Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 13 April 2016 in Room L0-006
Teaching & Learning Centre, Queen Elizabeth University Hospital

Present:
Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Ms Morag Deans SRC Assessor, Dr Carl Goodyear Senate Assessor, Professor Nick Hill Senate Assessor, Professor Karen Lury Senate Assessor, Mr Liam King SRC President, Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson General Council Assessor, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr Ronnie Mercer Co-opted Member, Ms June Milligan Co-opted Member, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Mr David Ross General Council Assessor (Convener of Court), Dr Duncan Ross Senate Assessor, Ms Lesley Sutherland General Council Assessor, Professor Paul Younger Senate Assessor

In attendance:
Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Ms Christine Barr (Director of Human Resources), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate), Professor Jon Cooper (Vice-Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Roibeard O Maolalaigh (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal)

Observing:
Elizabeth Passey, Catriona Reynolds

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

Attenders: Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Muffy Calder (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor James Conroy (Vice-Principal Internationalisation), Professor Frank Coton (Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation), Professor Miles Padgett (Vice-Principal Research)

CRT/2015/33. Announcements

Elizabeth Passey, Convener of Court from 1 August 2016, and Ms Catriona Reynolds, Head of Governance & Engagement, Arts & Business Scotland, were welcomed as observers.

Professor Anna Dominiczak and her colleagues in MVLS were thanked for their hospitality at, and for the tour of, the Teaching & Learning Centre.

CRT/2015/34. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 10 February 2016

The minutes were approved.
CRT/2015/35. Matters Arising

Information on the spread of ratings applied to senior management in the 2015 pay award had been circulated to Court members following the last meeting, having already been provided to the HR Committee. The spread of these ratings as compared to other staff would be discussed at the next meeting of the Remuneration Committee. The Convener advised that the Senior Senate Assessor would be invited to attend that discussion.

CRT/2015/36. Report from the Principal

CRT 2015/36.1 University Funding - 2016-17

In February, the University had received an indicative 2016-17 funding letter from the SFC. The key headline for the University was that the overall grant for Teaching, Research and Innovation would drop by 3.6%, approximately £5m. This was broadly in line with the Scottish budget announcement in December. This reflected a drop of 4.8% in total teaching funding (though controlled subjects were not included), slight rises in the Research Excellence Grant (up 0.1%) and the Research Postgraduate Grant (up 0.4%) which were protected by SFC, with the former Knowledge Exchange (General)/Knowledge Transfer Grant (now called the University Innovation Fund) dropping by 41% (from £2.4m to £1.4m) due to the major reduction in the UIF. Taken together, these represented an overall drop in research funding of 1.6%. Capital Maintenance had been reduced by around £700k to £2m.

Grants for new Widening Access students from MD40 postcodes (an additional 150 places, bringing the University to its target of 783) had been removed, although the funding for existing students had been maintained. The SFC and the Government did, however, expect universities to recruit to the agreed target without the additional funding. In a follow-up letter of guidance to the SFC from the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning, the Scottish Government had reaffirmed the priority it wished to give to Widening Access and had noted its desire that the SFC support the fourth and final tranche of the additional places scheme for access and articulation in academic year 2016-17. If SFC implemented this, it would mean that the University would receive funding for the additional 150 students, which equated to around an extra £1m.

Court noted that it remained the intention of the government to reach a multi-year settlement with the sector. Discussions on this would await the outcome of the Scottish Parliamentary election.

CRT 2015/36.2 Major highlights across University and Colleges

Court noted a number of significant achievements across a breadth of University activity, including: the involvement of colleagues from the College of Science & Engineering in research leading to the recently-announced observation of Gravitational Waves; the £40m first phase redevelopment of Kelvin Hall being on target for completion in the summer; the launch of the National Centre for Resilience, a new facility based at the Dumfries Campus that would enhance Scotland’s resilience capability to combat natural hazards; and that the University would be a key player in a Scottish “global centre of excellence” in precision medicine (the ‘Precision Medicine Ecosystem’), tackling diseases such as cancer and multiple sclerosis, with funding from an additional £4 million government investment.
CRT/2015/36.3 Key Activities

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

CRT/2015/37. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2015/37.1 Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Bill

At the last meeting, Court had heard that a number of revisions had been made to the first draft of the Bill. These had taken into account some of the concerns that Universities Scotland and the Committee of Scottish Chairs had discussed with the Cabinet Secretary in late 2015. These revisions had included: removal of clauses in the Bill which had involved new ministerial powers and so had raised concerns regarding possible reclassification of universities as public bodies; removal of the proposal to cap the membership of a University Senate at 120; and removal of proposed legislative amendments that would have deleted references to the Rector’s role as ‘president’ of Court in the ancient universities.

The next draft of the Bill had also included amendments that, among other matters, clarified the process for selecting a senior lay governor, including the absolute requirement for an election to take place before the person was appointed.

The Bill had been passed by the Scottish Parliament on 23 March. The transitional arrangements would not be known until after a new Scottish Government had been formed, and it was expected that universities would have a transitional period of approximately four years in which to implement changes to their constitutions and the membership of their governing bodies and academic boards.

CRT/2015/37.2 Court Governance Working Group

Court’s Governance Working Group had met in March to consider the implications of the Higher Education Governance Act for the University; to review the outcome of Court’s recent self-assessment of effectiveness; and to review a draft statement of compliance with the terms of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance.

Court approved associated recommendations from the group, with the effect that:

1. In relation to the Higher Education Governance Act:

   i) the documents describing the position of Rector, and Court’s Standing Orders, would be reviewed to ensure that there was clarity about the respective roles of Rector and senior lay governor; and with regard to the Standing Orders it was also agreed that these would be reviewed more comprehensively, including in relation to equality and diversity matters;

   ii) there would be as little disruption as possible to Court’s existing membership categories, retaining the membership at 25 (and no more), and retaining a clear lay majority;

   iii) liaison would take place with Senate about possibilities and options to effect the required changes to the composition of Court, and the Principal would consider establishing a Court-Senate Working Group to take forward this discussion. Court noted a comment from the Clerk of Senate, John Briggs, endorsing this approach as a way forward. With regard to the Act’s
requirement for the membership of Court to include 2 Trade Union-nominated members, it was agreed that the Group would look for appropriate input from the trade unions as well as from Court and Senate.

2. In relation to Court’s self-assessment:

i) consideration would be given to the possibility of refresher training for Court members, although existing Court members were already invited to the annual Court induction day;

ii) where possible, Court members would be contacted in a targeted way with details of University-related events of particular interest to them and/or which would benefit from their skills, including events held elsewhere in the UK;

iii) brief biographies of new members would be circulated to Court, at the time of their appointment; and

iv) Court would discuss the appropriateness of Committee remits, as part of the annual (October) review of documents relating to governance.

