conclusion of the evaluation and a number of recommendations to enhance the process for the next cycle was considered by the University’s Academic Standards Committee (ASC) on 23 May 2014.

The outcome of the review concluded:

- Confidence that the PSR process met the Schools’, University, Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Scottish Funding Council (SFC) requirements
- Broadly, the appropriate level for review had been found i.e. Subject Area and School level. There were a few anomalies to this and it was agreed that liaison with Schools would continue to ensure the groupings remained appropriate.
- The level of documentation required for the PSR was significant, but this was mainly due to meeting external requirements. It was acknowledged that management of the documentation had been much improved following the introduction of SharePoint for the collation and distribution of documentation.
- Schools had found the production of the Self Evaluation Report (SER) an onerous task; therefore it was proposed to revise the template for the third cycle to align more closely
to the Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR3) guidance. The revised template is provided at Appendix 1.

- Recommendations and commendations would be more rigorously reviewed to ensure that they were evidenced-based and Schools were invited to comment on recommendations prior to submission to ASC.
- The Senate Office would provide greater ongoing liaison and support with Schools post-review to guide responses to recommendations and to highlight good practice identified in other PSR reports.

Academic Standards Committee approved the above recommendations, and further agreed the following:

- The estimated length of the SER should be 15-20 pages. Explicit guidance would be given to subjects that the SER was intended to be a focussed, reflective analysis of the subject area.
- A copy of the SER to be provided to Deans (Learning and Teaching) and Vice-Principal and Head of College in advance of the Review as well as a copy of the draft report prior to submission to ASC. This allowed Colleges to provide additional commentary on factual accuracy, to the Review Panel.
- PSR was an enhancement-led process and should not be used as leverage for additional resources in budgetary planning processes. It was however recognised that although direct resources were out of the scope of PSR, Review Panels could consider that limited or poor-quality resources were having a direct impact on the learning and teaching provision and the student experience. This issue would be resolved by the provision of explicit guidelines to Review Panels on the appropriate wording and phrasing of recommendations with resource impact.
- Schools/Subjects to address recommendations within 6 months of ASC approval rather than the current 1 year progress report.

2.1 Subject Areas Reviewed in Session 2013-14

Seven reviews\(^1\) were conducted during 2013-14, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Open Studies (Session 2012-13)</td>
<td>11/12 March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Health Care</td>
<td>4/5 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Social History</td>
<td>23/24 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td>13/14 February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>25/26 February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology and Religious Studies</td>
<td>6 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>12/13 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Community Development and Adult Education</td>
<td>13/14 March 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of the programmes covered by the reviews are included in Appendix 2. The University’s confirmed PSR review reports are publically available at: [http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/periodicsubjectreview/#tabs=3](http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/periodicsubjectreview/#tabs=3)

---

\(^1\) The report from the review of Open Studies was not included in the Annual Statement for 2012-13 as it was yet to be endorsed by the Academic Standards Committee and therefore is included in the Annual Statement for 2013-14.
2.2 Update on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2012-13

One year on, Progress Reports were considered by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for the following subject areas that were reviewed in 2012-13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Subject</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences Graduate School: Postgraduate Taught Programmes&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ASC agreed that MVLS should be commended for the detailed responses to the 10 recommendations and that their strategy document had resulted from detailed discussions between key stakeholders. The restructuring of PGT provision and renewed vigour for international recruitment and collaboration had been well thought out. A number of small points for clarification were referred to the College of MVLS. ASC also proposed that the College consider rationalising the number of programmes by offering a range of specialisations from a core set of MSc programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>10 out of the 13 recommendations had been given full and appropriate consideration but 3 warranted a further progress report in 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8 of the 13 recommendations had been given full and appropriate consideration but 5 warranted a further progress report in 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>ASC considered that the 7 recommendations had been given full and appropriate consideration. Responses were considered to be very thorough with good progress made. Some further progress was requested in relation to 1 recommendation regarding the issue of recompense for GTA staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic and Gaelic</td>
<td>8 of the 12 recommendations had been satisfactorily addressed but 4 warranted further review and therefore a further update was to be provided during Session 2014-15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>This was endorsed by ASC under “summer powers” and an update on progress in expected to be received at the October 2014 meeting of ASC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Further progress reports on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2011-12

As requested by ASC, further updates on progress from Reviews undertaken in Session 2011-12 were received for:

<sup>2</sup> Postponed from late 2011-12 to early 2012-13 and did not include PGT for Dentistry and Life Sciences as they had been reviewed in 2009-10 and 2011-12 respectively.
• 4 outstanding recommendations following the Review of the School of Life Sciences were considered on 4 October 2013. ASC had considered that good progress had been made in relation to 2 of those recommendations but sought further information for the remaining 2. Final responses were received and considered satisfactory at the November 2013 meeting.

