Court

Minute of Meeting held on Tuesday 24 February 2015 in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr David Anderson General Council Assessor, Professor George Baillie Senate Assessor, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Professor Christine Forde Senate Assessor, Dr Carl Goodyear Senate Assessor, Mr Marvin Karrasch SRC Assessor, Professor Karen Lury Senate Assessor, Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson General Council Assessor, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Ms Breffini O’Connor SRC President, Mr David Ross General Council Assessor (Convener of Court), Dr Duncan Ross Senate Assessor, Dr Donald Spaeth Senate Assessor, Ms Lesley Sutherland General Council Assessor, Professor Paul Younger Senate Assessor

In attendance:

Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Ms Christine Barr (Director of Human Resources), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate), Professor Muffy Calder (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor James Conroy (Vice-Principal Internationalisation), Professor Jon Cooper (Vice-Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Roibeard O Maolalaigh (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal)

Apologies:

Members: Mr Brian McBride General Council Assessor, Cllr Pauline McKeever Glasgow City Council Representative, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Representative

Attendees: Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Miles Padgett (Vice-Principal Research)

CRT/2014/22. Announcements

Court welcomed Professors Muffy Calder and Roibeard O Maolalaigh to the meeting.

CRT/2014/23. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 17 December 2014

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2014/24. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2014/25. Report from the Principal
At the previous meeting, Court had been updated to the effect that there had been continuing discussions through the Joint Negotiating Committee of USS between the employers and UCU. The negotiations between the Employers Pension Forum of Universities UK (UUK) and UCU had now led to the agreement on a joint proposal for a revised benefit structure for USS. This joint proposal for USS benefit reform had been approved at the JNC meeting on 29 January without a vote, and put forward to the USS Trustee Board.

The reforms proposed were designed to address the deficit in the scheme and to mitigate the risk that contribution rates would become unaffordable for employers and employees alike.

In summary, the proposal was that final salary accruals would cease as at 31 March 2016, with benefits built up before this date being protected. Future defined benefits would be built up in the Career Revalued Benefits section of the scheme, based on an accrual rate of 1/75th of actual pensionable salary. Benefits in this section would be based on the first £55,000 of the member’s pensionable salary (indexed), based on actual pay. Any pensionable salary over this threshold would be pensioned through a new Defined Contribution section of the scheme.

The proposal had led to appropriate consideration by the USS Trustee Board on the setting of the technical provision assumptions, following intensive discussions between the USS Trustees, the Employers and the Pensions Regulator, particularly given the difficult post-valuation experience in the scheme. The setting of the assumptions by the Trustees on the technical provisions allowed for the employers (blended) contribution rate to be set at 18%. There would now be a statutory consultation process with current and prospective USS members, expected to begin in mid-March, for at least 60 days.

Court recorded its appreciation of the Principal’s and colleagues’ efforts in achieving the progress to date.

Court congratulated the Principal on his appointment as Chair of the Commission on Urban Economic Growth. This appointment was associated with the £1.13billion City Deal for the Glasgow City Region. In tandem with this, Lord Haughey had been appointed Chair of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Economic Leadership Board. The bodies were being created to assist the newly established Glasgow and Clyde Valley Cabinet in dealing with the co-ordination and maximisation of wider economic development activity related to the City Deal.

The Deal would fund major infrastructure projects, drive innovation and growth through the support of key sectors such as life sciences, and address challenges in the region's labour market. Funding for the initiative came from the UK and Scottish Governments who would each give the City Region £500million in grant funding, and the local authorities would borrow a further £130million. The life of the project was 20 years.

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.
With respect to SMG business, Court noted that analysis was being undertaken of areas connected to metrics used in some league tables.

**CRT/2014/26. Reports on Strategic Plan/Improvement Programmes, Staff Survey and Estate Strategy**

*Strategic Plan/Improvement Programmes*

In June 2015, Court would be asked to approve the University Strategic Plan 2015-20. The Plan had been the subject of an early briefing at the Court Strategy Day on 30 September 2014, and, since then, Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice-Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, had led the development of the Plan, through an extensive process of consultation. Court had received details of progress to date, including a revised statement of the mission, vision and values of the University, and the priority themes that the new Strategy would seek to address, together with the action that was planned to take forward a coordinated set of improvement programmes, to ensure the strategy was delivered, that financial delivery of the Estates Strategy was on a sustainable footing and that staff were fully engaged in delivery of the institution’s aims. Court also noted details of progress against University KPIs.

The three themes of change and improvement that had emerged from the various consultation events were: **Focus** on optimising teaching and research to ensure the needs of students and funders were best met, with Court noting that Schools and Colleges would be the driving force for change, to be achieved within agreed budgets and in the context of market research; **Agility** to respond to changes and opportunities, eliminate bureaucracy and build flexibility for staff to act in pursuit of the University’s strategic goals; and **Empowering People** with individual responsibility to work towards the successful fulfilment of the University’s strategic goals. Pursuing and implementing the themes, through an improvement programme, would require significant resources. Court heard that SMG had approved individual work streams and associated operational groups to develop remits and work plans, with major milestones, and advise on required resources for the themes. SMG would receive regular updates on implementation and would act as the governing body for the improvement programme. Issues of cost efficiency would be addressed within the focus and agility themes.

In discussion, comments were noted with regard to: IT and other systems/processes requiring to be as streamlined as possible; community (rather than ‘civic’), and wider economic, engagement being stressed as very important; consistency in differentiating strategic and operational matters; and the importance of positive and aspirational language and tone for the Plan.

The Strategic Plan would be presented to the June 2015 meeting of Court for final approval. In the meantime Court gave its very positive support to the Plan’s continued development.

*Staff Survey*

Court had received details about the high-level outcomes from the 2014 Staff Survey. Areas of good practice included equality & diversity, job satisfaction, line management and physical environment; areas for improvement included workload pressures, management of change, communication, strengthening leadership effectiveness and feeling valued.

Christine Barr, Director of HR, briefed Court about actions being taken following the Survey, which would focus on areas including effective structures and team working; leadership development; staff engagement and involvement; and internal communication, including IT and web-based strategies. The actions also linked closely to the **Empowering People** strand emerging from the development of the Strategic Plan.

*Estate Strategy*

Court had received a paper prepared by Ann Allen, Director of Estates & Buildings, which followed extensive work in recent months at SMG and had involved the Court Working Group
established to oversee the development of the Campus Estate Strategy. Court heard that the Estate Strategy was underpinned by the key principle that the estate was an enabler. The Estate Strategy was closely linked to the University’s Strategic Plan, as were the individual projects proposed within it.

Court noted the proposed capital investment plan for the next ten years, which aligned with the principles set out in the Estate Strategy and proposed investment in new buildings which encouraged greater collaboration and knowledge exchange, and focused on both the student experience and research excellence. The plan would see up to £450m of additional capital expenditure supporting the development of new buildings, refurbishment of significant existing buildings and investment in infrastructure essential to support the University. The sum was in addition to £175m of pre-existing/committed project spend and £150m ongoing revenue spend on regular maintenance and minor upgrades over ten years, and was in line with the current financial sustainability model for the University. To support this investment, the University would introduce robust governance arrangements for large estates capital projects. The Campus Development Framework would continue to inform the strategy, which it was noted would be implemented in a phased way for reasons of resource (financial and staffing) and of minimising disruption as far as possible. With regard to the personnel required and whether this was at a sufficient level, Court was advised that staffing levels would be looked at for each project as it was submitted.

Court noted input from the University Audit Committee to the effect that there needed to be an identified governance forum and management information flows to enable the risks around affordability at the overall programme level to be monitored and managed. To this end, Court had been provided with details of the Governance and Accountability structure, within the paper circulated for the meeting. Court noted that it would be kept updated regularly, through Estates and Finance Committees, as implementation of the Estate Strategy progressed. This would include an updated review of affordability whenever business cases for projects were submitted for approval. It was noted that to date the only commitment, which Court had approved, was for the design element of the Learning and Teaching Hub. For major projects (of £25m and over) the convener of the Project Governance Board would be accountable to Court and would present the business case, including details about funding and resourcing.

Further, in the context of Court wishing to see the various iterations of the campus development within an overarching strategy, and to be regularly informed about affordability and sustainability, it was agreed that the Court Strategy Day would be a suitable occasion for a comprehensive annual update, in addition to project submissions at regular Court meetings. Court would also receive its usual annual update on the University budget, at the June meeting.

With respect to risk associated with affordability, it was noted that three main elements existed, which had been analysed by the Finance Committee. The main elements were sustained cash flow generation, where in terms of mitigation, capital plans would if necessary be reviewed if cash flow changed, and where it was noted that contingency existed for external factors that might increase costs; the level of potential philanthropic giving, where a feasibility study had been undertaken ahead of the proposed capital programme being finalised; and the disposal programme, which was closely linked to the eventual configuration of the campus and was subject to market movements. The risks associated with this latter element would be monitored.

In discussion, it was clarified that maintaining the integrity of the campus was an important factor, but that this did need to be balanced against appropriate, and carefully managed, property investment and disposal opportunities. It was also confirmed that analysis of likely patterns of movement around a reconfigured campus had been undertaken.

Following consideration of the paper, Court approved:
- a ten-year capital plan of the University's priority projects including the development of a new Learning and Teaching Hub, a Research Hub, co-locations within some Colleges, new builds and refurbishments; when added to existing capital commitments and to planned maintenance expenditure in the next ten years, this plan involved a total commitment of £775 million over 10 years.

- a funding strategy to finance an estimated £450 million of additional expenditure, which would be sufficient to fund the additional capital commitments set out in Annex A. This funding strategy involved £100 million of borrowing and was in line with the University's financial sustainability model;

- a new estates capital investment governance structure and a proposal that all capital projects of £25 m or above would require approval by Court of a recommendation from Finance Committee.

Court noted that business cases would now be developed for a number of new projects and that funding would be requested for fees to do this.

**CRT/2014/27. Report from the Secretary of Court**

**CRT/2014/27.1 Ordinance on Composition of Court**

At the December meeting, Court had agreed to initiate consultation on a draft Ordinance relating to the composition of Court, involving a reduction in the number of Senate Assessors from 7 to 6, a reduction in the number of General Council Assessors from 5 to 2, and an increase in the number of Co-opted members from 5 to 9.

Two responses to the consultation had been received. The response from the Council of Senate had been supportive of the draft Ordinance. The response from the General Council Business Committee (GCBC) had not been supportive. A Court Governance Working Group had met to consider the responses, which had also been provided in full to the present meeting, and had discussed how Court might respond to the matters raised by the GCBC. The group’s meeting had included a discussion with the convener of the GCBC and a colleague. The group had agreed that there were areas where Court might be able to take steps that would help address the GCBC’s concerns, principally through a commitment to measures that should ensure a continuing substantial alumni presence on Court, and a continuing role for the GCBC in helping to encourage suitably qualified alumni to apply for vacancies.

Court approved a recommendation from the Governance Working Group, supporting the Ordinance as drafted, reducing the number of Senate Assessors from 7 to 6, reducing the number of General Council Assessors from 5 to 2, and increasing in the number of Co-opted members from 5 to 9. Court confirmed a commitment to maintaining a strong presence of University of Glasgow graduates on Court and confirmed its support for a number of practical measures to be implemented to provide an active role for the GCBC in the future recruitment of Co-opted members.

Lesley Sutherland commented that she continued to have reservations about the Ordinance, and that while she recognised and welcomed the constructive conversation between the Working Group and the GCBC convener, this did not fully satisfy her reservations. Paul Younger commented that the draft Ordinance might be seen as a retrograde step in terms of the democratic process; David Ross commented that what was proposed would not exclude Glasgow graduates but would permit the widest possible pool in terms of applications for Co-opted positions on Court.

**CRT/2014/27.2 GU Holdings Ltd**
GU Holdings Ltd was the University's investment company for subsidiary and spin-out company activity. At the previous meeting, new arrangements had been proposed for the operation of GUHL, covering the visibility of decision-making and the appointment of Directors. Court had noted the views of a former member of Court and one of the current Directors of GUHL, who had expressed reservations regarding the future composition of the Board of Directors, in terms of the balance of expertise among the members, and the need for the Board to have access to advice from experts with a practical understanding of issues affecting technology spin-outs. Court had asked that the proposals on GUHL should be considered afresh in the light of the concerns.

Court now approved revised recommendations relating to the future operation of the company. This included an increase in the number of Directors from four to five, including two external members, with all Directors to be appointed by Court on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, and on the basis that there was no conflict that would impair their ability to make decisions wholly in the interests of the University. Expert advice would be available to the Directors through the attendance at each meeting of the Vice-Principal (Knowledge Exchange) and of staff from the Research Strategy & Innovation Office, and, as required, through procuring advice from external advisers.

In approving this Board structure, Court also approved the appointment of Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice-Principal as Chair of the Board of Directors, and of Robert Fraser, Director of Finance, and Professor Muffy Calder, Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Science & Engineering as Directors.