Court noted that the Working Group had also suggested the possible participation of Court members in the annual risk workshop, but that Court should decide on this matter following consideration of the options contained in the Audit Committee’s paper on Risk Management arrangements. This would be discussed later in the meeting.

CRT/2015/37.3 HE Governance Code

The Governance Working Group had undertaken its annual review of compliance with the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance. The Group had been satisfied that the University was in compliance with the terms of the Code. Following good practice set out in the Code, Murdoch MacLennan had also recently undertaken an appraisal of the Convener’s performance and Court members had been advised of the outcome.

CRT/2015/37.4 School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing

Court approved the renaming of the ‘School of Medicine’ as the ‘School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing’.

CRT/2015/37.5 Nominations Committee Business

At the last meeting, it had agreed that the Finance Committee’s membership and skills profile would be augmented by the appointment of an additional co-opted member. Since then, Brian McBride had indicated that he would not be standing again following completion of his term on Court. His General Council position was being replaced by a Co-opted position under the relevant Ordinance. Recruitment would take place for these two positions over the coming months, with recommendations for appointment following via the Nominations Committee.

Court approved the appointment of Mr Rob Goward to the Remuneration Committee.

The Convener withdrew while Court considered his appointment in a continuing role. Court approved the reappointment of David Ross as Chair of the Investment Advisory Committee for a four-year period, commencing 1 August 2016.

CRT/2015/37.6 Court Procedural Review Group – MVLS

In March, the Court Procedural Review Group had agreed that management should be given authority to implement organisational change in Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences. The
area involved was the provision of administrative support for Postgraduate Taught Programmes, and the intention was to create a centralised service that would be more effective and efficient than the current dispersed model of support. As in all organisational changes, the University would seek to mitigate the impact on those staff affected.

CRT/2015/37.7 Glasgow Student Villages (GSV)
At a meeting on 21 March, the SRC had approved a motion that expressed concern at the rising cost of accommodation in Glasgow Student Villages residences. The motion had included a commitment by the SRC to oppose future rent increases for these properties and to petition Court to terminate the current arrangement with GSV and retake control of the Student Residence accommodation.

Information on the GSV arrangements was included with the papers from Finance Committee for discussion later in the meeting.

CRT/2015/37.8 Heads of Research Institute/School appointments
College of Arts
Professor Lynn Abrams had been appointed as the new Head of the School of Humanities/Sgoil nan Daonnachdan with immediate effect and until 31 July 2018.

College of Science & Engineering
Professor David Cumming had been appointed as Head of the School of Engineering for 4 years from 1 August 2016, to succeed Professor John Marsh.

College of MVLS
Professor Jeff Evans had been reappointed as Head of the Institute of Cancer Sciences, for a further one year, until 31 July 2017.

CRT/2015/37.9 SRC Elections
Ameer Ibrahim had been elected as the next SRC President from 1 July 2016.

CRT/2015/38. Report on Research and Knowledge Exchange and Innovation
Professor Jon Cooper, Vice Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange, briefed Court on Research and Knowledge Exchange & Innovation (R&KEI) activities over the past year.

Priority activities to enhance future research success included: improving publication quality through promoting research excellence and providing knowledge resources to achieve high-quality publications and thus improve REF performance; nurturing and attracting talent; and increasing and diversifying income, through providing increased opportunities for funder engagement and practical measures that supported competitive funding applications.

Priority activities to enhance KE&I success included: enhancing engagement with industry, government, NHS, third sector and the public, to create strong impact case studies for the next REF exercise, and an ambition (and a new KPI) to develop strategic partnerships; inspiring people to fulfil their aspirations at each career stage (from students to staff), and attracting and
nurturing the next generation of entrepreneurs; and supporting the generation of impact from research-led innovation through industrial collaboration, licensing and spin-out.

Court was reminded that following the REF, units of assessment (UoA) had undergone review. A framework and actions had been developed for improving the University’s standing across the R&KEI KPIs. These were being communicated through presentations which included practical advice, and raising awareness of 4* output quality. Court noted the report and progress against Research KPIs, the latter relating to Research income, Research grant holding, improvement in output quality, PGR student:staff ratio, and PGR satisfaction.

With regard to funding, Court noted that the University Innovation Fund (UIF) would replace the Knowledge Transfer Grant (KTG) from 2016. The KTG had funded HEIs’ knowledge transfer resources and activities, with awards based on the extent of KE activity measured by commercial income. The majority of UIF would be distributed on the basis of satisfactory contribution of each HEI towards the delivery of 12 national priorities aligned with the Scottish economic priorities. The 12 priorities included: strengthening and increasing student entrepreneurship, increasing collaboration with SMEs, and helping with a fundamental re-think of the Scottish Innovation eco-system. The change would mean existing KE and Innovation activities at the University would need to be reshaped.

Court noted a range of future activity including an institutional mini REF to be undertaken ahead of the next national exercise.

In discussion, details of the Research and Innovation Strategy were requested to be provided ahead of Court’s detailed consideration of the Research Hub case. It was noted that development of the strategy would include consideration of the relationship with IP Group, the Intellectual property business investing in technology companies. With regard to the ongoing discussions by SMG about the future use of citations as a KPI output measure, it was noted that there was recognition that these were more applicable to some Colleges and Schools than to others, but that it was nevertheless vital to have data against which to benchmark institutional performance. There was no intention to use a citation KPI at the individual level.

Court thanked Professor Cooper for the briefing.

CRT/2015/39. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2015/39.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2015/39.1.1 Campus Development Financing Strategy

Robert Fraser, Director of Finance, summarised the option for the campus development financing, that was being recommended to Court. Court was reminded that it was anticipated that borrowing facilities of £100m would be required to complete the finance needed to deliver the building programme proposed on the Western Infirmary site. Several types of finance had been considered as options by the Finance Committee, and Court was now being presented with a possible portfolio of funding instruments to provide the borrowing package. Given the longevity of the campus development project and the many variables that required to be accommodated, the overriding aim of the strategy was to create a high level of flexibility, such that the University could meet all of the debt service requirements, adjust borrowing levels to match cash flows and minimise costs.

The proposal comprised two private placements of funds of £40m each with US and UK institutions, repayable at maturity dates of 30 and 40 years respectively, as well as a £25m,
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25 year loan from the European Investment Bank (EIB). This mix of funding was proposed to allow flexibility on fixed commitments (being the amount that had to be repaid every year) and in relation to early repayment (EIB) and refinancing options which had staggered term dates. Details of the financing structures and of related cash flows were noted by Court.