• 6 recommendations following the Review of Management were received by ASC on the 15 November 2013. ASC was content that the responses demonstrated that progress was being made and confirmed that no further updates were deemed necessary.

• 5 recommendations following the Review of the School of Education were received by ASC on the 15 November 2013. It was noted that good practice had been made in many areas and actions were identified as being completed. There was one remaining recommendation regarding publication of an overview of programmes on the School’s webpages were progress had been considered as limited. A further update would be provided at the October 2014 meeting of ASC.

• 3 recommendations following the Review of the School of Law were received by ASC on the 15 November 2013. ASC confirmed that satisfactory progress had been made and that no further updates were required.

• 10 recommendations following the Undergraduate School of Medicine were received by ASC on the 15 November 2013. ASC was satisfied that good progress had been made with many of the issues highlighted but sought further information on two areas: one regarded teaching responsibilities of all staff, including clinical academics whilst the other regarding changes to the Year 1 and 2 curriculum. ASC received further information at its February 2014 meeting regarding the first issue where it was concluded that satisfactory progress had been made with the School drawing up a set of proposals which had been approved by the College Management Group. A further update regarding changes to the Year 1 and 2 curriculum would be submitted to the October 2014 meeting of ASC.

• 6 recommendations following the Review of the School of Physics and Astronomy were received by ASC on the 15 November 2013. ASC considered that 3 of these were satisfactory but there were unresolved issues for the remaining 3. One of these issues concerned disabled access to a common room. Estates and Buildings had advised that this issue had been referred to the University’s Estates Strategy in June 2014 and therefore a further update would be provided to ASC in October 2014. The other 2 recommendations were considered resolved by the May 2014 meeting of ASC.

As highlighted under Section 2, from Session 2014-15, Schools and Subject Areas will be expected to provide a progress report after 6 months of the publication of the PSR report. It is anticipated that shortening the period to respond to recommendations will bring about speedier resolution of issues raised within reviews. ASC will monitor the effectiveness of this amended timescale.

2.4 Subject Reviews to be conducted in Session 2014-15

The following seven reviews are scheduled to take place in Session 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre, Film and TV studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Postponed from 2012-13
3. **Reviews by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)**

3.1 *PSRB Reviews conducted in Session 2013-2014.*

Please note that the reviews listed below are those reported to the SFC in Autumn 2013 as expected in 2013-2014. The reviews shaded in grey will be carried over to the 2014-2015 report and will be noted there.\(^4\) Those entries highlighted in bold should have been included in the report for 2012-13 as these reviews were held during 2013-14. Those marked in italics provide updates to reviews which took place in 2012-13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PSRB</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS)</td>
<td>Programmes accredited to 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical &amp; Earth Sciences</td>
<td>Chartered Institute of Civil Engineering Surveyors (CICES)</td>
<td>Accredited to October 2013. Visit scheduled for September 2013. Programme accredited to August 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>The Chartered Institute of Library and Information (CILIP)</td>
<td>Programme accredited to 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS)</td>
<td>Programme accredited to 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>General Medical Council (GMC)</td>
<td>Review undertaken in April 2014. Report still to be received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>Institute of Physics (IOP)</td>
<td>Review requested by IoP for November 2013. This was undertaken in March 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^4\) While the reviews may have taken place in 2013-2014, some reports of reviews were not available at the time of writing. These programmes will be noted in the 2014-2015 listing with appropriate comment.
Veterinary Medicine

Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS), American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), Australian Veterinary Boards Council (AVBC) and the European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE)

Reviews undertaken in 2013. Reports now received.

3.2 PSRB reviews to be conducted in Session 2014-15

The following PSRB visits are anticipated in 2014-15. Subjects noted in grey are reviews carried over from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PSRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>Chartered Institute of Management Accountants (CIMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Engineering Accreditation Board (EAB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Physics and Medicine in Engineering (IPEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution of Engineering Designers (IED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Board of Moderators (JBM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Aeronautical Society (RAeS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following subjects were reviewed in 2013-2014 but reports of accreditation reviews have not yet been received. The reports from the accrediting bodies listed below are due to be received/confirmed in 2014-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PSRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>British Psychological Society (BPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>General Medical Council (GMC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Graduate School Reviews

The College of Social Sciences Graduate School review took place in May 2013 and considered by the Research Planning and Strategy Committee (RPSC) on 20 March 2014. The report concluded that this was a strong Graduate School with robust processes and procedures with a number of assets to draw on with significant potential for growth. A diverse range of subject areas were available and there were no issues with the currency or validity of the research being conducted. The Graduate School had developed an excellent relationship with the ERSC-funded Doctoral Training Centre and continued to attract the highest calibre of students.
The Graduate School in the College of Arts was reviewed during Session 2013-14 which has yet to be approved by RPSC. The College of Medicine, Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences will be reviewed during Session 2014-15. Confirmation of the date of the review is awaited although likely to be undertaken in Spring 2015.