CRT/2014/27.3 HE Governance Code

The Court Governance Working Group would meet in March to consider the outcome of the annual effectiveness review of Court and also, with reference to the Code, to ensure that the University was addressing all its responsibilities in terms of good governance. The group would report to April Court, at which meeting the appraisal of the Convener would also be an item, given the absence at the present meeting of Murdoch MacLennan, who had co-ordinated the appraisal.

CRT/2014/27.4 Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill

The draft Bill included clauses designed to address campus extremism, placing a new statutory duty on institutions including universities to “prevent individuals being drawn into terrorism”. Strong representations had been made from across the sector that the Bill would place an unlawful and unenforceable duty on educational institutions. The principle of academic freedom currently placed a duty on universities to ensure that freedom of speech within the law is secured. It was not clear how this duty would work alongside the requirement to ensure freedom of speech. An amendment to the Bill had been agreed in the House of Lords, such that HEIs and the Secretary of State “must have particular regard” to institutions’ duty to ensure freedom of speech and academic freedom, and had been reflected in the published Act, which had received royal assent on 12 February. Separately, the Scottish Government had led a consultation process on Scottish guidance in relation to the Act, and had engaged positively with higher education institutions to put in place guidance that was measured and practical.

CRT/2014/27.5 Socially Responsible Investment Policy

The University's fund managers had been asked to provide professional advice on the impact of the policy of disinvestment in fossil fuels on the financial performance of the University's
endowment investments. In addition, the Glasgow University Climate Action Society had been offered the opportunity to provide evidence from other sources on the impact of fossil fuel disinvestment on financial returns. The University's Investment Advisory Committee would consider the details and advise Court. Advice would also be provided on the impact of the disinvestment policy on income for academic activity and on philanthropic income.

CRT/2014/27.6 Conflict Minerals

In 2014, the SRC 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. A Court working group had met and discussed this matter with representatives of the group behind the initiative. A further meeting would be held on key points in the petition, and the working group was undertaking some enquiries about the current regulatory framework for HEIs and about the practicalities of action that might be taken in response to the SRC motion. Court would be updated further at a future meeting.

CRT/2014/27.7 Nominations Committee Business

Court had approved the appointment of Mr David J Watt as a member of the Audit Committee for a period of four years from 1 February 2015.

CRT/2014/27.8 General Council Business Committee convener

Mr John Marsh had been appointed as convener of the GCBC for a period of four years from 31 January 2015.

CRT/2014/28. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2014/28.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2014/28.1.1 Chemistry Laboratory Development: Capex application

The Committee had received a paper seeking additional funding of £380k to accommodate an overspend on laboratory refurbishment. The Committee had sought and had received assurance that the changes recently made in the management of capital projects would ensure there was no recurrence.

CRT/2014/28.1.2 Joint Educational Institute

Finance Committee had given in-principle approval, subject to risk management considerations, to the formation of a Joint Educational Institute (JEI) with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC), which would grow the existing partnership between the two universities including expanding degree programmes, as well as exploring research collaborations in due course. Court noted a comment from the SRC President that the SRC should be involved in such discussions where its resources would be involved in a collaborative arrangement.

CRT/2014/28.1.3 Finance Key Performance Indicators

Court noted a report on finance-related Key Performance Indicators.

CRT/2014/28.1.4 Endowments Investment Report

Court noted an endowment investment report as at 30 November 2014.
CRT/2014/28.1.5 Financial reports

Court noted an Overview of Performance and a debtors report as at 30 November 2014.

The Finance Committee report was noted.

CRT/2014/28.2 Estates Committee

The report was noted. The Committee had received an update on the Estate Strategy, including details about the formal establishment of the Learning and Teaching Hub project and of the convening of a Project Development Board, with Professor Frank Coton as Project Sponsor. The project team had arranged for a wide range of representative groups to be engaged in the briefing process. The Committee had agreed that a policy on naming of buildings would be developed, to include a commitment that campus names should reflect the diversity of the University community.

CRT/2014/28.3 Human Resources Committee

The report was noted. The Committee had received an update on the current status of possible industrial action; forthcoming national pay negotiations; the outcome of the REF 2014; and the Transforming Research Management project. The Committee had received presentations outlining work to date on strategic Organisational Developments; and on competing in the International HE market. The Committee had approved the Shared Parental Leave Policy. The Management of Organisational Change Policy had been discussed and will come back to the Committee at a future date.

With regard to the matter of the Living Wage, Christine Barr would update Duncan Ross regarding ongoing discussions.

CRT/2014/28.4 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

The report was noted. The Committee had received: reports from Occupational Health and the Safety & Environmental Protection Services; a report on the take-up of the Employee Assistance programme; an update on the creation of new safety committees; and had discussed the possibility of a policy on e-cigarettes, referring the matter to SMG.

CRT/2014/29. Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate held on 5 February 2015

The report was noted. The Council had received updates on Education Policy & Strategy Committee business, and the REF outcome. Council of Senate has submitted a response to the Scottish Government with respect to the consultation on the HE Governance Bill. Council of Senate supported the draft Ordinance on the composition of Court.

CRT/2014/30. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2014/31. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 15 April 2015 at 2pm in the Senate Room.
Items A : For Discussion

1. Universities Superannuation Scheme USS

At the last meeting, I updated Court to the effect that since the previous meeting, the USS trustees had been consulting on the technical provisions assumptions behind the scheme valuation. There had also been continuing discussions through the Joint Negotiating Committee of USS between the employers and UCU. The negotiations between the Employers Pension Forum of Universities UK (UUK) and UCU led to the agreement on a joint proposal for a revised benefit structure for USS.

This joint proposal for USS benefit reform was approved at the JNC meeting on 29 January without a vote, and was put forward to the USS Trustee Board. This outcome followed more than a year of discussions and negotiations aimed at developing a viable joint proposal. This followed the positive outcome of a UCU consultative ballot, bringing the union’s dispute with University employers to an end and avoiding possible industrial action over the proposed changes. The reforms proposed are designed to address the deficit in the scheme and to mitigate the risk that contribution rates would become unaffordable for employers and employees alike.

In summary, the proposal is that final salary accruals will cease as at 31 March 2016, with benefits built up before this date being protected. Future defined benefits would be built up in the Career Revalued Benefits (CRB) section of the scheme, based on an accrual rate of 1/75th of actual pensionable salary. Benefits in this section would be based on the first £55,000 of the member’s pensionable salary, based on actual pay. Thus for members earning up to £55,000, their total salary would be pensioned through the CRB scheme; this is estimated to apply to 83% of all active USS members. All members would receive this core benefit up to and including the salary threshold of £55,000, which will be indexed. Any pensionable salary over this threshold would be pensioned through a new Defined Contribution (DC) section of the scheme. This ensures that the defined benefit risk is contained compared to the existing benefit structure.

More details on the proposals are available at the following link:
http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/aboutus/AssociatedOrganisations/Partnerships/EPF/Pages/QAsontheUSS.aspx

The proposal led to appropriate consideration by the USS Trustee Board on the setting of the technical provision assumptions, following intensive discussions between the USS Trustees, the Employers and the
Pensions Regulator, particularly given the difficult post-valuation experience in the scheme. I will provide a verbal update to Court on the post-valuation experience. The setting of the assumptions by the Trustees on the technical provisions allowed for the employers (blended) contribution rate to be set at 18%. There will now be a statutory consultation process with current and prospective USS members, expected to begin in mid-March, for at least 60 days.

Court will be kept updated at future meetings.

2. Appointment to Chair of the Commission on Urban Economic Growth

As Court members may know, I have been appointed to the Chair of the Commission on Urban Economic Growth. This appointment is associated with the £1.13billion City Deal for the Glasgow City Region. In tandem with this, Lord Haughey has been appointed Chair of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Economic Leadership Board.

These associated bodies are being created to assist the Cabinet in dealing with the co-ordination and maximisation of wider economic development activity related to the City Deal.

The City Deal was developed by officers from the eight participating local authorities in the Glasgow City Region and other local partner organisations. It will fund major infrastructure projects, drive innovation and growth through the support of key sectors such as life sciences, and address challenges in the region's labour market. It is an exciting initiative and is expected to give the City Region a permanent uplift in its GVA of £2.2billion per annum (4.4%); generate 15,000 construction jobs during the construction period and 28,000 permanent additional jobs once construction is complete. It is also predicted that it will unlock £3.3billion of private sector investment.

Funding for the initiative comes from the UK and Scottish Governments who will each give the City Region £500million in grant funding, and the local authorities will borrow a further £130million. The life of the project is 20 years.

I’m delighted to have the opportunity to contribute to this initiative and look forward to working with the Commission and Glasgow City Region to maximise the impact and benefit of the City Deal.

Items B: For Information

3. 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.

3.1 Academic Development and Strategy

5 January: Interviewed for the Chair of Synthetic Biology and on 23 January for the Head of School, Education.
5 January: Participated with the Head of College, MVLS in a working dinner for essential players, including industry representatives, in relation to Precision Medicine Catapult. This was a prelude to visits to Inchinnan and South Glasgow University Hospital hosted by the College of MVLS.

8 January: in partnership with Glasgow life, participated in a brief film to promote the Kelvin Hall development.

13 January: I provided opening remarks at an Away Day event for our REF (2014) panel members, organised by the VPs for Research and Innovation & Knowledge Exchange. The purpose of the day was to encourage panel members to meet, share and discuss their experiences of working on panels with a view to preparing for the next assessment exercise.

21 January: Along with the HofC and colleagues from MVLS, I attended a lunch in honour of our Carnegie Visiting Professor, Brett Finlay. Later that day I attended the NHS/GU Joint Strategy Group.

4 February: I participated in a visit from the Director of Research & Technology Rolls Royce who was on campus to meet with colleagues from the School of Engineering.

3.2 International Activities

3 February: I met with Professor Joseph Sung, the VC of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. He was in Glasgow as guest speaker at the “Russell Group – China Summit on Public Health Opportunities and Challenges” organised by our Institute of Health and Wellbeing.

9 February: I met and welcomed a Pakistan Delegation of Senior HE leaders who were attending a Modern University Governance Programme run by the School of Education. The School won the British Council bid, supported by the Pakistan Higher Education Commission to deliver this leadership programme, which fuses both academic and practical elements.

3.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

19 December: I attended an SFC Board Meeting and will attend an Additional Council Board SFC Meeting on 16 February.

9 January: At the request of the BBC, the University hosted the BBC Radio Scotland broadcast of The Big Debate, with presenter Gordon Brewer and MSPs. Panel members joined me in the Lodging for coffee after the recording. On the same day I gave an interview for the BBC.

15 January: I gave an interview for the THE and Chris Havergal, the Scotland correspondent, which particularly focussed on the campus development.

15 January: I met with the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning, Angela Constance, followed by brief meeting with Dr Rebekah Widdowfield, Head of HE and Learner Support.

16 January: I was invited for a small informal lunch with the Chair, BBC Trust and BBC Trustee for Scotland to discuss how the BBC can best meet the needs of licence payers in Scotland.

19 January: The Cabinet Secretary visited the University to deliver a talk to, and meet with, ITE Primary students from Glasgow and Strathclyde and staff from the School of Education. Her subject was attainment in education.
20 January: I attended Universities Scotland's annual Parliamentary reception which had the theme Innovation in Scottish Universities.

23 January: I attended the Lord Provost's Burns Supper as a guest of the Lord Provost.

27 January: I attended Universities Scotland Main Committee Meeting held in Edinburgh Napier University followed by the SFC/SG Liaison Meeting.

28 January: I attended the Russell Group Access Lunch at the House of Commons to discuss access to the UK’s leading universities. The aims of the meeting were to explore the root causes of the under-representation of disadvantaged students at leading universities and how Russell Group universities were helping to tackle the problem. The next day I attended the Russell Group Board meeting and dinner.

30 January: I attended the UUK Board Meeting and will attend UUK Members Meeting on 20 February to outline the USS Reforms.

3 February: I met with the Deacon Convener, Trades House Glasgow. It is the University’s turn to host the annual Trades House Lecture later this year. Professor Dominiczak will be the speaker.

3 February: I met with Rev John Chalmers, Moderator of the General Assembly of Church of Scotland, as part of the annual visit of the Moderators to the University organised by the Chaplain.

3 February: I attended a lecture given by the First Minister and held in the Bute Hall. This was organised by a University student group: Successful Women at Glasgow (SW@G).

5 February: I was invited to give evidence to the Devolution (Further Powers) Committee, Scottish Parliament.

5 February: I attended, with HofC and colleagues from MVLS, the Scottish Enterprise Life Sciences Awards 2015. The University of Glasgow, with its partners, NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde, ThermoFisher and Aridhia, won the first prize in the ‘Innovative Collaboration’ category. The award recognised the group’s efforts in developing innovative infrastructure and collaborations at the South Glasgow University Hospital.

I attended the Core Cities Dinner and Core Cities UK Devolution Summit on 8 & 9 February hosted by Glasgow City Council. The debate centred on how we rebalance our country's power and resources to achieve growth and economic development. I was invited to take part on the 9th as a panel member in the morning session.

10 & 11 February: I visited London to meet with potential supporters and donors and on the evening of 10 February attended the BHF Roll out the Red Ball dinner.