Court also received details of a proposal to refinance existing obligations to Glasgow Student Villages Ltd (GSV), presented in tandem with proposals relating to securing finance to support the Western development. The refinancing of GSV as proposed would have a zero Net Present Value (NPV) over the course of the current GSV agreement, while providing greater University control over the accommodation arrangements and reducing fixed cash commitments in the short term. Details of related cash flows and NPVs were noted by Court.

Court also noted details of non-financial considerations relating to the GSV arrangements. John Briggs declared an interest in his capacity as a board member of GSV, referring to the good standard of the maintenance schedule and of call-out response from the current provider, and requesting that this should continue under any new arrangements, to ensure the best possible student experience.

With regard to a question about the lack of certainty about the final costs of the campus development and whether in this context the proposals were premature, Court noted that the position over 20 years would be the same, but that the proposals being put to Court allowed for a package of long term funding with low risk and avoiding high interest rates. Court also noted that with regard to competitive selection of providers, the University’s offer would be presented to the market in order to obtain bids.

Court noted a comment from the SRC President Liam King that the proposal relating to GSV was welcomed, in the context of the present arrangements not being optimal for students, particularly in terms of rising costs of rents. The SRC had recently approved a motion that had expressed concern about this, committing the SRC to oppose future rent increases for the properties and to petition Court to terminate the current arrangement with GSV and retake control of the Student Residence accommodation.

Court noted a further comment that, more widely, the proposals should be considered in the context of what was best for the University as a whole, as well as financially.

Following the discussion, Court approved the recommendation from the Finance Committee, agreeing to a financial strategy for the campus development, involving a mix of private placements with UK and US institutions, a term loan from the European Investment Bank and, subject to satisfactory terms being negotiated, the refinancing of the Glasgow Student Villages debt.

Having approved this recommendation, Court also agreed to establish a special purpose working group to oversee implementation of the strategy. The group would comprise David Ross, Ken Brown, Robert Fraser and Graeme Bissett. Court would be kept informed on progress.

_CRT/2015/39.1.2 Endowment Investment Report_

Court noted an endowment investment report as at 31 January 2016.
CRT/2015/39.1.3 Financial reports

Court noted an overview of performance as at 29 February 2016. The report was noted.

CRT/2015/39.2 Estates Committee

Court had received a briefing on the Campus Masterplan, ahead of the Court meeting. Court thanked and congratulated Ann Allen and her team for the significant work in this area to date.

Court approved the executive summary of the Masterplan and noted that a formal Planning application would be submitted to the City Council in May 2016.

The Court Estates Working Group would meet before the June Court meeting in order to brief members on the best governance arrangements on the project as the campus development progressed, given Court’s overall governance role.

Court noted that in terms of communications and consultation on the Estate Strategy including the Masterplan, there had been meetings with community groups, and a display of plans, ahead of the application for planning permission, but that as part of due process there would now be a break, ahead of renewed communication activity in the early autumn. However, there would still be press communications, and the overall communications plan was undergoing a review, with the recent appointment of a dedicated member of staff. Communications with the University community would continue, to cover details of individual projects as well as updates on the Strategy as a whole.

Court noted the progress made in respect of the Estate Strategy, and noted the Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications in respect of: James Watt South Space Developments in the sum of £1,407m, subject to an update being provided to the Committee on Transnational Education; and Estate Strategy and Masterplan Design Fees in the additional sum of £1,838,819.

The report was noted.

CRT/2015/39.3 Audit Committee

Court was ultimately responsible for risk management within the University. This function was largely delegated, and at its last meeting the Audit Committee had discussed the matter, agreeing to ask Court to consider if the current arrangements, including the level of its involvement (and that of the Audit Committee) in institutional risk management, remained satisfactory or whether any refinements should be introduced. In addition, at its recent meeting, the Court Governance Working Group had recommend to Court that it should make a decision on possible participation of Court members in the annual risk workshop, following Court’s consideration of the options contained in the present Audit Committee report on risk management. Heather Cousins, one of two Court members on the Audit Committee, added that it was important that the Committee obtained Court’s own views on the appropriateness of arrangements, as opposed to the auditors’ opinion, given Court’s different perspective.

In discussion, comments were noted from a number of members, including: a view that there should be greater risk management consideration at Court committees’ level; that the Audit Committee might increase its oversight of College risk management; that Court should see at least annually a summary of key, graded and prioritised, risks in order to consider if these were
correct and complete; that Court could add value from a strategic angle, for example in the context of the campus development and in terms of capability needs as the University changed and developed in the future; that Court should seek assurances from the Audit Committee that work being undertaken to manage risks was adequate; that as well as satisfying itself that key risks were being addressed, Court should consider High Impact Low Probability (HILP) risks.

It was agreed that members would contact the Secretary of Court following the meeting, summarising the points they wished to be considered, and that the item would be carried forward for further discussion at the June meeting.

The Anti-Bribery and Corruption Policy, which had been reviewed by the Finance Committee and approved by Court, has been noted by the Audit Committee at its recent meeting. It had been suggested that the policy’s application should be extended to members of Court and relevant Committees. Court noted that the policy was currently being piloted and that this suggestion would be carried forward to a future meeting of Court, in the light of the experience of the pilot.

The report was noted.

CRT/2015/39.4 Human Resources Committee

The Committee had received an update on the P&DR process, in the context of a new cycle of such reviews beginning. The process had been amended to reflect concerns expressed following the previous cycle, about aspects including fixed distribution of performance assessment ratings, and the operation of the moderation process.

The Committee had received an update advising that the University had conducted an equal pay audit and had published its overall gender pay gap figure. There were no significant variances in the rates of pay between genders within each of the grades, but the overall gender pay gap was significant, as a result of the distribution of the genders across the grades, with the senior grades having a higher proportion of men. The Pay, Performance and Reward team were developing a 4 year action plan, including a target to reduce the overall gender pay gap. Court had been invited by the Committee to approve a recommendation to this effect. In discussion, Court noted that structural issues were an important factor in preventing the gap being closed. Court also agreed that it was important that the data underpinning the figures was fully understood, including staff turnover details which affected the statistics in some staff categories in particular, and comparative information against other HEIs. Court therefore agreed to support the desire to reduce the University’s gender pay gap, but requested that the HR Committee, working with HR colleagues, provide more detail in advance of the next Court meeting, at which it was hoped there could be an informed discussion on a realistic institutional target.

A draft minute of the last meeting of the JCCN was provided in the report and was noted by Court.

The report was noted.

CRT/2015/39.5 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Court noted an executive summary of the annual report of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Service, provided to Court in the context of its overall responsibilities in this area, as governing body. Court also noted a commentary on a gap analysis undertaken against University Safety & Health Association (USHA) leadership guidance, provided to Court to advise it of steps being
taken to address all aspects of the guidance. In this context, it was noted that health and safety audits were being expanded to cover some areas not run directly by the University, including the student unions. It was commented that references to actions being done on a ‘regular basis’ should be further defined.