5. University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP)
   A revised Administrative Review process was introduced in 2012-13 with the Library reviewed in Session 2013-14. Provisionally, Janitorial and Security and Planning and Business Intelligence have been scheduled for review during Session 2014-15, but this may be subject to change.

6. The Outcomes of the Institutional-led Review Processes
   The outcome of a subject review visit at the University of Glasgow is a report produced by the Review Panel identifying the key strengths of the School or Subject Area along with conclusions and recommendations for improvement or change. There were no recommendations during the 2013-14 PSR reviews that called into question the continuation of any programme for reasons relating to quality or standards.

   The University makes the reports of its institution-led quality reviews publicly available through its website; including PSR reviews, Graduate School reviews and University Services’ ARP reviews. Responses to the recommendations arising from PSR reviews are also published.

7. The Role and Nature of Student Involvement in Institution-led Review Processes
   The University continues to work closely with the Students’ Representative Council (SRC) with students involved with all review processes at the University of Glasgow. This also included the QAA Enhancement-Led Institutional review that took place over February and March 2014.

   7.1 QAA Enhancement-Led Institutional Review (ELIR) 2013-14
   As part of ELIR, the SRC participated in structured meetings to brainstorm and discuss the key themes; consider the strategic issues surrounding learning and teaching and the student experience from a student perspective. Agreed notes from focus groups were discussed with students, representatives and SRC Council members. Students and Class or PGR Representatives participated in informal facilitated meetings (focus groups, attendance at informal or formal representative groups meetings) to brainstorm the key strengths and weaknesses of the student learning experience and discuss their experience and understanding of the key themes. In addition, PSR Student Reviewers acted as an editing ‘sounding board’ and assisted with the review of drafts of the Reflective Analysis.

   7.2 PSR process
   Student panel members have been involved in internal reviews since 2006-07; the nominated student representatives are senior Council members of the SRC. As discussed in previous reports, the Senate Office, in association with the Student Representative Council (SRC), provides a one-day training course for all Student Panel Members. The course provides an overview of PSR in relation to the Scottish Quality Enhancement Framework as well as highlight what is expected from Panel Members, including how to analyse and interpret documentation, how to be an effective communicator and how to plan for the Review. The training also includes a mock review visit meeting involving an experienced Convener and Panel Members, meeting with School staff. Feedback received from Convener panel members indicates that student participation of review panels is highly regarded as they provide a valued student perspective both to the process itself and to the discussion undertaken during the reviews.

   Students from the subject being reviewed (undergraduate and taught postgraduate) have an opportunity to contribute to the development of the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and the
Subject/School is asked to give details in the SER on how this was done. From 2013-14, Heads of Subject/School/SER leads undergoing PSR, are offered informal ‘open discussion’ support sessions on SER preparation, which include a section specifically aimed at student engagement.

The review panel also meets with groups of students which should be representative of the student body from the Subject/School (e.g. each level of study, mode of study (part time, full-time, distance learning), ethnicity, home and international, disabilities, etc) and guidance is provided to Subjects/Schools on this.

7.3 Graduate School Reviews

Similarly, as part of Graduate School Reviews, there is a student member of the review panel (where possible, this will be the SRC Postgraduate Convener) and review panels will meet with postgraduate research students (PGR) from across Subjects and Schools within the College.

7.4 University Services Administrative Review Programme

A student member is included in all Administrative Review Panels.

8. Development Needs and the Identification of Good Practice

8.1 PSR

Development Needs

As in previous years, an examination of the recommendations made by PSR Panels during Session 2013-14 has been undertaken. In total, 113 recommendations were made from 8 reviews. As part of our standard practice, a report on the examination of the recommendations will be submitted to the October 2014 meeting of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). ASC’s attention will be drawn to the groupings with specific attention drawn to any recommendations that have potential for University-wide consideration.