12 February: I co-hosted with the HofC MVLS a visit by Sir John Savill, Chief Executive of the MRC, to our MRC Units, the MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, led by Professor Laurence Moore, and the MRC University CVR, led by Professor Massimo Palmarini.

13 February: I will co-host with HofC MVLS the visit of Mr Philip Rycroft, Director General, Deputy Prime Minister’s Office. He is visiting to hear about Life Sciences/Biomedical developments at the University of Glasgow and South Glasgow University Hospital (including City Deal) and Stratified Medicine Scotland Innovation Centre (Inchinnan).
23 February: I will meet with Labour's Shadow Ministerial Team for HE including Iain Gray Shadow Education Secretary and Catherine Stihler MEP, HE Spokesperson.

24-25 February: The University will host the launch of the Quantum Technology Hub. On the 25th I will attend the official opening of the Hub by the Deputy First Minister, John Swinney.

3.4. Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

19 December: I attended and spoke at the James Bridie Memorial Dinner, Glasgow University Union.

14 January: I attended a Quantum Technology Hub celebration reception to mark the success of the Glasgow team.

26 January: I spoke to trainees participating in our Telephone Campaign Training, encouraging them in this very important and effective aspect of our alumni and donor relations activities.

31 January: I attended and spoke at the General Council Half Yearly Meeting.

6 February: I attended the MRC–University Centre for Virus Research (CVR) Scientific Opening and gave words of welcome, congratulating the Centre on reaching this milestone in the history of Virology at Glasgow.

16 February: I will host the annual Reception for Student Office Bearers in the Lodging.

I held Principal's Surgeries on 3 February, with the next set due to take place on 12 March and continued my monthly meetings with SRC sabbaticals.

4. Senior Management Group business

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

*SMG Meeting of 15 December 2014*
- ‘TellMeMore’ update
- Information Strategy
- League Tables
- Work Load Modelling
- Estates strategy – Campus development
- LKAS Maternity Leave Policy
- Streamlining Recruitment Process

*SMG Meeting of January 2015*
- Internal Audit Report - Consultancy Policy
- SMG League Table Action Plan
- Media Activity Report
- Reviewing the REF2014 units of assessment
SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Ordinance on Composition of Court

At the December meeting, Court agreed to proceed with consultation on Ordinance 207. The Court Governance working group will meet on 19 February to consider the responses, and a report will then be circulated by the working group to Court. Apologies, therefore, that a late Court paper will be circulated. The reason for this is that, in view of the fact that the 8-week statutory period for this consultation straddled the Christmas/New Year holiday, one additional week was allowed for responses to the consultation.

A.2 GU Holdings Limited

GU Holdings Ltd is the University's investment company for subsidiary and spin-out company activity.

At the last meeting, new arrangements were proposed for the operation of GUHL, covering the visibility of decision-making and the appointment of Directors. In considering this paper, Court heard reservations regarding its proposals. Court therefore asked that the proposals on GUHL should be reconsidered.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill

The Bill, which began its course through the Westminster parliamentary system at the end of November 2014, contains provisions in relation to terrorism, covering areas including controlling the return to the UK of British citizens suspected of involvement in terrorism-related activity, retention of communications data, and security in relation to air, sea and rail transport.

The Bill also includes clauses designed to address campus extremism, placing a new statutory duty on institutions including universities, colleges and schools to “prevent individuals being drawn into terrorism”. Ministers would have powers to issue directions, enforceable by a court order, to organisations that repeatedly invited extremist speakers or failed in other duties under the proposed legislation.

Under the proposals, Universities would have to put in place policies relating to extremist speakers, and would have to take into account guidance published by the Home Secretary, with enforceable sanctions for non-compliance.
Strong representations were made from across the sector that the Bill would place an unlawful and unenforceable duty on educational institutions. This included stressing that universities and colleges are centres for debate and discussion, where ideas can be promoted and challenged. The principle of academic freedom currently places a duty on universities to ensure that freedom of speech within the law is secured. As originally drafted, the new legislation would place a statutory duty on the same institutions to prevent individuals being drawn into terrorism. It is not clear how this duty would work alongside the requirement to ensure freedom of speech.

Earlier this month, the House of Lords agreed amendments to the Bill, such that HEIs and the Secretary of State “must have particular regard” to institutions’ duty to ensure freedom of speech and academic freedom. This amendment is reflected in the Counter-Terrorism & Security Act, which received royal assent on 12 February.

While the Bill has been working its way through the UK Parliament, consultation has been taken forward by the Home Office on the statutory guidance that will accompany the new legislative duty. Legislation in this area is a reserved UK matter, but in Scotland there has been a distinct approach because the statutory guidance north of the border requires to be specific to Scottish structures. The Scottish Government's Prevent Unit has led a consultation process on Scottish guidance, and has engaged positively with higher education representatives in order to put in place guidance that is measured and practical, and strikes a more moderate tone that the Home Office guidance. At the time of writing, this guidance has still to be finalised.

B.2 HE Governance Code

As agreed at the last meeting, a questionnaire for Court self-assessment/feedback on performance has been circulated. The governance working group will meet in March to consider the outcomes of this annual effectiveness review and also, with reference to the Code, to ensure that the University is addressing all its responsibilities in terms of good governance. The working group will report on this to April Court.

In the meantime, Murdoch MacLennan has undertaken an appraisal of the Convener's performance.

B.3 Socially Responsible Investment Policy

Court was advised in December that the issue of fossil fuel disinvestment would come back to the current meeting, with advice on the possible financial impact that a policy of disinvestment would have on the University's investment returns and on its academic and philanthropic income.

The current position is that the University's fund managers, Newton and Schroder, have been asked to provide professional advice on the impact of the policy of disinvestment on the financial performance of the University's endowment investments. Independent advice has been sought also from a third fund manager which has no involvement with the University's business. In addition, the Glasgow University Climate Action Society has been offered the opportunity to provide evidence from other sources on the impact of fossil fuel disinvestment on financial returns. A meeting of the University's Investment Advisory Committee will take place on 11 March, where it is intended that IAC will consider the inputs supplied by these four parties and decide on the advice it should give to Court. That investment advice should therefore be available for the April meeting of Court, where input will be
provided also on the impact of the disinvestment policy on income for academic activity and on philanthropic income.

B.4 Conflict Minerals
Last year, the SRC 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. As previously advised, this issue does not come within the scope of Court’s Socially Responsible Investment Policy. Court agreed however to ask a working group to consider the matter; the group comprised Ken Brown, Marvin Karrasch, Morag Macdonald Simpson, Paul Younger, David Newall and the Head of Procurement, Josephine Gallagher.

The working group has met and discussed this matter with representatives of the group behind the Initiative. It has asked that the group revisit its petition paper to focus on those points that it considers are of most importance. The working group is also undertaking some enquiries about the current regulatory framework for HEIs and about the feasibility/practicalities of action that might be taken in response to the SRC motion.

The working group intends to meet again in March and to report to the next Court meeting.

B.5 Nominations Committee Business
The Nominations Committee recommended to Court, and Court has approved, the appointment of Mr David J Watt as a member of the Audit Committee. Mr Watt took up the position, which is for a period of four years, on 1 February 2015.

B.6 General Council Business Committee convener
Mr John Marsh has been appointed as convener of the GCBC for a period of four years from 31 January 2015, in succession to Mr George Tait.
Annex 1

GU Holdings Limited

Court, 24 February 2015

Introduction

At the December meeting of Court, I presented a paper proposing the appointment of new Directors for GU Holdings Ltd, and new arrangements for its interface with the Finance Committee. Two questions were posed at that time, which led to Court asking that a revised proposal be prepared. The first question, from Graeme Bissett, was a fundamental one: i.e. what purpose GU Holdings was intended to serve. The second question, prompted by the comments of a current Director, Michael Scott Morton, was whether the Board’s expertise should not be enhanced in the areas of venture capital / spin out enterprises. Court therefore asked that a revised proposal be brought back and, as an interim measure, agreed that Neal Juster should take over the chairmanship of the Board.

I have amended my original paper in the light of these points.

DN, 6.2.15

This paper discusses the future arrangements for running GU Holdings Ltd, in particular for appointing directors of the company, and for ensuring it maintains effective contact with the University Court.

1 GU Holdings is a tax-efficient vehicle for managing the University's financial interest in spin-out companies. It is valuable for the University to have a distinct legal entity of this sort, but important also for Court to ensure it has effective ultimate control.

Looking back to the time when GUHL was established in 1997, Court's expectation clearly was that the activities of the company would be closely controlled by executive officers. The first GUHL Board comprised 2 Vice-Principal, the Director of Finance, the Director of Research & Enterprise and the Secretary of Court. Over time, the balance of experience on the Board shifted, with the appointment of directors experienced in issues affecting spin-out enterprises, and with a reduction in executive officers such that in recent years neither the Director of Finance nor the Secretary of Court have been directors. There is a need for the Board to have expertise in early-stage company growth, but that must be balanced by the presence of members who are in a position to ensure GUHL's activities are closely aligned with the interests of the University.
2 From a governance perspective, there have been two perceived difficulties with the operation of GUHL in recent years:

.1 its decision-making has not been visible to the University Court;

.2 its directors have included members of staff who have a role in promoting the development of spin-out companies, leading to situations where there may be a real or perceived conflict of interest between their duties to the University and their concern for the success of the companies.

3 To address the issue of visible decision making, (2.1 above), **Court is asked to consider the following proposals:**

.1 that the constitution of GUHL should be altered such that, for decisions with a financial implication for the University above a threshold of £100,000, the approval of Finance Committee would be required. In situations where an urgent decision was required, the chair of Finance Committee would have authority to act on the Committee's behalf.

.2 that minutes of meetings of GUHL should always be provided for information to the Finance Committee, and that GUHL should submit an annual report on its strategy and performance to the Committee.

4 To address the potential conflict of interest on the part of directors (2.2), and to achieve an appropriate balance of expertise on the Board, **Court is asked to consider the following proposals:**

.1 that all directors should be appointed by Court, and that they must have no conflict that would impair their ability to make decisions wholly in the interests of the University: should a director subsequently acquire an interest in a University spin-out enterprise, then that interest must be openly declared and the Board should consider whether the conflict is of such significance that the director should be required to stand down from the Board.

.2 that GUHL should be chaired by the Senior Vice-Principal.

.3 that two independent directors should be recruited, who should have experience of early-stage company growth and venture capital investment. Appointment should be by Court, on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee. The appointments should be for an initial period of 4 years with, subject to Court approval, a possible second term of 4 years.

.4 that two other directors should be appointed, who should be university executive officers who have no direct involvement with spin-out activity.

.5 that expert advice should be available to the directors: through the attendance at each meeting of the Vice-Principal (Knowledge Exchange) and of staff from the Research Strategy & Innovation Office; and, as required, through procuring advice from external advisers.
The current directors of GUHL are:

John Lumsden
Steve Beaumont
Neal Juster (interim chair)
Michael Scott Morton

If Court supports the proposals in Sections 3 and 4 above, it is suggested that they are taken forward as follows:

.1 the positions of independent director should be advertised, to be filled by a process that will be overseen by Nominations Committee.

.2 Court should confirm Neal Juster's continuing appointment as Director, for an initial period of four years, and ask Neal to take the chair on a continuing basis.

.3 two other executive officers of the University should be appointed as directors, again for a period of four years. Robert Fraser and Muffy Calder would be willing to serve in this capacity.

.3 Michael Scott Morton, John Lumsden and Steve Beaumont should be thanked for their contribution to GUHL and advised that their directorships will come to an end on 31 March 2015.

.4 The Vice-Principal (Knowledge Exchange), Jon Cooper, should be invited to attend all future meetings of GUHL, with a remit to provide strategic advice to the directors. Professor Cooper would not contribute to decision-making in a situation where he had an interest in a spin-out company being discussed.

Is Court content to proceed in this way?

DN, 5.2.15
Consultation on Draft Ordinance 207

Report from the Governance Working Group

1. Responses received to the Consultation

The Governance Working Group met on 19 February to consider submissions made to the Consultation on Draft Ordinance 207 and to discuss how Court should respond to them. Members of the Working Group are: David Ross (convener), Dave Anderson, david Anderson, Ken Brown, Margaret Morton, Breffni O'Connor and Duncan Ross.

Two responses were received to the Consultation; from the Council of Senate (Appendix 1) and from the General Council Business Committee (GCBC) (Appendix 2). The Council of Senate’s submission is supportive of the Draft Ordinance. The GCBC’s is not supportive. At its meeting, the Governance Working Group therefore discussed how Court might respond to the matters raised by the GCBC.

2. Matters Raised by the General Council Business Committee

The GCBC had formed a working group to consider its response to the Consultation. The working group, having received inputs from members of the GCBC, and from the wider membership of the General Council, had submitted a response with 15 conclusions ('a' through to 'o'). The Governance Working Group noted these, and endorsed a response to each of the 15 points, as drafted by the convener. (Appendix 3).