The HSW Committee had noted that the University’s sickness absence policy was being redefined, to change how support staff on sickness absence were supported. The current scoring system would be replaced with a series of formal review points that would be triggered depending on the level of absence.

The report was noted.

CRT/2015/40. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2015/41. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 22 June 2016 at 2pm in the Senate Room.
Items A: For Discussion


The White paper was published on 16 May 2016. Core elements include the intention to make it easier for new providers to set up and gain degree awarding powers, the introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and other measures that focus on student choice, and a number of changes to the HE and research architecture in the UK, including the creation of an Office for Students (OfS) and a new UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) body. Social mobility and value for money are also present as cross-cutting themes.

It is intended that Stage 1 of the TEF will be introduced for 2016/17 with a trial year involving more detailed metrics in 2017/18 and the full framework at subject level expected to be running across all universities in England by 2019/20, following subject pilots.

From a Scottish perspective the TEF presents a dilemma. The HE sector in Scotland generally values the Scottish Framework for Enhancement (its focus is enhancement rather than audit) and would not wish to jeopardise this approach and ethos in favour of the TEF. Running counter to this however is the negative reputational impact that could develop south of the border if Scottish universities are not in the TEF, and there is therefore no apparent means of benchmarking teaching quality against a common UK-wide assessment methodology. From a Scottish perspective the aim therefore is to try and secure UK wide recognition of the Scottish quality enhancement framework, and the understanding that it is at least as demanding as the intended levels of the TEF.

Items B: For Information

2. University Funding

In my last report, I summarised next year’s HE grant funding, and referred to the fact that we had advised the SFC that, as the Grant Letter might change, we reserved the right to amend the Outcome Agreement if any material changes appeared in any new Grant Letter. In the event, there were no changes, and therefore the Agreement will not require amendments.

3. University Rankings

We have details from two of the UK League Tables: the Complete University Guide and The Guardian. In the Complete University Guide, we are up one place from 30th to 29th since 2015 (30th in 2014). We are now 26th in the Guardian league table, down from 24th in 2015 (25th in 2014).
4. New Regius Professorship of Precision Medicine

Her Majesty the Queen has created a new Regius Professorship of Precision Medicine and awarded the honour to the University of Glasgow. The new Regius Professorship, in an area of excellence for the University, was created to mark the Queen’s 90th birthday. Eleven other Regius chairs were granted, and ours is the only one in Scotland. A Royal Warrant will be issued formally conferring the new Regius Professorship in due course.

5. University activity in Hong Kong

One of the largest ever academic delegations from the University, representing all four Colleges, was recently in Hong Kong, to establish new links and reinforce existing links with the University of Hong Kong. The aim was to continue to develop strategic research collaborations and provide opportunities for our students to gain international experience.

6. Guild of European Research Intensive Universities

A group of world-leading universities, including Glasgow, has held an inaugural meeting in Brussels to found the Guild of European Research Intensive Universities. The Guild brings together universities that have demonstrable excellence in teaching, research and policy formation from across Europe to collaborate on the creation of innovative solutions to some of Europe’s most intractable scientific and social challenges. I will be Vice-Chair of the Guild. Other officers appointed include Professor Ole Petter Ottersen (Oslo) Chair; Professor Stanislaw Kistryn (Krakow) Treasurer; and Professor Jan Palmowski (Warwick) Secretary General.

The Guild will be formally launched on November 21, 2016, at an event that will also be held in Brussels. Member institutions of the Guild will be announced then.

7. Growing Value Scotland Task Force

The final report and recommendations of the GVS entitled The Step Change: Business-University Collaboration Powering Scottish Innovation, commissioned by the National Centre for Universities and Business was launched on 25 May in Edinburgh with Deputy First Minister of Scotland John Swinney. The Task Force was chaired by Rob Woodward, Chief Executive, STV Group plc, and Professor Sir Ian Diamond, Principal of the University of Aberdeen. I was delighted to be a member of the group, and believe that the report offers a very useful contribution to the discussion on how Scotland, and HE in particular, might harness their world class creativity and inventiveness to stay at the forefront of innovation and development in a globally competitive world. This is critical to the health of our economy. The report presents 9 conclusions and 9 recommendations for action. Copies of the report are available to Court members at the meeting and I commend it to you.


At the CIPR Excellence award ceremony held in London on 8 June, the University of Glasgow won the Best Use of Social Media award. This was based on the social media promotion of the discovery of Gravitational Waves. Part of the citation read:

The University of Glasgow became the most authoritative voice on this topic by utilising a wide range of social media platforms in both their home and overseas markets to underpin their aspirations of being recognised as world changers.
This was a terrific result and a ringing endorsement of the excellent work the Director of Communications and Public Affairs, Peter Aitchison and his team do to promote the University across range of media outlets.

9. 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.

Academic Development and Strategy

Interviews: On 15 April chaired interview for Dean of Public Policy and Knowledge Exchange; 6 May, chaired interview for Head of School of Chemistry; on 6 & 19 May interviewed for Head of UK Major Gifts; 3 June, chaired interviews for the Head of School of Medicine and 14 June, chaired interviews for Professor of International Relations.

19 April & 25 May: Attended REF Review Steering Group Meetings at BIS, London.

21 April: Attended and gave the welcome at the launch of the EPSRC Centre for Multiscale Soft Tissue Mechanics.

22 April: Attended the Adam Smith Business School Strategic Advisory Board.

25 April: Attended the third in the series of SMG team workshops.

18 May: Presented our pitch for potential investors at Lloyds with Robert Fraser.

7 June: Hosted a Biomedicine Joint Strategy Group Dinner held in the Lodging involving GGC Health Board and the Principals of the Universities in Glasgow and the West.

8 June: Hosted a Stevenson Dinner in the Lodging around encouraging citizenship in Scotland’s schools.

14 June: Will welcome a group of Senior Managers from Weir who are taking part in a senior management 2 day annual strategy meeting. As part of this, they will spend half a day at the University ‘technology foresighting’, exploring the University’s work on precision medicine and data analysis content, gravitational waves, and future electronics.

16 June: Attended a University of Glasgow Trust Meeting.

Internationalisation activities

26 April: Welcomed Professor Liu Jianping, Chairman of the University CPC Standing Committee at Tianjin University (TJU), China, and signed a joint MoA.

On the same day, I also met with Professor Mohd Amin Jalaludin, Vice-Chancellor of The University of Malaya.