Adopting the revised template for the SER (as discussed under Section 2), recommendations are now grouped under the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic standards</th>
<th>Setting, maintaining and reviewing</th>
<th>Appropriate quality processes</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course/Programme approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Examining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation and other external references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context and Strategy</td>
<td>Academic governance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing good practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancing the Student Experience</strong></td>
<td><strong>Admissions, Retention, Success</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student numbers and trends</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention and Progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leavers destination data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality and Diversity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supporting students</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support mechanisms</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition and Induction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widening participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Engagement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Graduate attributes</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internationalisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Learning &amp; Teaching</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning &amp; Teaching</strong></td>
<td><strong>Curriculum design and development</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approaches to ILOs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work based learning and placement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology enhanced L&amp;T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment &amp; Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of assessment methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with Assessment policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What/how students receive feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying/extending good practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for L&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engaging and supporting staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationer and early career development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA support and training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conclusion of our examination of the recommendations is that, whilst the recommendations cover a number of themes, the following 3 themes contain the most recommendations: Support mechanisms (12), Physical resources (13) and GTA support and training (15). On reviewing the types of recommendations that fell under “Support Mechanisms” the majority of these recommendations related to the provision of clearer articulated information on pathways, courses, progression and the provision of guidelines on academic study skills. Issues involving “Physical resources” require to be addressed at College or University level and tend to be outwith the School or Subject’s control. These are predominately related to accommodation and the need for better or larger space. These issues are more difficult to resolve in the short term and Review Panels can only ask budget holders to consider the recommendations as part of College/University strategy. The number of recommendations in relation to “GTA support and training” will be highlighted to Academic Standards Committee on 3 October 2014. This area has also been identified as good practice within other reviews, both from this Session and previous Sessions, and therefore it will be proposed that greater focus be given to ensuring good practice is extended across the University in relation to this issue.

Fuller details on Recommendations can be made available, if required.

**Key Strengths and Good Practice**

A total of 56 areas of good practice/key strengths were identified, out of which 33 have potential for University-wide dissemination. Good practice was identified in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic standards</th>
<th>Setting, maintaining and reviewing</th>
<th>Appropriate quality processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context and Strategy</td>
<td>Range of provision</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes since last review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall aims and linkage to University strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancing the Student Experience</th>
<th>Admissions, Retention, Success</th>
<th>Student numbers and trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers destination data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting students</th>
<th>Support mechanisms</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition and Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancements</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Graduate attributes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internationalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>Curriculum design and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum design and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>Range of assessment methods</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement with Assessment policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for L&amp;T</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging and supporting staff</td>
<td>Probationer and early career development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA support and training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly to recommendations, good practice identified covered a large number of themes; with “Support mechanisms” with 12 areas of practice highlighted being the most significant category. The areas identified included outstanding/high level of support, recognition of diverse needs, committed staff, excellent pastoral and peer support, innovative initiatives, such as Honours taster day for Level 2 students, use of ‘Reading parties’ to provide educational and social support to students and pairing of students with more senior students.

ASC will be asked to confirm which areas of good practice identified would be widely disseminated across the University. As mentioned under Section 8.1, attention will be drawn to good practice relating to GTA training and support. The Learning and Teaching Committee will also review the key
strengths and good practice and identify which examples will be presented at the annual Learning and Teaching Committee Away Day.

Appendix 3 highlights the correlation between recommendations and good practice for information. Where good practice has been identified, consent will be sought from Heads of Subject/School with further information requested to be forwarded to Heads of School/Subject where recommendations have been made on corresponding activities.

Further details on Key Strengths and Good Practice can be made available, if required.


The University of Glasgow was reviewed during Session 2013-14. The overarching judgment was: “The University of Glasgow has effective arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience. These arrangements are likely to continue to be effective in the future. This is a positive judgment, which means the University has robust arrangements for securing academic standards and for enhancing the quality of the student experience.”

Disseminating good practice was one of 10 areas the Review Team highlighted as 'good practice'. In relation to Periodic Subject Review, the ELIR report highlighted:

“Where instances of good practice are identified and endorsed via periodic review, they are highlighted as 'commendations' which are then considered by Academic Standards Committee. This approach is reinforced and augmented by the Senate Office which identifies good practice from one periodic subject review report which corresponds to recommendations from another. Schools or subjects are then strongly encouraged to consider the good practice when responding to the recommendations. A summary of good practice arising from the periodic subject review process is disseminated by the Senate Office to the school level on an annual basis. This is an effective mechanism for the dissemination of good practice across schools.”

“The approach to periodic review is well established and meets Scottish Funding Council and Quality Code expectations, which is confirmed by the advance information set. An outcome of University restructuring has been the creation, in many areas, of larger subject groupings (for example, multiple departments being merged to form a single school), and the University has adopted a flexible approach to the unit of review so that reviews are generally held at the subject level, but where appropriate may be at the school level and incorporate a number of subjects.”

“Since the 2010 ELIR, the University has developed the support it provides for periodic review panel members, and there has been an increase in training delivered by the Senate Office. This includes targeted support for review panel members, including students and conveners, and from 2013-14 support sessions for heads of school or subject.”