To assist in considering matters of concern to the GCBC, the Governance Working Group invited the Chair of the GCBC, John Marsh, to attend its meeting on 19 February. Mr Marsh was accompanied by a GCBC colleague, Mr Gerry Law. Part of the Working Group’s time with Mr Marsh and Mr Law was spent discussing points raised in the GCBC’s response (Appendix 2), in particular the concern that Ordinance 207 would result in a Court with a dominant membership appointed by Court itself. On that point, several working group members spoke of the essential governance role that is addressed by the full meeting of Court, commenting on the diverse nature of Court’s membership, and the value of this in providing robust governance. They emphasized also the vital governance role that is played by co-opted members with particular professional experience, stressing the importance to Court of appointing more members on the basis of their specific skills and experience, and noting that, if Ordinance 207 is approved, co-opted members will continue to be a minority on Court, holding 9 positions out of 25.
Before the meeting, Mr Marsh had shared with the working group a suggestion that he hoped might satisfy Court's need to ensure it had the right skills round the table, while allowing GCBC an important role in securing the appointment of Court members. His suggestion was that, when Court sought to recruit co-opted members with specific skills, it should ask the GCBC to invite applications from alumni, and that there should then be a selection process with a panel composed of GCBC members and Court members. The Working Group warmly welcomed the GCBC's attempt to put in place measures that would satisfy both Court and GCBC, and the constructive manner in which Mr Marsh had sought to take this forward. In discussing the approach he had suggested, the group did, however, have two significant reservations. Firstly, it felt that, while Court would welcome a strong pool of graduate applicants for co-opted positions, it would not want the field of applicants to be restricted to graduates only. Secondly, the group was clear that, following the terms of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, the selection process for co-opted members should be run on Court's behalf by the Nominations Committee, which was constituted for that purpose, and which included academic staff, support staff, student and lay members.

While the Working Group did not therefore support the proposal put forward by Mr Marsh, it agreed that there were areas where Court might be able to take steps that would help address GCBC's concerns. Should Ordinance 207 be approved, the Working Group felt that Court could simultaneously commit to measures that would ensure a continuing substantial alumni presence on Court, and a continuing role for the GCBC in helping fill vacancies. It was agreed also that Court could make clear that these measures were intended to remain in place for the long term, and that they would not be altered in future without prior consultation with the GCBC.

3. **Recommendations to Court**

Having reviewed the GCBC's submission, and following the constructive dialogue with Mr Marsh and Mr Law, the Working Group recommends that Court should:

.1 confirm its support for Ordinance 207 as drafted, involving a reduction in the number of Senate Assessors from 7 to 6, a reduction in the number of General Council Assessors from 5 to 2, and an increase in the number of Co-opted members from 5 to 9.

.2 confirm its commitment to maintaining a strong presence of University of Glasgow graduates on Court;

.3 confirm its support for practical measures to provide an active role for the GCBC in the future recruitment of co-opted members; and

.4 agree the following practical measures, intended to support points 2 and 3 above:
a that the membership of the Nominations Committee should be amended such that it will always include a General Council Assessor;

b that, whenever a new co-opted member is recruited, the General Council Assessor on Nominations Committee should be invited to be a member of the interview panel;

c that Nominations Committee should, in recommending individuals to Court for co-option, bear in mind the desirability of having at least three co-opted members who are graduates of the University;

d that all job descriptions for co-opted members should include, as an essential criterion, 'commitment to the values and success of the University of Glasgow';

e that in the future recruitment of co-opted members, Nominations Committee should liaise with the General Council Business Committee with the aim of encouraging applications from graduates of the University; and

f that the measures above should not be varied by Court without prior consultation, over a period of 2 months, with the General Council Business Committee.

Should Court support the above recommendations, then:

- Ordinance 207 will be submitted to the Privy Council following the meeting of Court; and

- The Convener and Secretary will meet with the Convener of the GCBC to discuss with him the measures agreed as a to f above, and to consider how Court and GCBC will work together to implement them.
Appendix 1

Communications to Court from the meeting of Council of Senate held on 05 February 2015

Extract

6. University Court: Communications from the meeting held on 10 December 2014

6.1 Ordinance on Composition of Court

As reported at the meeting of the Council of Senate on 2 October 2014, the draft Ordinance on the composition of Court discussed in 2014 concerning the composition of the University Court submitted to the Privy Council for approval last spring had been withdrawn on advice to retain rather than change some points of terminology. Court had consequently re-drafted the Ordinance and reverted to the previous terminology (this involved restoring use of the title 'Assessor'). While the Ordinance remained otherwise unchanged - the new draft remained in line with the proposal made by the Council of Senate and accepted by Court that there should be six Senate Assessors on Court in the new Court composition - the change in terminology had necessitated a fresh consultation exercise. The revised draft had been circulated to Senate at the beginning of January, as part of the formal consultation process for new Ordinances, with an invitation to submit observations on the draft to Court by 19 February. Council of Senate supported the draft Ordinance.
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Recommendation to the Business Committee

The Business Committee Working Group recommends that the Business Committee opposes draft Ordinance 207.

Executive Summary

Court has consulted General Council on draft Ordinance 207, which seeks to reduce the number of General Council Assessors from five to two; to reduce the number of Senate Assessors from seven to six; and to replace the Assessors thus removed by increasing the number of members to be co-opted by Court from five to nine.

Court indicated that the reason for seeking to amend the Ordinance was to comply with the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance.

The Business Committee appointed a Working Group (the BCWG) to consider representations from General Council members, and to make recommendations for submission to Court.

The BCWG received comments from 31 General Council members in response to an email sent to all General Council members whose contact details were available, and from a number of Business Committee members. Six General Council members supported the draft Ordinance, two neither opposed nor supported, and 23 opposed.

The Business Committee members who commented opposed the draft Ordinance on the following grounds:

- The proposals would result in a Court with a dominant membership appointed by Court itself
- By reducing the number of General Council Assessors to a token level, Court is subverting the intention of the Universities (Scotland) Acts that Court, as the governance body for the University should have a membership representative equally of the graduate body, the academic body and the University.

An alternative process for appointing General Council Assessors was suggested by one member, in which Court would advise the Business Committee of the skills it requires, allowing the Business Committee to invite applications from General Council membership; an appointment committee comprised of members of Court and of the Business Committee would interview and appoints Assessors.

It was suggested that this might create a system which will satisfy Court’s desire to appoint members with appropriate skills while retaining the General Council’s influence in their appointment.

This proposal is currently under discussion with the Secretary of Court.

The BCWG believes that such an arrangement should be further investigated.
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Background to draft Ordinance 207

Court has indicated that it wishes to amend Ordinance No 182 (Composition of the University Court) to comply with the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance by

- limiting the membership of Court to 25 members, with a clear majority of independent members,
- having an appropriate balance of skills and expertise in its membership, and
- advertising positions for lay members externally and appointing them through a nominations committee.

The current composition of Court and that proposed by draft Ordinance 207 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent members</th>
<th>current</th>
<th>proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 elected by General Council</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 appointed by Court for their particular skills and experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Chancellor's Assessor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an appointee of Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not considered independent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>current</th>
<th>proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three, including the Rector, elected or appointed by the students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two elected by the academic and non-academic staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven elected by the Senate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total not considered independent</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total membership</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Court proposes to reduce the number of Senate Assessors from seven to six and the number of General Council Assessors from five to two, thus achieving an independent majority of 13 to 12, and to increase the number of directly-appointed members from five to nine.
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Historical Context

A full explanation of the process is given in Court's notification to General Council dated 18 December 2014.

In 2010 Court decided to amend the composition of Court, and its draft Ordinance was agreed to by the Business Committee on certain understandings designed to ensure at least three co-opted members were graduates of the University, but the submission to the Privy Council was later withdrawn, to ensure compliance with the forthcoming Code on Scottish Higher Education.

In 2014 Court consulted on draft Ordinance 206, which proposed to change the composition of Court to that shown in the right hand column of the table above. The Business Committee opposed the draft by a majority vote, and the submitted Ordinance was withdrawn following representations by the Lord Advocate's Office.

During the consultation process, Court suggested an informal arrangement, whereby

- Court would reduce the number of General Council Assessors by 3 to 2, to open 3 places to co-opted members, who might be graduates or non-graduates
- Court would give guidance to its Nominations Committee to consider General Council members for co-option
- Court would include one General Council Assessor on its Nominations Committee
- Court would work with the Business Committee to encourage graduates to apply

The Business Committee did not agree to this suggestion.

The present draft Ordinance 207 is identical to draft 206, except that the term "representative" has been replaced by "Assessor".

Court notified General Council of the proposed Ordinance 207 and issued a summary of the process on 18 December 2014, requesting comments by 19 February 2015.

At its meeting on 14 January 2015, the Business Committee agreed

1. to canvass its members again to confirm their continued opposition to draft Ordinance 206.
2. to seek comments from the Business Committee on draft Ordinance 207
3. to set up a Working Group to recommend a response by the Business Committee.
4. that, if the Business Committee votes to oppose Draft Ordinance 207, a new representation will be submitted to Court by the Working Group

Following the Half-Yearly Meeting of General Council on 31 January 2015, all current members of General Council who had voted on draft Ordinance 206 were invited to confirm whether they wished to change their vote, and all current members were invited to comment on draft Ordinance 207.
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Comments received on draft Ordinance 207

1. Response from General Council

31 General Council members responded to an email sent to all General Council members whose contact details were available. Six General Council members supported the draft Ordinance, two neither opposed nor supported, and 23 opposed. The result was inconclusive, as most simply supported or opposed draft Ordinance 207, without putting forward any supporting argument.

Only one response was received to the request for confirmation of continued opposition to draft Ordinance 206, stating that Resolution 207 should be opposed and any consultation should concentrate only on the single point of increasing the 2 General Council Assessors.

Of those who did offer comments, the following is a summary.

Supporters:
- Up to 2 Assessors adequate, and there is no need for the Chancellor to nominate an Assessor.
- Court should be governance and not management.

Opponents:
- I am concerned by increase in number of co-opted members, leading to increased risk of weakened critical oversight.
- Thought should be given to increasing elected numbers.
- Commercial business methodology must not be pursued so ruthlessly.
- Introduction of co-opted members rather than elected is not democratic and transparent.
- Under the proposals, a majority would be appointed by Senate.
- Independence and representative standing of Assessors essential to successful functioning of Council (sic).
- Room for modest compromise, with replacement of one SA and one GCA by two co-opted.
- Important to maintain position as set out in Universities (Scotland) Act 1858. Recution in Assessors runs risk of turning Court into self perpetuating body.
- Co-option can be seen as an indication of insecurity by management, and the preface to policy which the team is aware will not be acceptable to the community, and a sign of discomfort with the idea of independent assessment
- Important that members of GC should continue to play role in governance
- The way to achieve a clear majority is to reduce senate Assessors from seven to five; no case made to justify why number co-opted should rise to as many as nine
- Majority could be created by reducing Court to 23 and senate Assessors to 5
- Reduce senate Assessors from seven to six; increase GC Assessors from five to eight, reduce coopted members from five to three.

2. Specific Responses from Business Committee members

1. One member has proposed an arrangement which would ensure that Court has access to the skills it requires, involving collaboration between Court & GC on a nominations committee; 2 from Court, 3 from GC. Court advises committee of requirements, GC seeks applications, NC interviews and appoints. The proposal notes that Court will have lay majority if it reduces the number of Senate Assessors from 6 to 5 as proposed. This proposal retains the principle of drawing membership from the graduate body, and gives the Business Committee a de facto veto.

2. Court and Senate share an interest in and commitment to the University; Court is not a representative assembly, but a composite body with Senate and General Council as component elements; Proposed reduction in Senate Assessors resolves non-compliance with the Code requirement for clear independent majority; the University is only non-compliant with the requirement fora balance of skills on the basis of a narrow interpretation of the requirement that governance requires specialist independent business skills; suggests a compromise: allow General Council Assessors to be drawn from the Business Committee by a selection committee.
3. Extend the consultation period to allow the Business Committee to discuss points raised by Court at the coming Business Committee meeting; report the results of the Business Committee vote on Ordinance at next meeting.

4. Court has shown willingness to make only small changes.
Conclusions of the Business Committee Working Group

The Business Committee Working Group considered the comments received from General Council, including the Business Committee, and Court, and concluded that:

a) General Council and the Business Committee support Court's desire to have access to skilled members, but are opposed to the reduction in influence of General Council in the proposals.

b) The BCWG supports having no more than 25 members, but does not agree that way to achieve is by substantial increase in co-opted members with a resultant reduction in General Council Assessors.

c) The BCWG notes that an alternative arrangement has been put to the Convener of Court which could give Court access to appropriately qualified candidates, whilst preserving the impartiality and independence of appointment process.

d) The BCWG strongly supports reaching agreement with Court on an arrangement which will satisfy Court's desire to appoint members with appropriate skills while retaining the General Council's influence in their appointment and the independent governance of the University.

e) Having as large a number of co-opted members as nine will diminish the broad constituency of Court.

f) Such an increase in the number of co-opted members could lead to a self-appointing membership, and diminish the accountability and impartiality of Court as the governance body.

gh) The increase in the number of Court members selected specifically for their specialist skills could lead to a tendency for Court to see its role as to manage rather than to govern.

h) Reducing the number of General Council Assessors so substantially reduces the role of a primary stakeholder as envisaged by the Universities (Scotland) Acts and reduces the perspective which the presence of alumni brings to the workings of Court.

i) It notes that Court Minutes record that one General Council Assessor had already expressed concern that the proposal could mean that Court appoints members who best fit the University business model rather than those who will question from a governance perspective.

j) There is concern that the Court proposal for an informal agreement on Business Committee involvement is strongly dependent on a non-binding concordat which could be changed unilaterally.

k) Appointment of nominees by Senate, the student body and General Council is necessary to maintain the independence of members of Court and enable them to hold Court accountable.

l) There is concern that a future Court with less external accountability could readily reverse governance arrangements previously made.

m) It was concerned that there might be the potential for conflict between a Court which has become to some extent self-appointed seeking to take more management responsibility, and potentially leading to conflict with the management team of the University.

n) It notes that it has been suggested that Court may feel that restricting places to graduates defeats the key aim of broadening the skills of Court, but believes that adequate skills exist within General Council.

o) It notes that Court believes that to retain five General Council Assessors is at odds with the desire of government, but observes that the Business Committee has already expressed its objection to the Education Secretary as part of the consultation process on proposed legislation.