11-13 May: Attended the Universitas 21 Conference in Singapore. Either side of the conference I met potential supporters of the University, attended a reception for Alumni and friends in Eden Hall the residence of the British High Commissioner and on 13th a Singapore Applicants Event.
19-22 June: Will attend HKUST: Times Higher Education Asia Universities Summit 2016. The theme is *How Universities Nurture Creativity and Innovation* and I will participate in a panel session with the President of the National University of Singapore.

**Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University**

14 April: Welcomed attendees to a John Logie Baird event, to celebrate the life and work of this pioneer and entrepreneur and the fact that the University has now acquired a significant archive relating to Baird and his assistant Benjamin Clapp. Following the event I hosted a Lodging Dinner.


19 April: Attended and participated in a EU Roundtable lunch and briefing at Westminster arranged through the Russell Group involving a group of Labour MPs. The session was chaired by Alan Johnson, MP. And on the 17 May I attended and participated in an EU Roundtable with SNP MPs in Westminster, chaired by Carol Monaghan MP.

27 April: Met with Stephen Parker who was visiting the University on a Fellowship from the Australian Government to discuss Scotland’s widening access policies, the subject of his research.

20 April: As invited, I gave a talk and participated in Q&A session on EU Referendum at a Glasgow Talks event.

23 April: Attended the Shakespeare 400 event and performance of Dream On and welcomed guests to a pre performance reception.

28 April & 9 June: Attended USS Board meetings; and on 5 May: Attended a USS Investment Committee Meeting in London.

3 May: Hosted a public lecture given by His Excellency Daniel Mulhall of Ireland, Ambassador to Great Britain and a dinner in the Lodging.

17 May: Met with David Willis, the new lead for Devolution policy, appointed by HM Treasury.

20 May: Attended the Scottish Funding Council - Strategic Development Meeting and a Business meeting on 10 June.

23 May: Delivered a lecture entitled *Some (Macro) Economic Aspects of the European Referendum* to the RSE as part of its Enlightening the European Debate series.

25 May: Hosted the third of the University’s Carnegie Lectures which was delivered by Sir Paul Nurse. The topic of his lecture was: 'Trust in Science'. This was followed by dinner in the Lodging.

26-27 May: Attended the CASE Europe Spring Board of Trustees Meeting which was hosted this year by the University.
27 May: Gave an interview with Jamie McIvor, BBC on Brexit and what it might mean for HE and later the same day an interview with RAI (Italian TV) who were undertaking a report on Scotland and wished to interview Italians living and working here.

2 June: Welcomed guests to the Hunterian Museum and the launch of the book *Bearsden: A Roman Fort on the Antonine Wall*, an account of the dig that took place over the 70s by Dr David Breeze and which included teams of archeology students from Glasgow.

3 June: Hosted a visit of the First Minister and Humza Yousaf MSP, Minister for Transport and the Islands who had expressed an interest in meeting students and Academics with particular connections with the EU either in terms of exchanges or research.

3 June: Met with the Clerk and Chief Executive, Scottish Parliament, Paul Grice.

3 June: Hosted and spoke at an evening reception in the Lodging held for Glasgow University Kennedy Scholars from the past and more generally for scholars now living and working in Scotland. The latest Kennedy Scholar from Glasgow due to go to Harvard in September, also attended.

6 June: Chaired Glasgow City Deal - Commission – Interviews.

7 June: Attended the Glasgow City Region Cabinet Meeting.

9 June: Attended a Russell Group Meeting and Dinner.

16 June: Gave a presentation on the University at an Open day.

**Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events**

Continued monthly meetings with SRC President and Sabbatical officers.

19 May: Hosted a Brodies Solicitors Reception in the Lodging which combined a general networking event with alumni connections.

20 May: Attended the SRC Dinner, which traditionally marks the transfer of power from the outgoing President and Sabbatical officers to their successors.

31 May-1 June: As noted under section 6 of this report, I travelled to Brussels to attend the inaugural meeting of Guild of European Research Intensive Universities. I combined this with an Alumni event, and meetings with a potential supporter and an MEP.

4 June: Dropped in to meet and thank a group of alumni who took part in a sponsored swim in the Stevenson Building.

15 June: Commemoration Day

**6. Senior Management Group business**

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

*SMG Meeting of 20 April 2016*

- Research Output Quality KPIs
- Promotion Criteria
- **Sustainability Strategy**
- **REF Review Reporting**
  - UoA 4 Psychology, Psychiatry & Neuroscience
  - UoA 9 Physics
  - UoA 10 Mathematical Sciences
  - UoA 11 Computer Science and Informatics
  - UoA 31 Classics
- **Governance Arrangements for Academic Collaborations: Proposals for Change**
- **Next steps for TNE following Penang**

***SMG Meeting of 19 May 2016***

- In relation to the general Campus development update, which is a standing item, the Head of the Adam Smith Business School gave a presentation on his vision for the School, particularly as it relates to space and accommodation needs.
- **Budgets 2016-17**
- **Revising the Institutional KPI for Research Output Quality**
- **Partnership Review - Scotland's Rural College**
- **REF Review Reporting**
  - UoA 25, Education
  - UoA 27, Area Studies
  - UoA 28A, Modern Languages and Linguistics
  - UoA 34, History of Art
- **Daphne Jackson Trust Fellowships**
- **Complaint Handling Session 2015-16: Third Quarter Report**
SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Campus Estates Strategy/Court Estates Working Group

Court will receive a briefing from Ann Allen at the pre-Court session on 22 June, to include further details about the Learning & Teaching Hub, including an update about the single phase approach to the project and the relocation of Mathematics and Statistics; and information on cost increases and affordability.

In the meantime, since the April Court meeting, Court members have been advised that Finance Committee met on 25 May and, among other things, approved expenditure of £1.162M to continue design work on the Learning & Teaching Hub. This work will help inform the full business case for the development, which will be brought to Court in December. As previously mentioned, the Finance Committee has authority to approve expenditure on this scale, but the Committee asked that Court's attention be drawn to its decision, because the decision to proceed or not with the L&T Hub project will be for Court itself to make, and because, on current estimates, the cost of the L&T Hub will exceed £80M, whereas the estimate presented to Court in February 2015 was £69M.

Since the last meeting of Court, members have also been advised about actions planned over the summer months to ensure effective governance of the Estates Strategy. At its most recent meeting, the Court Estates Strategy Working Group recognised that there is a significant amount of work to be done in relation to bringing the L&T Hub project to a point where there is a robust business case that Court can consider in December 2016; and recognised the need for reviewing, individually and collectively, the progress of the other projects so that, if Court decides to proceed with the L&T Hub, it will do so in the context of an overall strategy that is sound and affordable.