John Marsh
Des Leslie
Gerry Law
Amber Higgins

Business Committee Working Group
Conclusions of the Business Committee Working Group

The Business Committee Working Group considered the comments received from General Council, including the Business Committee, and Court, and concluded that:

a) General Council and the Business Committee support Court’s desire to have access to skilled members, but are opposed to the reduction in influence of General Council in the proposals.

RESPONSE: The proposals will open up a wider pool of potential applicants but will not prevent any suitably qualified alumni from applying

b) The BCWG supports having no more than 25 members, but does not agree that way to achieve is by substantial increase in co-opted members with a resultant reduction in General Council Assessors.

RESPONSE: A number of those appointed to Court as co-opted members have been alumni so it is by no means inevitable that reducing the number of General Council Assessors will lead to a reduction in the number of alumni on Court. When co-opted vacancies are being filled by advertisement and interview the candidates appointed will be those who are seen to most closely fit the needs of the University Court at that time. That must be seen to be in the best interests of the University

c) The BCWG notes that an alternative arrangement has been put to the Convener of Court which could give Court access to appropriately qualified candidates, whilst preserving the impartiality and independence of appointment process.

RESPONSE: The alternative arrangement which will be considered by Court, would restrict the pool of applicants for the three positions which Court wishes to become co-opted positions, by allowing only alumni to apply.

d) The BCWG strongly supports reaching agreement with Court on an arrangement which will satisfy Court’s desire to appoint members with appropriate skills while retaining the General Council’s influence in their appointment and the independent governance of the University.

RESPONSE: While the proposal would reduce the number of General Council Assessors the measures which Court has proposed in relation to there being a General Council Assessor on the Nominations Committee, the guidance from Court to the Nominations Committee about the desirability of having at least 5 alumni on Court and Court’s desire to work with the GCBC in encouraging suitably qualified alumni to apply from co-opted positions will retain General Council’s influence in the appointment of co-opted members and the independent governance of the University

e) Having as large a number of co-opted members as nine will diminish the broad constituency of Court.

RESPONSE: The number of constituencies electing or appointing members to Court will not be reduced. Indeed co-opted members bring a wide range of backgrounds and experience to Court thereby enhancing the breadth of Court.

f) Such an increase in the number of co-opted members could lead to a self-appointing membership, and diminish the accountability and impartiality of Court as the governance body.

Appendix 3
RESPONSE: The co-opted members will be in a distinct minority on Court as almost two thirds of the members of Court will not be co-opted with a majority of Court being elected by staff students or alumni.

g) The increase in the number of Court members selected specifically for their specialist skills could lead to a tendency for Court to see its role as to manage rather than to govern.

RESPONSE: On the contrary the availability of these skills and experience on Court enable Court to monitor more knowledgeably the performance of the management of the University, and so hold it to account; one of the principle roles of a governing body.

h) Reducing the number of General Council Assessors so substantially reduces the role of a primary stakeholder as envisaged by the Universities (Scotland) Acts and reduces the perspective which the presence of alumni brings to the workings of Court.

RESPONSE: The number of General Council Assessors on Court has varied over the years. When Courts were established by the Universities (Scotland) Act 1858 there was one General Council Assessor on a Court of seven at Glasgow University. Even without the measures proposed (see the response in d) above) a number of co-opted members of Court have been alumni thereby supporting the perspective which alumni bring to the workings of Court.

i) It notes that Court Minutes record that one General Council Assessor had already expressed concern that the proposal could mean that Court appoints members who best fit the University business model rather than those who will question from a governance perspective.

RESPONSE: Good governance requires that a member of a governing body knows what are the correct questions to ask, and whether the answers which they receive are valid and acceptable. That in turn requires knowledge and understanding of the way in which the organisation operates (the business model of a University)

j) There is concern that the Court proposal for an informal agreement on Business Committee involvement is strongly dependent on a non-binding concordat which could be changed unilaterally.

RESPONSE: Court will no doubt consider this concern at its meeting on 24th February.

k) Appointment of nominees by Senate, the student body and General Council is necessary to maintain the independence of members of Court and enable them to hold Court accountable.

RESPONSE: As noted in f) above the co-opted members will be in a distinct minority on Court as almost two thirds of the members of Court will not be co-opted, with a majority of Court being elected by staff, students or alumni.

l) There is concern that a future Court with less external accountability could readily reverse governance arrangements previously made.

RESPONSE: In so far as this expresses the same concern as in j) above Court will no doubt consider this concern at its meeting on 24th February. The introduction of more members who are co-opted will not affect the accountability of Court as it will remain accountable to a wide range of constituencies and interests. The proposals will not alter how Court might change governance arrangements which are regulated by Statute or Ordinance.
m) It was concerned that there might be the potential for conflict between a Court which has become to some extent self-appointed seeking to take more management responsibility, and potentially leading to conflict with the management team of the University.

RESPONSE: The senior management of the University have not expressed any concerns that the proposals might lead to such conflict, and as noted in f) above the co-opted members will be in a distinct minority on Court as almost two thirds of the members of Court will not be co-opted, with a majority of Court being elected by staff, students or alumni.

n) It notes that it has been suggested that Court may feel that restricting places to graduates defeats the key aim of broadening the skills of Court, but believes that adequate skills exist within General Council.

RESPONSE: The proposals do not in any way reflect adversely on the skills of members of the General Council but they will allow the University to appoint as co-opted members the best applicants- who may well be alumni.

o) It notes that Court believes that to retain five General Council Assessors is at odds with the desire of government, but observes that the Business Committee has already expressed its objection to the Education Secretary as part of the consultation process on proposed legislation.
Court – Tuesday 24 February 2015

Report from the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on
14 January 2015

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/2014/41. University of Glasgow / UESTC Joint Educational Institute
Finance Committee received a paper outlining proposals to form a Joint Educational Institute (JEI) with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC). The proposed JEI would grow the existing partnership between the two universities, allowing a greater degree of autonomy around the creation of new degree courses, with firm plans to create three new BEng dual degree programmes and the potential in future to add more programmes including PGT and PGR, as well as exploring research collaborations in due course.

The Committee approved the venture in principle, subject to further consideration being given to the best approach of managing risks associated with the JEI model.

CA/2014/42. Finance Key Performance Indicators
Finance Committee received a report on the Key Performance Indicators. The Committee noted a year-on-year increase in total revenue in 2013/14 of 9% (an increase from £469m to £511m). The University KPI of 2% surplus was achieved in 2012/13 and exceeded in 2013/14. The 2014/15 outlook projected a surplus of £7.8m.

It was noted that an analysis of Glasgow’s income growth, benchmarked against other Russell Group universities, would be provided later in the year.
CA/2014/43. Endowments Investment Report as at 30 November 2014
Finance Committee noted the Endowments Investment Reports.

CA/2014/45. Overview of Performance as at 30 November 2014
Finance Committee received the overview of performance as at 30 November 2014 (Annex 3) noting the full year outlook was £7.8m, £2.2m higher than budget.
University of Glasgow
Finance Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 14 January 2015

Melville Room, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:
Mr Graeme Bissett, Mr Paul Brady, Mr Ken Brown (Convener), Mr Robert Fraser, Dr Carl Goodyear, Ms Margaret Morton, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Ms Breffni O’Connor, Mr David Ross, Dr Duncan Ross, Mr Iain Stewart

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

For item CA/2014/41: Mrs Debbie Goldie, Prof John Marsh, Mr David Rhodes

Apologies:
n/a

CA/2014/37. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 12 November 2014

The minutes of Finance Committee held on Wednesday 12 November 2014 were approved.

CA/2014/38. Matters arising

CA/2014/07. Finance Committee Remit

Discussions were ongoing regarding the remit of the Committee, particularly with regard to approval routes for large capital projects. A revised draft remit would be brought to a future meeting of Finance Committee for consideration.

CA/2014/08. Insurance Renewal 2014/15

The Director of Estates had circulated some information to the Committee on the insurance arrangements on the Western Infirmary site. The arrangements for the South Glasgow University Hospital site were not yet completely confirmed, and were being worked through on a property-by-property basis. The Committee would receive updates in due course.

CA/2014/29. GU Holdings Investment Process

GU Holdings Ltd had been discussed at the December meeting of Court and would be considered further at a future meeting.

CA/2014/31. Update on HSBC operational banking/New accounts

Finance Committee received a paper listing the new bank accounts which would be opened with HSBC following the procurement exercise which had been carried out. The Committee noted that the new accounts would replace existing accounts which had been held with the
Clydesdale Bank, which would be closed as part of the transfer to HSBC. The only accounts remaining open with the Clydesdale Bank would be accounts receiving philanthropic donations.

**CA/2014/39. Conflicts of Interest**

No conflicts of interest were noted.

**CA/2014/40. Chemistry Laboratory Development: Capex application (paper 5.1)**

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting an additional £380k of funding for Professor Liskamp’s laboratory refurbishment. A number of elements of the project costs had increased since the original Capex application was approved in March 2013. It appeared that the Project Board had not been given the opportunity to consider and approve these changes before they were implemented. There had also been serious issues with the reporting and presenting of project costs, resulting in a false position being presented to the Project Board.

The Committee objected to the fact that the application was in reality a request to approve funding in retrospect, since the project had been completed. Committee members sought assurance that University officers understood exactly what had gone wrong and that the changes recently made in the management of capital projects would ensure there was no recurrence.

In response, the Director of Estates made a number of points:

- There had been fundamental improvements in project governance structure and the capital projects team within Estates and Buildings. It was noted that the senior Estates team had been strengthened with three new appointments. The Secretary of Court agreed that there was now a robust governance structure and Estates team in place.

- The Estates Strategy working group meeting later in January and Audit Committee meeting in February would provide opportunities to highlight the work which was being done on governance processes.

- The Committee was reminded of the external review which had been carried out, the recommendations of which were now being implemented.

- The Estates team was carrying out work on procurement strategy, reviewing the timing of bringing projects to Capex Committee, and ensuring accurate briefing of projects.

- There were current examples of large projects which were going well, progressing to time and on budget, providing evidence that the team and structures have the capability to manage projects effectively.

The Committee suggested that Estates Committee should receive a paper setting out the new governance processes with input and agreement from the Estates team and Finance Office team.

The Convenor noted his concern that the University should consider ways of streamlining committee structures, with regard to Finance/Estates/Audit Committees, in order to minimise overlap. This would be discussed at the next meeting of the Committee Convenors.

Finance Committee reluctantly approved the application.
CA/2014/41. University of Glasgow / UESTC Joint Educational Institute (paper 5.2)

The Convener welcomed Prof John Marsh, Head of School of Engineering, Mr David Rhodes, Head of Finance, College of Science and Engineering, and Mrs Debbie Goldie, Head of Administration, School of Engineering to the meeting.

Prof Marsh introduced a paper outlining proposals to form a Joint Educational Institute (JEI) with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC). The Committee noted that there was currently a partnership in place with UESTC delivering a four year undergraduate BEng (Hons) degree programme in Electronics and Electrical Engineering in Chengdu, China. The partnership was currently in its second year of student admission and had been set up as a Joint Educational Programme (JEP).

Finance Committee approved the venture in principle, subject to further consideration being given to the best approach of managing risks associated with the JEI model.

CA/2014/42. Finance KPIs (paper 6.1)

Finance Committee received a report on Finance Key Performance Indicators. The Committee noted a year-on-year increase in total revenue in 2013/14 of 9% (an increase from £469m to £511m). It was noted that the increase in income was largely driven by an increase in SFC income, increased international tuition fees and growth in research income. The 2014/15 outlook recorded 1.1% year-on-year growth in total revenue. The 2015/16 budget projected 2.5% year-on-year growth due to continued expansion in international student recruitment and improved research performance. The University KPI of 2% surplus was achieved in 2012/13 and exceeded in 2013/14. The 2014/15 outlook remained positive, projecting a surplus of £7.8m.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Principal noted that there was no overall growth target set, due to growth being largely dependent on the external environment and particularly the level of the SFC grant.