SMG has committed to a thorough review of the Estates strategy priorities over the summer, recognising the need to contain the strategy within the funds approved by Court and that this will require choices and prioritisation. In addition, a short-term working group of senior executives and senior lay members will meet monthly between now and 26 September, when a full briefing will be provided to Court at its annual Strategy Day. The lay members will, on Court's behalf, ensure that good progress is being maintained on the L&T Hub and on the review of the estates strategy. The executive members of this working group will be: Ann Allen, Neal Juster and
A.2  Court Strategy Day

The Strategy Day is scheduled for 26 September. As referred to above, the day will include a briefing on the Estates Strategy and an opportunity for Court members to contribute to the ongoing discussion about this. The draft programme, which it is hoped will include some external speakers, will also cover a presentation on the UK Higher Education landscape, Governance matters, and Internationalisation.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1  Nominations Committee Business

Advertisements for recruitment to co-opted positions on Court and the Finance Committee will be placed in July, with recommendations for appointment following via the Nominations Committee.

On the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, Court’s approval is sought for Heather Cousins to take on the convenership of the Audit Committee with effect from 1 August 2016, and up to March 2018, which is the end of Heather’s current term as a member of Court. Heather has been a member of the Committee for two years, and would succeed Paul Brady, whose membership of Audit Committee will expire in the course of 2016/17.

B.2  Heads of RI/School appointments

College of MVLS

Professor Matthew Walters has been appointed as Head of the School of Medicine from 1 July 2016 until 31 July 2020, succeeding Professor Alan Jardine.

College of Science & Engineering

Professor Graeme Cooke has been reappointed as Head of the School of Chemistry for four years from 1 August 2016, succeeding Professor Stephen Clark.

B.3  Senior Vice-Principal

In 2013, Court approved a recommendation from the Principal that Professor Neal Juster be appointed to the role of Senior Vice-Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, initially for a period of 3 years. That period expires on 31 July 2016, and the Principal would like Court’s approval to extend the appointment by a further 3 years, to 31 July 2019.

B.4  Court Procedural Review Group – Interdisciplinary Studies

On Court's behalf the Court Procedural Review Group considers proposals on organisational change. It has the authority to instruct management to implement
proposals. Alternatively, it may decide not to authorise the proposals, and/or to refer them to Court for discussion.

Membership of the CPRG is currently: Ken Brown, Morag Macdonald Simpson, Karen Lury, David Milloy and Duncan Ross.

Since the last meeting of Court, CPRG has given management authority to take forward an organisational change proposal in the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, base at Dumfries. The proposal relates to curricular changes which have been implemented in recent years and which now mean there is a reduction in the requirement for staffing resource. The proposal will result in a reduction of up to 1.5 FTE staff.

As in all organisational changes, the University will seek to mitigate the impact of redundancy on those staff affected, either through redeployment or through other measures.

B.5 Higher Education Governance Act

The commencement date of the Higher Education Governance Act is not yet known. It is understood that, from the date of commencement, universities will have four years in which to ensure they are compliant with the terms of the Act.

B.6 Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance

The current Governance Code for Scottish Higher Education was published by the Committee of Scottish Chairs in July 2013. At the time of publication, the chairs committed to a review of the Code after 3 years. A Review Committee has now been established, chaired by Ian Marchant, former Chief Executive of Scottish and Southern Energy. It has been tasked with completing its review by November 2016. As part of this exercise, the University will receive a visit, probably in September, from consultants working on behalf of the Review Committee, and it is likely that they will wish to interview a number of members of Court. I will advise Court members as soon as I have more information on this.

B.7 Audit Scotland – Review of Higher Education

Audit Scotland have recently undertaken a high-level review of the Scottish Higher Education sector, and their report is due to be published on 7 July. It will make general observations about the financial health of the sector and the effectiveness of funding mechanisms in implementing Government policy.

DM/DN, 12.6.16
Court – Wednesday 22 June 2016

Report from the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on
25 May 2016

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

A Items – for action

CA/2015/69. Budget 2016-17 and Four Year Forecast
The Budget and Four Year Forecast to 2019-20 were considered by the Committee.
The Committee noted that the 2016-17 budget outlined a management accounting surplus of £13.2m equating to a statutory accounting surplus of £15.1m. The cash generation anticipated was £24.5m.
The budgetary forecast predicted cash generation of £24.4m, £26.2m and £27m in 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20 respectively, and management accounting surpluses of £13.3m, £14.7m and £9.9m respectively. This equates to statutory accounting surpluses of £15.2m, £16.6m and £11.5m in the same three-year period.
Finance Committee agreed to RECOMMEND the budget to Court.

CA/2015/71. Capex Application: Decant of Mathematics & Statistics to Modular Accommodation
The Committee received a request for £8.308m of funding to relocate the School of Mathematics & Statistics to modular accommodation, thus allowing the Learning & Teaching Hub project to progress.
Finance Committee agreed to DEFER approval to Court, noting the proposed relocation of Maths & Stats formed an integral part of the Learning & Teaching Hub project.
B Items – for noting

CA/2015/70. Capex Application: Adam Smith Business School - Finance Refurbishment
Finance Committee APPROVED the application.

CA/2015/72. Capex Application: Chemistry & Engineering Complex - Advance Works - Fees
Finance Committee APPROVED the application.

CA/2015/73. Capex Application: Learning & Teaching Hub – Fees Stage 4
Finance Committee APPROVED the application.

CA/2015/77. Endowments Investment Reports as at 31 March 2016
Finance Committee noted the Endowments Investment Reports

A report containing an overview of performance in Period 9 was noted
CA/2015/66. Farewell

The Committee thanked David Ross for his service to the Committee over the past eight years. Mr Ross would step down as Convenor of Court in the summer but would remain as Convenor of the Investment Advisory Committee. The Convenor also expressed his personal thanks to Mr Ross for his support and advice.

The Convenor thanked Liam King, SRC President, for his contribution to the Committee over the past year. His successor, Ameer Ibrahim, would be invited to attend Finance Committee meetings from September.

CA/2015/67. Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 22 March 2016

The minutes of Finance Committee held on 22 March 2016 were approved.

CA/2015/68. Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were noted.

CA/2015/69. Budget 2016-17 and Four Year Forecast (paper 5.1)

Finance Committee received the proposed budget for 2016-17 and financial forecasts to 2019-20. The Committee noted that the 2016-17 budget outlined a management accounting surplus of
£13.2m equating to a statutory accounting surplus of £15.1m. The cash generation anticipated was £24.5m.

The budgetary forecast predicted cash generation of £24.4m, £26.2m and £27m in 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20 respectively, and management accounting surpluses of £13.3m, £14.7m and £9.9m respectively. This equates to statutory accounting surpluses of £15.2m, £16.6m and £11.5m in the same three-year period.