The Group Financial Controller noted that a benchmarking exercise was also carried out each year with Higher Education institutions of a similar size and type. These data will come to Finance Committee later in the financial year. The Committee noted it would be useful to have accompanying commentary pointing out the key comparisons to focus on within the dataset.

The Committee accepted the KPIs.

CA/2014/43. Endowments Investment Report as at 30 November 2014 (paper 6.2)

The Committee noted the Endowments Investment Report as at 30 November 2014. The Convenor of Court noted that the figure of 6.1% RPI over 12 months which appeared in both the Newton and Schroders columns would be checked.

CA/2014/44. Draft minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee meeting held on 14 November 2014 (paper 6.3)

Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee held on 14 November 2014.
CA/2014/45. Overview of Performance as at 30 November 2014 (paper 7.1)

The Director of Finance provided an overview of performance at 30 November 2014. Finance Committee noted that at Period 4 the operating surplus was £22.2m, £4.3m higher than budget. The full year outlook was £7.8m which was £2.2m higher than budget. The Committee noted the main movements, most significantly a £2.5m lower than budget spend on salaries. Tuition fee income was in line with budget, with some movements across the Colleges.

Tuition fees were forecast to be £3.3m higher than prior year. Social Sciences was up £0.2m, Science & Engineering was up £0.9m, MVLS up £1.4m mainly on international UG students and Arts up £0.7m due to increases in rUK and PGT student numbers.

Salaries were £3.1m higher than prior year driven by £1.3m pay inflation, with the remaining increases found across the Colleges and University Services.

There was £175.7m in net funds as at 30 November 2014. Cash inflow was £16.2m for the year to date. The closing cash forecast for 2014/15 was £127.2m.

The Committee was satisfied with the format of the commentary, finding it helpful and comprehensive.

CA/2014/46. Debtors Report as at 30 November 2014 (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received a report of debtors as at 30 November 2014. The Committee noted that overall debt levels had increased year-on-year from £75.16m at November 2013 to £83.06m at November 2014. Student and sponsor tuition fee debt had increased from £55.02m at November 2013 to £58.25m at November 2014. The top ten sponsor balances represent 86% of total sponsor balance outstanding.

The Committee noted that commercial debt stood at £22.1m at November 2014, an increase from £16.7m at November 2013. However this was due to an increase in invoicing activity. It was noted that debtor days had decreased from 38 in November 2013 to 35 in November 2014.

CA/2014/47. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 25 March 2015, 2pm, Melville Room.
Court - Tuesday 24 February 2015

Report from the Estates Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Estates Committee held on 7 January 2015 are attached.

Action Requested

Court is asked to:

Note the progress made on the Estate Strategy (EC/2014/20 refers); Court is also receiving a briefing on this matter at the February meeting.

Note the remainder of the minute.

Originator of the Paper

Lynn Duncan
Clerk to Estates Committee
10 January 2015
UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW
Estates Committee
Minute of the meeting held in the Estates and Buildings Conference Room on
Wednesday 7 January 2015

Present: Mrs A Allen, Professor J Briggs, Professor N Juster, Mr D Milloy, Ms M Morton (Convener), Professor A Muscatelli, Mr D Newall, Ms B O’Connor, Mr A Seabourne, Professor P Younger

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

Apologies: Professor S Beaumont, Professor F Coton, Dr S Inch, Mr R Fraser, Professor K Lury

EC/2014/17 Minute of the meeting held on 3 November 2014
The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2014/18 Matters Arising

EC/2014/18.1 Estate Strategy Progress Report
Western Infirmary Transfer (EC/2014/10.1 refer)
The Committee noted that the handover schedule had yet to be finalised and an update would be provided at the meeting scheduled to take place on 13 March 2015.

EC/2014/18.2 Estate Strategy Update (EC/2014/12.1 refers)
The succinct, condensed version of the Strategy would be provided to Committee members in advance of the next scheduled meeting.

EC/2014/18.2 JLL Review Update (EC/2014/14.2 refers)
The Committee noted that progress was being made in relation to the matters identified in the report, specifically noting that issues of capability and governance were being addressed.

EC/2014/19 Declarations of Interest
There were no declarations.

EC/2014/20 Strategies and Performance

EC/2014/20.1 Estate Strategy Update
The Committee noted that following Court approval of the Estate Strategy in October 2014, the focus had been to agree the financial envelope for the strategy and its priority projects. The Court Working Group had considered the draft Capital Investment Plan at its meeting on 17 December 2014 and would undertake further detailed discussion, within the context of funding proposals and a sustainable financial model, at its next meeting.

EC/2014/20.1.1 Teaching and Learning Hub
The Committee noted that the project had been formally established and a Project Development Board with Professor Frank Coton as Project Sponsor was convened. The project team had arranged for a wide range of representative groups to be engaged in the briefing process. The team was being assisted by Dr Kenn Fisher, a leading architect and academic from Melbourne University who had been central to the early thinking and briefing of the Learning and Teaching Hub, University of Adelaide.

At its last meeting Estates Committee was advised that a design team from the new framework would be appointed. It noted however that the decision had been reviewed following further legal advice. As a consequence two possible alternative procurement options were identified:

Scape - allows mini-tendering and earlier design team appointment but would result in the loss of significant operational control and additional fees; and

OJEU – takes longer to appoint design team however this additional time provides opportunities for extensive consultation and development of the brief and consequently a better design/planning process.
The Committee noted the decision to proceed to full OJEU which had been well received by the market. It noted that PQQs had been received on 23 December 2014 and that these were being assessed. A further update would be provided at the next meeting on 13 March 2015.

**EC/2014/20.1.2 Master Planning and Infrastructure Proposals**
The Committee noted that Court Working Group had considered an outline Procurement Strategy and that the project was currently out to OJEU for appointment of a lead design team. There had been a number of expressions of interest and PQQs were due for return on 12 January 2015.

**EC/2014/20.1.3 Space Standards**
The Committee noted the opportunity to second a member of staff from Strathclyde University Estates team for six months to develop space proposals.

The Committee noted the focus for the next eight weeks; briefing of the Learning and Teaching Hub; the procurement process for respective teams of advisors; and securing Court approval to the proposed Capital Plan.

**EC/2014/21 Governance**

**EC/2014/21.1 Naming of Buildings Proposal**
The Committee noted that the University did not currently have a policy specifically relating to the naming of its buildings and other spaces, and also that current campus names referred almost exclusively to white men. It agreed that, as we move towards the development of significant new buildings, this should be reviewed. A new policy should be drafted, which should include a commitment that campus names should reflect the diversity of the University community, and proposals should be formulated on how the policy would be implemented. The Committee agreed that this action would be led by the Secretary of Court.

**EC/2014/22 Projects**

**EC/2014/22.1 Approved Projects Status (RAG) report**
The Committee noted the report and the current status of projects.

In relation to CP11/444 South Glasgow Hospitals (Clinical Trials Facility), the Committee agreed that the budget sum contained within the document should be updated to reflect the financial scope of the entire project.

**EC/2014/22.2 Project Exception Report**
The Committee noted the position in relation to the project exceptions:

**EC/2014/22.2.1 GUU/Stevenson**
Works reported 5-6 weeks behind programme, largely attributed to unforeseen ground conditions and the constrained nature of the site. It was anticipated that some programme recovery was achievable during the fit-out stages and programme options were being reviewed by the project team.

Whilst the budget remained as approved, the building would not be available for occupation in September 2015 and whilst disappointing the Committee agreed that quality must not be compromised by acceleration of works. It was agreed that following the Project Board meeting in January 2015 a communication would be issued to ensure all student groups were advised of the reasons for the delayed opening.

The Contractor had submitted a formal request for an Extension of Time and this was being reviewed by the project team.

**EC/2014/22.2.2 Garscube Learning and Social Space (GLaSS)**
The Committee noted the six week delay reported in November 2014, a further delay of 14 weeks had been reported by the Contractor due to problems in the availability of structural steelwork which
would not be delivered until mid-February 2015. As a consequence works would not be completed to allow the building to open at the start of semester one, 2016.

The Contractor had submitted a formal request for an Extension of Time which was being reviewed by the project team.

EC/2014/22.3 Main Building Tower (Phase Two)
The Committee noted that tenders for Phase 2 had been returned and were being analysed. The project was expected to exceed the approved budget due to a change in the scope of the works which had become evident as a result of a detailed assessment of the building condition. Tender inflation was also expected to impact on cost. A detailed report would be prepared for CapEx Committee in due course.

EC/2014/22.4 Wind Tunnel Acre Road
The Committee noted that delivery of specialist equipment actor had been delayed negatively impacting on the final project completion date, now anticipated in late March 2015. It also noted that costs had increased by circa £140k beyond approved budget due to design development changes. The Committee agreed that a robust design change control process was required.

EC/2014/22.5 Fraser Building Bank Outlet (Santander)
The Committee noted an anticipated time delay due to discovery of an unknown underground gas main.

EC/2014/22.3 Project Approvals

EC/2014/22.3.1 CP12/496 Liskamp Laboratory
The Committee noted the CapEx application in the sum of £378,249 (inc VAT) which was being requested to meet contractual obligations for works already completed.

It noted a number of issues had contributed to the cost increase including: the complexity and scope of Phase 1 works had been greater than anticipated; QS advice indicated that the value of Phase 2 works would exceed award level for framework projects and was split into two separate phases (2 and 3); and the cost of works to Phase 3 was greater than anticipated at the time of commitment to proceed.

The Committee discussed the fact that this overspend arose from poor project governance and emphasised its concern that such a situation must not recur. The overspend would now be reported to Finance Committee for its consideration.

EC/2014/23 Estates Operating Matters

EC/2014/23.1 Critical Path
The Committee noted the Critical Path would be updated following review of the Capital Plan.

EC/2014/24 Any Other Business

EC/2014/24.1 Cost Price Inflation
A Quantity Surveyor would be asked to undertake an assessment and prediction in relation to market conditions.

EC/2014/25 Schedule of Meetings for 2014/15

Friday 13 March 2015
Friday 15 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 Wednesday 21 January 2015 is attached for information.

The HR Director provided an update to the Committee highlighting a number of substantive areas including current status of anticipated industrial action; forthcoming national pay negotiations; the outcome of the REF 2014 and the TRM project.

The Committee received two presentations. The first from Mr Eddie O’Grady, the Head of Employee and Organisational Development outlining work to date on strategic Organisational Developments. The second presentation was from Professor Jim Conroy, Vice Principal Internationalisation who relayed the challenges facing the University in competing in the International market both in terms of staff and student numbers. Both presentations were well received and generated good dialogue amongst the members.

The Committee received an update on Policy matters.

The Committee approved the Shared Parental Leave Policy. The Committee heard that HR would be devising an FAQ document to support the policy which would be reviewed after one year.

The Management of Organisational Change Policy was also discussed and agreed that it would now be reviewed and would come back to the Committee at a future date.

Action required
Court is asked to note the draft minute of the HR Committee meeting on 21 January 2015.

Richard Claughton
Deputy Director of HR & Clerk to the HR Committee
16 February 2015
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Human Resources Committee

Minute of meeting held in the Melville Room
on Wednesday 21 January 2015

Present: The Principal (AM); Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), Mrs A Allen (AA), Mrs C Barr (CB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Mr R Claughton (RPC), Mrs H Durndell (HD), Professor C Forde (CF), Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson (MMS), Mr David Newall (DN), Professor R O Maolalaigh (ROM), Dr D Spaeth (DS); Professor G Baillie (GB); Mrs S Campbell (SC).

By Invitation: Professor J Conroy (JC), Mrs T Stirling (TS); and Mr. E O’Grady (EOG).

Attending: Mrs E Rae (Minute)

HR/14/36 Opening Remarks & Apologies
DA opened the meeting and noted no apologies on this occasion. He welcomed Professor George Baillie, Senate Assessor and Mrs. Susan Campbell, Independent Lay Member to the Committee.

On behalf of the Committee, DA congratulated Professor O Maolalaigh who had recently been appointed as VP/Head of College for the College of Arts.

HR/14/37 Minute of the Meeting held on 17 November 2014
The minute was taken as read and approved by the committee.

HR/14/38 Matters arising from meeting held on 17 November 2014
The Committee noted that there were no outstanding actions which were not covered in the HR Director’s Report or other agenda items.

HR/14/39 HR Director’s Report
CB provided an overview of the HR Director’s Report highlighting a number of substantive areas including an update on anticipated industrial action, forthcoming national pay negotiations, outcome of the REF 2014 and TRM.

CB reported that further industrial action had been suspended following a meeting of the Joint Negotiating Committee (JNC) on 15 January. Staff communications had been prepared and would be issued imminently.

CB confirmed that staff would be advised that a proposal for USS Reforms had been put forward to the USS Trustee Board that had received the support of UUK and UCU and which brought this dispute to an end, thus avoiding any resumption of industrial action over the proposed changes to USS. The proposal is subject to consideration by the USS Trustee Board and the Pensions Regulator and a statutory consultation process was anticipated to commence with current and prospective USS members in mid-March, for at least 60 days.

CB confirmed that it was the intention of the Principal that we write to staff nearer the time to advise them of the consultation arrangements in order that they might participate accordingly.

CB also advised that the proposed contribution rate of 18% was at the limit of affordability for the employer. DN highlighted that this had increased from 16% to 18%.

AM commented that the last 5 years in the pensions market should show that future conditions are extremely difficult to predict in such challenging economic times, however, moving to 18% made the future of the scheme more secure.

Finally CB confirmed that she and the Pay & Pensions Manager had provided approximately nine pension drop in sessions for staff to outline the changes. Furthermore an online calculator had been developed to assist staff to understand what the changes might mean for them personally.
CB highlighted that UCEA had recently notified participating HEIs that preparation had begun for the multi-employer negotiating round for academic session 2015-16. Consultation with employers is scheduled to begin in mid-February with a view to finalising the preferred negotiating position ahead of the first negotiation meeting with the recognised trade unions on 26 March 2015.

CB undertook to update the Committee on the outcome of the 2014 Research Excellence Framework. The University had improved its position re grade point average from 33rd in 2008 to 24th considered against all participating HEIs in the UK. CB highlighted that the University's performance in terms of GPA demonstrates improvement on performance from the previous exercise in 21 out of 32 submissions. The GPA for inclusion at Glasgow was 2.5 with an overall average outcome of >3. Further, the proportion of our return at 4* level has increased to 31% from 15% in the previous exercise.

AM expressed his view that the outcomes were very positive. He had hoped that in a period of some 10 years Glasgow would be in the top half/quarter of Russell Group's institutions and be performing on a par with HEIs such as Kings/Edinburgh and Manchester. Looking at the Intensity rating, Glasgow was rated 14th, which was two places behind Edinburgh but 1 ahead of St. Andrew's.

DA asked if the University might positively influence the case for a reduction in beaurocracy/administration around the REF submission process? AM advised that HEFCE was conducting a review with the aim of producing a “lighter touch” process. Russell Group members were also discussing the matter.

CB concluded that the University must focus on the factors which it could influence e.g. number and quality of publications and any support which could be given through the PDR/Zoning process to support our staff to, in turn, further our income generation.

CB provided an overview of the recent work undertaken by Professor Neal Juster in leading an ambitious change programme with a number of work streams that will impact across the University. Key aspects which naturally fell to HR and which CB would lead were developing and realising our organisational values and culture, employee engagement, and inspiring leadership. The themes emerging from the strategic planning process highlight academic focus; greater flexibility at unit level and people centred development as fundamental pillars in driving forward strategically to achieve University ambitions. CB highlighted as a direct outcome of the 2014 Staff Survey, focus groups had been established and were feeding into the change programme and linking outcomes to the staff survey feedback.

DA asked whether Professor Juster might be invited to attend a future HR Committee and CB agreed to approach this suggestion post February SMG when a paper would be presented and more strategic direction might be available to inform a future presentation. 

Action – CB

SC asked whether she could receive detail of the most recent staff survey since she was new to the University and it might assist her understanding of future discussions. Action – CB.

CB invited RPC to give an update in relation to the TRM project (Transforming Research Management). RPC confirmed that announcements had now been made during January to staff potentially impacted by this project. A number of existing roles were expected to close once the new structures were established and a management plan was in place to work with staff to minimise the risk of negative impacts and maximise the retention of skills and knowledge as we introduce improved and more consistent support processes. RPC confirmed that the Union representatives had been regularly appraised of developments and consultation on the approach being taken would continue throughout the project.

CB introduced the launch of a new initiative, the aim of which was to deliver an excellent service culture as part of a collective University Services commitment. She confirmed that a number of business process review exercises were already in train within individual HR sections/teams and it was clear that there was scope for further improvement. A service level charter has been drafted seeking key leaders/managers to engage and assume responsibility for people related initiatives within their respective areas, supported by the HR team accordingly. ‘Delivering an Excellent Service Culture’ will be the topic of the next full
day HR staff event across the service to drive forward service excellence as a core element of the ‘One University’ culture.

HR/14/46 CB commented upon the Scottish Government’s recent pledge to Scottish businesses which aims to focus upon such initiatives as investment in youth employment; improving gender pay balance and the living wage. CB advised the Committee that she and DN had recently met with the local MSP to discuss the University’s approach to the living wage, following a series of parliamentary questions on the subject. The University has not committed to living wage accreditation but we confirmed that we would continue to review the position on an annual basis and have to date matched the living wage for all employees.

HR/14/47 CB concluded with a brief update on the e-recruitment module in the Core HR System and planned adjustments to the recruitment process. She also confirmed that she would provide a full update on the 2014/2015 PDR process at the March Committee.

DA commented that previous Core implementations haven’t been particularly successful from the end user point of view and CB confirmed that caution would be expressed in the next release and considerable testing had and would be conducted. CB expressed her confidence in the preparatory steps taken to improve Core functionality.

HR/14/48 AM took the discussion back to TRM and asked whether, given this project’s reliance on processes and systems, would changes be piloted rather than a major switchover. He expressed nervousness on behalf of the SMG who believed that TRM was very central to all of the University’s future aspirations for research staff.

RPC advised that the “people” processes were in place and a training plan was about to be signed off for the, soon to be recruited, Project Co-coordinators. New modules and existing modules had been reviewed and he was reassured that these were fit for purpose. The new ways of working and the supporting system were to be introduced in a phased manner.

HR/14/49 Organisational Development – Strategic Update
EOG had been invited to attend the HRC to give a presentation outlining work to date on strategic Organisational Developments. He outlined key deliverables and their prioritisation, he shared how deployment would drive organisational improvement, he introduced the OD strategic operating model and sought feedback/input from the HRC on the plans outlined.

The strategic impact of the work aimed to deliver improved identification and retention of talent, clearly iterated, acceptable and effective “leadership styles”, Leaders who were more effective in their role more quickly, more focused leadership development, and ultimately increased effective leadership impact on organisational performance.

CB confirmed that the HR strategy was aligned to the Organisational strategy and one aspect already embedded was the inclusion of a specific leadership objective for anyone who had leadership/line management responsibilities. EC stated that going forward, it would be important if succession planning was to succeed, that focus on talent at an earlier career stage was essential. DS talked of his own recent experience of the Academic Leadership programme which he found useful and positive. In his view, it would be important to guard against the perception that such programmes were a “fast track” to promotion. Therefore, an open and transparent approach was very important in order to widen understanding.

AA stated that from an Estates and Buildings perspective, such initiatives were fundamental to the success of other University initiatives e.g. the estates strategy, however, she suggested that whilst focussing on leadership development HR must also develop talent at all grades of staff.

EOG confirmed that the majority of the programme deliverables would be handled in-house.

MMS thanked EOG for his presentation and commented that in her experience, it was important in succession planning to focus on whom she referred to as the “number 2’s” or deputies etc. Often these members of staff had a wealth of experience and were highly motivated in their supporting role. Not everyone aspired to be in the top job but those people should still have their talents developed.
DA thanked EOG for an informative presentation of what was an ambitious programme of work.

**HR/14/50 Internationalisation Strategy**

Professor Jim Conroy had been invited to give an update on progress to date with the University’s Internationalisation agenda.

He relayed the challenges facing the University in competing in the International market both in terms of staff and student numbers. A key challenge related to geographical and cultural diversity of home and abroad and the significant competition which existed in the public and private realms.

In his view there was more to be done in terms of how we served the needs of our students and an area that he wished to see improve was non-university international placements with only five students placed with commercial partners this year. JC suggested that the Alumni network could be better utilised and influential to support this. He also noted that the fact that students often had to negotiate their credits once they returned was detrimental to the opportunities being taken up.

JC recognised that the agenda should also target improved international staff initiatives and that a more strategic recruitment solution could enhance this aspiration. CB highlighted that overall international staff numbers had risen by 8% last year.

JC commented on the substantial benefit to students of having direct access to resources such as the University Library and ideas as to how to mitigate this lack of access for students studying overseas should be developed.

AM commented on the approaching general election and it was noted that the outcome may have an impact on future immigration legislation. He highlighted that the UUK Board had discussed the likely landscape should the UK exit from the EU and took the step of signing and submitting a letter to the Times expressing their concerns for the Research and Teaching sector should that occur.

JC concluded his update by stating that a number of solutions were being considered to help achieve more positive figures for Internationalisation such as piloting tutor supported software packages, a raft of elements including assessments and summer schools and, in his view, more subtle/responsive structures needed to be in place for future students. Looking closely at what the “standard” experience should be for a student would be an interesting starting point but it was clear that creative solutions were essential.

DA expressed the thanks of the Committee for Professor Conroy’s attendance today.

**HR/14/51 HR data analytics and benchmark information**

CB introduced this item and welcomed Tracey Stirling, Recruitment Manager, to the meeting.

She summarised that previously the Committee received a report on Key Performance Indicators but a new style reporting suite of data analytics and benchmarks seemed to be more useful and this data set had been developed to better focus on the current status and workload for the team. She advised that recruitment activity had steadily increased over the period to July 2013 by c.6%, and c.9% in the year to July 2014. This largely related to the REF in the period to November 2013 but more recently was driven by growth in student numbers and the creation of new positions.

DA advised that Court had already received the new format report and the Committee were grateful for the information it offered. CB advised that the report would be further developed to focus on “service provision” in a more useful way.

CB advised that in future a wider range of selection tools would be utilised where appropriate to inform recruitment decision making processes from 2015 such as psychometric tests covering verbal and numerical reasoning. A number of HR staff are in the process of qualifying in psychological testing (Level A & B) to enable a degree of flexibility and cost effectiveness in the broader application of selection tools, minimising the costs associated with sourcing these services through a third party provider.
The Recruitment & Selection Policy will be reviewed to reflect this and circulated appropriately for discussion and approval prior to implementation.

At this juncture AM paid tribute to the work of the recruitment team and commented that it was clear to him that the Colleges and University Services benefitted greatly from the support recruitment offers them. In his view, recruitment was often held to account for delays when they had no control in some instances e.g. immigration deadlines etc. He very much supported the introduction of the profiling and reasoning tools and commended the team for their efforts. TS confirmed that the SMG would soon consider a proposal to assist international recruits with tier 2 Health levies (which will be significant if a family was relocating to Glasgow and which were now to be paid “up-front”). The Committee asked to be kept appraised of SMG’s discussion. **Action – TS.**

**HR/14/52 Policy update**

**HR/14/53 Shared parental leave**
RPC advised that he sought the Committee’s approval for the policy which had been circulated in advance. Comments from the Committee suggested that more than one person found the policy confusing in its terms. RPC acknowledged that it was challenging policy to draft given the relatively unwieldy nature of legislation and the complexity of the benefits. RPC confirmed that he would be devising an FAQ document to support the policy and it would be reviewed after a year to consider best practice across the sector. The Committee approved the policy.

**HR/14/54 Management of organisational change**
RPC provided an update in relation to this policy and indicated that it would now be reviewed and would come back to the Committee at a future date yet to be agreed. One of the key areas that RPC had looked at was the language used in the policy and the need to ensure it provided a framework for organisational change and not simply redundancies. He indicated that a framework was in train to support the policy and the TUs had welcomed this. RPC confirmed that since the policy had not been tested in earnest yet it would be important to revisit the policy following it’s usage in the TRM project as this proceeded. The Committee welcomed this update and asked that RPC consult appropriately regarding the scope of the review given its relative newness and the extent of the discussion when the policy was initially introduced.

**HR/14/55 HRC Sub-Committee Update**

**HR/14/56 EDSC (Equality & Diversity Strategy Committee):**
The minute of the meeting of the EDSC held on 25 November 2014 was noted.

**HR/14/57 Any other business**
CB highlighted that the Equality & Diversity team had recently conducted a monitoring exercise and reported back on that with substantive information and data which could be very useful in supporting other strategic initiatives such as gender pay etc.

Further the EDU manager, Mhairi Taylor (MT), had recently accompanied CB to present to the General Council Business Committee and there had been a lively discussion and a very engaged audience on this occasion. CB asked the Committee to note that she was very reassured by the work that was being undertaken and the results being achieved by the EDU.

DA asked whether MT would be available to bring the monitoring data report to the Committee and CB confirmed that perhaps the May Agenda could accommodate a 20 minute presentation. **Action – RPC.**

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12.30pm. DA thanked CB, RPC and team for input to the January Committee.

**HR/14/58 Date of next meeting**
The next meeting of the HR Committee was noted as Tuesday 31 March 2015 at 10am – 1.00pm in Room 250, Gilbert Scott Conference Suite, Main Building. This date had been rescheduled and it transpired that AA and SC would have to tender apologies for the new date.
University of Glasgow
Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 10 December 2014 at 12:00 AM in the Melville Room

Present:
Mr James Gray, Mr David McLean, Mr John F Malcolm, Dr Catherine Martin, Mr David Newall, Ms Julie Ommer, Mr Paul Phillips, Mr Deric Robinson, Mr David Somerville, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Selina Woolcott, Ms Louise Bowden, Mr Liam King, Mr Oscar Schafer

In Attendance:
Ms Debbie Beales, Mr Richard Claughton

Apologies:
Mrs Ann Allen, Ms Christine Barr, Ms Mae Boyd

HSWC/2014/1 Convenors Business
The Convenor welcomed Oscar Schafer, the second SRC member, to the group. He also welcomed Mr Richard Claughton, Deputy Director HR, who was deputising for Christine Barr.