In order to achieve the projected surpluses, tuition fee income from overseas students was expected to increase incrementally to £117.7m per annum (2019-20) from £93.4m in 2016-17. The risks and challenges around this forecast were noted, particularly with regard to external issues such as the perception of the UKVI policy from international students, and challenges to international undergraduate growth and rUK student recruitment. Despite these risks, the projections were thought to be robust, and the Committee noted the external market research which had been carried out, leading to premium pricing of certain degree programmes. The evidence to date suggested that the intelligence gathered in this regard was reliable, as demand was increasing for some courses.

The Committee noted that the projections in the outer years remained largely in line with the 2015-16 budget.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend the budget to Court.

CA/2015/70. Capex Application: Adam Smith Business School - Finance - Refurbishment (paper 5.2.1)

Finance Committee received a paper seeking £0.69m of funding to refurbish areas in the Gilbert Scott Building for use by the Adam Smith Business School. There was a critical need for additional space to accommodate immediate growth in staff numbers. The Committee noted the Business School’s >£20m contribution to the University and its overwhelming success in attracting international postgraduate taught students.

The Committee noted the project has been tendered and the amount sought is the full sum to carry out the work, including fees and VAT.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2015/71. Capex Application: Decant of Mathematics & Statistics to Modular Accommodation (paper 5.2.2)

The Committee received a request for £8.308m of funding to relocate the School of Mathematics & Statistics to modular accommodation. The existing Maths & Stats building is located within the proposed footprint of the Learning & Teaching Hub and thus the School will require to be relocated to allow the Learning & Teaching Hub to progress. Finance Committee noted the long-term location of the School would be clarified as the estate plan for the College of Science & Engineering develops.

The Committee took the view that this application should be approved by Court as part of the Learning & Teaching Hub approval process, as the relocation was integral to that larger project. If the application was deemed to form part of the L&T Hub project, it would be submitted to Court for approval in December along with the full business case for the L&T Hub.
The Director of Estates highlighted some of the risks associated with delaying approval until December. Finance Committee noted that delayed approval would mean it would not be possible to deliver the L&T Hub in time for academic session 2019/20, as planned. There would be significant knock-on effects impacting on the project as a whole and involving substantial cost increases due to inflation, as well as serious problems in providing facilities for learning and teaching.

Following discussion, it was proposed that Court could be asked to consider the application in June, in the context of the draft business case for the L&T Hub.

The Convenor requested further information to be brought to June Court, as follows:

1) A price comparison, showing costs to rent modular accommodation vs buying the accommodation;

2) An estimate of inflation costs which would apply if approval was delayed until December.

On this basis the Committee agreed to defer approval to Court at its meeting in June.

CA/2015/72. Capex Application: Chemistry & Engineering Complex - Advance Works - Fees (paper 5.2.3)

Finance Committee received an application for £0.83m for fees to undertake survey and design works for fabric repairs within the Grade A listed Joseph Black Building. The design works would inform a future Capex submission for construction works currently estimated to cost circa £15.47m.

The Committee noted that the works are urgently required to maintain a safe environment. It is not possible to defer the works until the proposed integration with the planned new build element of the Chemistry & Engineering Complex.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2015/73. Capex Application: Learning & Teaching Hub – Fees Stage 4 (paper 5.2.4)

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for £1.162m for fees relating to design work on the Learning & Teaching Hub. The proposed expenditure would enable the Design Team to continue to 60% completion of RIBA Stage 4.

The Committee noted that continuing with the Design Team as proposed would prevent loss of momentum and would help inform the full business case for the development, which would be brought to Court in December.

Further, the Committee noted that there was some urgency in moving ahead with the design work, and there were risks to the overall programme if approval was delayed.

Committee members were keen for Court to be made aware of the application for two reasons. Firstly because the decision to proceed or not with the Learning & Teaching Hub project would be for Court itself to make. Secondly because, on current estimates, the cost of the Learning & Teaching Hub would exceed £80m, whereas the estimate presented to Court in February 2015 was £69m.
Finance Committee approved the application, on the basis that the Secretary of Court would draw Court’s attention to its decision. Court members would be provided with a briefing on the Learning & Teaching Hub in June but meanwhile would be encouraged to raise comments or queries via the Secretary of Court.

CA/2015/76. University of Glasgow / UESTC Joint Educational Institute: Update to Financial Models (paper 6.1)

Following approval of the Joint Educational Institute (JEI) with UESTC, Finance Committee received a paper setting out financial models for two different scenarios: one agreed with UESTC as probable for planning purposes, and a model based on the approved student numbers, comparing the outcomes against the approved business plan.

Finance Committee noted that in approving the JEI, the Chinese Ministry of Education had restricted the student intake to levels well below those in the business plan – hence the need to develop updated financial models. There was confidence that the MoE would approve increased numbers in due course.

The Committee accepted the update.

CA/2015/77. Endowments Investment Reports as at 31 March 2016 (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee noted the endowment investment reports. The Committee noted that a meeting of the Investment Advisory Committee had taken place on 13 May, however the minutes were not yet available. The Committee noted that both managers were performing well.

Finance Committee noted that the Smart Beta tender process was progressing and the position would be clearer by the autumn.

CA/2015/78. Draft Minutes of Student Finance Sub-Committee 13 April 2016 (paper 6.3)

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

It was noted that the SRC reported an operating loss of £21k (versus prior year surplus of £50k); the QMU returned a deficit of £113k (versus last year’s £50k deficit), resulting in a movement on reserves to £604k versus £716k prior year; the GUU reported a £9k surplus in comparison with a prior year surplus of £6k; and GUSA reported a surplus of £7k, an increase on last year’s £5k deficit position.

Student Finance Sub-committee agreed to fund the following for 2016/17:

SRC - £569,215
QMU - £228,700
GUU - £228,700
GUSA - £229,500
CA/2015/79. Update on Private Placement / GSV

The Committee received an update from the Director of Finance. The Principal and Director of Finance had made a presentation to potential investors on 18 May. Offers of investment would be received by close of play on 25 May.

In relation to the refinancing of the GSV vehicle, the Committee noted discussions with Sanctuary were at an advanced stage. The aim was to complete asset purchase by the end of June.

CA/2015/80. Overview of Performance at 30 April 2016 (paper 7.1)

Finance Committee received an overview of performance in Period 9. Finance Committee noted that the Period 9 results were £10.8m ahead of budget at £32m. The full year outlook at period 9 was £17.3m, £5.8m higher than budget and £0.7m higher than the outlook at Period 8.

The projected full year outlook variances against budget include a £3.7m underspend on salaries. Tuition fee income is projected to be £2.4m higher than budget and research contribution £0.9m lower than budget. Depreciation is £0.9m lower than budget and commercial contribution £0.8m lower than budget.