HSWC/2014/2 Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 16 September 2014
The Minute of the meeting held on Tuesday 16 September 2014 was approved.

HSWC/2014/3 Matters arising

HSWC/2014/3.1 OH Report (Paper 1)
The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that activities for external clients had continued to decrease. This had been expected as ex MRC staff were now incorporated into the University figures within the report. Activities for MVLS students and some staff had increased, such as fitness to practice. Contrary to expectation, there had not been a rise in management referrals for mental health following the cessation of self-referral appointments. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that due to increasing demand admin and clinical staffing resources had been reviewed. As a result, additional resources had been approved for a part time receptionist and for a second OH physician to work one half day session per fortnight. The vacant deputy manager post was currently being advertised and it was hoped that it would be filled in the New Year.

HSWC/2014/3.2 SEPS Report (Paper 2)
The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that there were no major anomalies within the report. The Committee requested that future reports should also record near misses.
HSWC/2014/3.3 EAP Report (Paper 3)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that utilisation had increased dramatically both year on year and since the previous quarter. It was possible that this was due to the cessation of the self-referral service within OH. The new drop-in service for staff had been launched within CAPS and was currently running 2 days per week. There had been low usage of this service so far with only 5 staff using the service in the last quarter. Ms Woolcott would continue to bring the drop-in stats to the Committee. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that a new head of CAPS had recently been appointed. He was currently reviewing what additional resources could be made available to staff and it was hoped that a pilot of wider in-house mental health support for staff would commence in Spring 2015.

HSWC/2014/3.4 Review of US safety committees (Paper 4)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that a review had taken place responding to a concern from UCU reps over routes where staff could raise health and safety issues. Some areas already had a safety committee in place, and it was proposed that they continue. In addition it was proposed that two new safety committees should be created within US, one for administrative activities and one for technical/operational activities. This proposal had been presented to USMG who were supportive of the idea. Services without a safety committee had been asked to nominate reps for these new committees, which would meet quarterly, by 9 January 2015. Ms Woolcott agreed to update the Committee at the next meeting in March.

HSWC/2014/4 SEPS Audit Programme report (DMcL) (Paper 5)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that he had monitored the pattern of completion rates and was satisfied that there was no need for the Committee to chase up non respondents this time round. Awareness that response levels were being monitored by this committee was already having a motivational effect. The University's insurers Sun Alliance were satisfied that the reports produced by SEPS were of a quality consistent with their own template. Mr McLean agreed to add a completion date column to future reports, and a flag indicating where priority recommendations had not been addressed.

HSWC/2014/5 Stress survey analysis feedback to local areas update (verbal report SW)

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that she had been visiting Schools, RI's and University Services to help them interpret results and address issues that had been raised by the stress section of the staff survey. She had visited 33 so far with further meetings set up for January. Red areas had improved from the last staff survey and it was hoped that this was as a result of interventions that had taken place after the last survey. Common themes included the volume of demands/prioritising demands and the ability to take regular breaks. In order to investigate this further, a suggestion would be that future staff survey questions in this section would drill down further to find out why this was the case. Another issue was that there were too many approvals required within processes i.e. expenses/Agresso/post management process. SMG were keen to address this and the next strategic planning process has this as a key strand. In the matter of bullying, it was clear that staff interpreted bullying in a variety of ways. Future staff survey questions relating to this issue would be reviewed to see if there was a way to drill down further into this issue.
HSWC/2014/6 Review of strategic role of HSWC (Paper 6)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that a short life working group, which included reps from E&B, UNISON, MVLS and CoSS, had met to discuss the role of the HSWC. The working group felt that the Committee approved and revised Policies without considering fully the financial impact on Schools, RI's and Professional Services. There was also a need to clarify the status of staff taking on the role of safety co-ordinator/fire warden to ensure that these roles were not seen as voluntary and therefore of lower priority than their substantive post duties. The Committee agreed that when working on Policies in the future that they would look at the resource implications before making final decisions. The Committee discussed the role of HSWC in resourcing health and safety and agreed that this fell under the remit of SMG. Once resourcing implications of new policies were identified, those which were substantial would be referred to SMG for consideration.

HSWC/2014/7 E-cigarettes (verbal report SW/DMcL)

Mr McLean informed the Committee that the University of Glasgow appeared to be among the minority of universities that did not yet have a policy on e-cigarettes. He stated that banning e-cigs on a safety basis did not seem appropriate as the risk was hard to justify. The Committee agreed that the University had a decision to make and that Mr McLean should forward all documentation on this matter to the Convenor who would raise the issue at a future SMG meeting.

HSWC/2014/8 Health & safety for students (verbal report JO)

Ms Ommer informed the Committee that she and the SRC reps had taken the issue of students working alone and/or without adequate training to the Student Support Committee (SSC). The SSC were concerned that although there was a Lone Working Policy for staff there wasn't one for students. The Committee agreed that the Executive Group would discuss the matter further and feedback to the Committee in March.

HSWC/2014/9 Any Other Business

There was no AOB.

HSWC/2014/10 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HWSC will be held on Wednesday 11 March 2015 at 10am in the Melville Room.
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Communications to Court from the meeting of Council of Senate held on 05 February 2015

(All matters are for noting)

1. Consultation on legislation on HE Governance

Further to the discussion at the meeting on 11 December 2014, the Council of Senate response to the consultation was circulated to Senate on 9 January 2015 for comment. No requests for amendments were received and the response had been duly submitted to the Scottish Government.

2. Education Policy & Strategy Committee: Report from the meeting held on 10 December 2014

Council of Senate received a report from the Education Policy and Strategy Committee from Professor Coton, Vice Principal for Learning and Teaching.

Council of Senate endorsed the following proposals for joint and double awards:

2.1 Proposal for a joint award: International Masters in Adult Education and Social Change with University of Malta, Open University of Cyprus, Tallin University and associate member University of Toronto.

2.2 Proposal for a joint award: MSc in International Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies with Charles University and a further partner institution.

The Council of Senate was asked to formally approve a proposal for collaborative provision constituting a joint award of MSc in International Security, Intelligence and Strategic Studies. Due to the recent withdrawal by another institution from the arrangement, an appropriate new partner was being sought. The Council of Senate agreed to endorse this proposal, subject to an additional partner institution being identified.

2.3 Proposal for a double award: Master of Education in Catholic and Faith Based School Leadership with Fordham University.

Professor Coton also highlighted the following items to note.
2.4 SRC Responsibilities to students on remote campuses

The SRC had raised the issue of support to students on remote campuses and had requested clarifications on the student representation mechanisms, in the three collaboration proposals considered. Concerns had arisen from the SRC over their ability to offer equivalent levels of support to students at the increasing number of dispersed locations and Programme Directors had been asked to give this issue detailed consideration. It was reported that there would be further dialogue on this matter between the SRC, Clerk of Senate, Vice-Principal Internationalisation and the Academic Collaborations Office to determine what the SRC’s responsibilities to students in locations remote from campus should be and how they might be delivered. The SRC President and Vice-President for Education reiterated their concerns to Council of Senate and their request that detailed consideration be given to establishing student representation mechanisms in collaborative institutions.

2.5 Update on Developments for MyCampus

Developments to MyCampus were to be introduced including an upgrade to recording of marks. A pilot implementation of “Marks and Exams” would be undertaken in two schools to model potential structures and to assess the work involved in departing from a basic template. The pilot would ensure that the developments were of benefit, did not cause additional workload and that the system was considered robust.

3. Convener’s Business

3.1 Scottish Funding Council Outcome Agreement Letter.

The Principal reported that the budget for Higher Education in Scotland had been reduced by £21.5M. Included in this was the anticipated discontinuation of the funding for Research Excellence, the remaining £6M was related to SFC strategic grants.

3.2 Debate on Tuition Fees

The Principal reported on recent debate about tuition fees in England and that the Labour party were proposing the fees cap be reduced from £9,000 to £6,000. Although this did not directly affect Scottish Institutions, it was anticipated that a lowering of tuition fees would have an impact on Scotland in terms of fee legislation.

3.3 QR Modelling

It was reported that the amount of funding available had remained the same but that the Funding Council had yet to reach decisions about the funding formula in Scotland. It was anticipated that decisions would be made by Mid-March.

4. Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 Update – Presentation

The Council of Senate received a presentation from Professor Padgett, Vice-Principal for Research and Enterprise, on the Outcomes of the REF. Professor Padgett reported that it was possible to construct a range of league tables based on a variety of metrics used in the REF14 and that the University had performed significantly better in all metrics than in 2008 Reasearch Assessment Exercise including the following key highlights:

- The percentage of world-leading research had doubled to 31% since the last assessment in 2008.
• Ranked 2nd in Scotland for research power, research intensity and research strength
• Ranked 12th overall in the UK for power of research
• Ranked 15th in the UK for research intensity
• The percentage of research judged to be 'internationally excellent' or better had risen from 56% in 2008 to 81%.
• Research judged to be 'world-leading' has doubled to 31%.
• This improvement had been achieved across all four colleges of the University and reflected a high performance across an exceptionally wide profile.
• The number of 4* outputs had doubled since 2008.
• Urban Studies in particular had performed well across a number of metrics

The ambition was to improve on the results in REF2020 and a number of lessons had been learnt that would help to achieve this. These included the importance of evidencing the difference made at a local level when demonstrating impact and environment, and the importance that it is explicitly stated within outputs why the research is considered important.

As part of the process to learn from REF 2014 and prepare for the next REF in 2020, a review of all 32 Units of Assessment would be carried out to evaluate the REF submission, supporting information and data. The aim for completion of the review exercise was by December 2016. Eleven Units of Assessment had been shortlisted to for the first cohort to be reviewed with the aim of completion by July 2015. A panel comprising of internal and external members including panel members from the REF2014 would conduct the review.

There was discussion about whether, as part of the review process there would be consideration of the accuracy of internal Grade Point estimates by the College Assessment Panels (CAPs). It was agreed this would be helpful information. Discussion also took place on the financial and reputational advantages and disadvantages of relatively high and low GPA thresholds for returning staff in the REF. This would again require careful consideration for REF 2020, if the 2014 methodology were retained. It was expected that HEFCE would shortly commence consultation with the range of stakeholders on the 2020 methodology.

It was noted that there had been approximately 25 members of staff from the University who had been panel members for REF2014; this was thought to be roughly in line with other Russell Group institutions. The fact that there had been number of Panel Members from the University would be beneficial in the preparations for 2020.

Members of Council of Senate were interested to learn to what extent the recruitment strategy for REF2014 had been beneficial. It was reported that staff recruited nearer in time to the deadline for the REF had tended to achieve better results. It was noted that appointment criteria had evolved since RAE 2008. It was noted that approaches adopted now would affect the outcome of REF 2020. It was also noted that there were other priorities for the University in the forthcoming period, including the development of the campus and ensuring teaching was appropriately resourced. The point was also made that the retention of existing staff through reward, promotion, morale and support was also important. Professor Padgett responded that, in his view, the University’s recognition and reward arrangements acted to facilitate staff retention.
The implications for those Units of Assessment not included in the initial cohort for review were queried. It was anticipated that beneficial approaches identified early on in the review process would be implemented before the full review was completed.

Members highlighted that interdisciplinary appointments were a particularly important consideration, as some of the most significant grants in recent years had been interdisciplinary in nature. It was noted that it was necessary to have facilitative organisational structures to support this ambition.

A further report would be made to the Council of Senate following the first cohort of research reviews.

5. Clerk of Senate’s Business

5.1 Senate Guest Night – 12 March 2015

The next Senate Guest Night Dinner would be held on Thursday, 12 March 2015 at 7.00pm in the Senate Room. The guest speaker would be Dr Bridget McConnell, Chief Executive of Glasgow Life. Dr Bridget McConnell had been awarded the honorary degree of DUniv on 18th June 2014 in recognition of her work towards the 2014 Commonwealth Games. As Chief Executive of Culture & Sport Glasgow, she led a staff of 2,600 and had overseen such projects as the refurbishment of Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum and an overhaul of the city’s sports and leisure facilities. Members of Senate and Court were encouraged to attend.

6. University Court: Communications from the meeting held on 10 December 2014

6.1 Ordinance on Composition of Court

As reported at the meeting of the Council of Senate on 2 October 2014, the draft Ordinance on the composition of Court discussed in 2014 concerning the composition of the University Court submitted to the Privy Council for approval last spring had been withdrawn on advice to retain rather than change some points of terminology. Court had consequently re-drafted the Ordinance and reverted to the previous terminology (this involved restoring use of the title ‘Assessor’). While the Ordinance remained otherwise unchanged - the new draft remained in line with the proposal made by the Council of Senate and accepted by Court that there should be six Senate Assessors on Court in the new Court composition - the change in terminology had necessitated a fresh consultation exercise. The revised draft had been circulated to Senate at the beginning of January, as part of the formal consultation process for new Ordinances, with an invitation to submit observations on the draft to Court by 19 February. Council of Senate supported the draft Ordinance.