There was £182.2m in net funds as at end of Period 9. Cash inflow was £35.6m for the year to date. The closing cash forecast for 2015/16 was £133.8m.

The Committee received a summary of cash balances and noted total balances of £206,592,814 at 18 May 2016. Finance Committee welcomed this information.

Finance Committee considered the procurement scorecard, and the Convenor noted that compliance rates were fairly static over the past 12 months, with a non-compliance run rate of 9.1%. The Director of Finance and Secretary of Court noted that it was not feasible to route all spending through procurement processes, as there were certain categories of spend which could not satisfy procurement requirements, for example legal fees and rates. Therefore some of the reported non-compliance was unavoidable.

The Committee requested some analysis be done for future meetings, in order to make the report more meaningful by highlighting the real incidence of non-compliance, in instances where procurement processes could have been adhered to.

CA/2015/81. Debtors Report at 30 April 2016 (paper 7.2)

The Group Financial Controller provided an overview of debtors as at 30 April 2016. Overall debt levels had increased year on year to £39.19m at April 2016 (£37.65m at April 2015).

Finance Committee noted that the overall increase was due to slightly higher levels of outstanding commercial debt – due to increased billing – and student debt. Commercial debt stood at £28.05m, an increase from £27.58m at April 2015. Student debt levels were slightly higher overall in April 2016 in comparison to April 2015, with £6.84m outstanding against students and £1.13m against sponsors. It was noted that sponsor debt was slightly lower than at April 2015. Within the sponsor debt, the top ten balances represent 78% of total sponsor balances outstanding.
CA/2015/82. Dates of meetings 2016/17

14 September 2016, 2pm – Melville Room (Graeme Bissett to chair)

16 November 2016, 2pm – Melville Room

18 January 2017, 2pm – Melville Room

29 March 2017, 2pm – Melville Room

31 May 2017, 2pm – Melville Room
Brief Description of Paper

Minute of the Estates Committee meeting of 13 May 2016, and documents relating to the Sustainability Strategy.

Action Requested

Sustainability Strategy

Six months ago, following discussion at Estates Committee, a project officer was appointed, working in Estates & Buildings, to review the University’s performance in carbon reduction and sustainability. A small Sustainable Environment Working Group was created to oversee the process. The first stage involved analysing how the University performed across a range of sustainability issues relative to Russell Group competitors. While there has been some success in recent times, in delivering the Combined Heat & Power project and in initiatives to promote sustainable procurement and biodiversity on campus, the University was not well-placed - in terms of policies, targets and evidenced progress - in several other areas. These included: carbon consumption per m2; electricity consumption and waste recycling, all areas in which poor environmental performance also involves additional cost for the University.

In April SMG proposed the adoption of a new Sustainability Strategy, supported by a Sustainability Action Plan, and led by a Governance Board and a Delivery Board. The Delivery Board would be chaired by David Newall, and would include a technical expert champion for each major theme of the strategy. The Governance Board, whose role would be to promote the strategy throughout the University and encourage staff and student engagement, would be chaired by Paul Younger, and would include a Sustainability Champion for each College and for University Services. Sustainability Champions would be senior colleagues who command respect in the Colleges and who have a genuine commitment to sustainability.

Estates Committee has endorsed these documents, and Court is now invited to endorse them if it is satisfied with the proposed approach. (EC/2015/37.1refers);

Court is also invited to:

Note the progress made in respect of the Estate Strategy (EC/2015/36);

Note Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications in respect of:
Adam Smith Business School (Finance Refurbishment) in the sum of £690,700 subject to final review (EC/2015/38.2.1 refers);
Learning and Teaching Hub (Modular Accommodation for Mathematics and Statistics) in the sum of £8,307,792 (EC/2015/38.2.2 refers);
Chemistry and Engineering Complex – Joseph Black Building (Professional Fees) in the sum of £830,000 (EC/2015/38.2.3 refers); and
Learning and Teaching Hub (Part (60%) Stage 4 Fees) in the sum of £1,083,831 with a potential further approval of £78,451 upon receipt of satisfactory clarity around the rationale for the sum (EC/2015/38.2.4 refers).

Note the remainder of the minute.
UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW
Estates Committee
Minute of the meeting held in the Williams Room on Friday 13 May 2016

Present: Mrs A Allen, Mr R Fraser, Professor N Juster, Mr L King, Professor K Lury, Mr D Milloy, Ms M Morton (Convener), Mr D Newall, Mr A Seabourne, Mr D Smith, Professor P Younger

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

Professor J Finch – Item 4.1.1 Adam Smith Business School
Professor J Cooper – Item 4.1.2 Smart Campus Update
Dr D Welch – Item 4.1.3 Learning and Teaching Hub (Full Business Case)

Apologies: Professor A Muscatelli (Principal)

EC/2015/33 Minute of the meeting held on 11 March 2016

The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2015/34 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising which were not otherwise covered by the agenda.

EC/2015/35 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2015/36 Strategies and Performance

EC/2015/36.1 Estate Strategy

EC/2015/36.1.1 Adam Smith Business School

The Committee welcomed Professor John Finch who had been invited to provide an overview of the case for a new facility for the University’s Adam Smith Business School.

The Committee noted the triple accreditation which the School has achieved and the distinctive international recognition this generates and which contributes to its successful reputation.

The Committee noted the Strengths and Weaknesses within the School business model as it currently operates and also the Opportunities to be explored and the Threats which require to be managed.

The Committee noted one of the key weaknesses was the absence of suitable business school facilities which limited growth when compared to competitors, particularly in comparison to those with high quality facilities, all of which were experiencing significant growth.

The Committee noted the aspiration for Glasgow’s Business School to offer to the market a leading business school model with excellent fit-for-purpose, competitive facilities, a distinct identity of excellence in its teaching and research and a distinctive, world-class business environment with well-developed corporate connections and the resultant income generation and rankings among its peer group.

EC/2015/36.1.2 Smart Campus Update

The Committee welcomed Professor Jon Cooper who had been invited to provide an update on the development of Smart campus.

The Committee noted the key linkages and drivers around the Smart Campus project: Research Opportunity; Strategic Technology advancement and development; Smart Cities; Resource Efficiency; Energy and Sustainability; and Campus Development.
It noted the range and levels of engagement which had taken place with stakeholder groups and that a number of clearly identified objectives had been scoped: Enhancing the Student Experience and the University’s reputation; Structured Engagement to combine research and innovation with the use of the Campus and its development as a data-rich learning, teaching and research tool; and Effective and Efficient use of technology and data to drive greater and more efficient use of the campus, its buildings and other resources.

The Committee noted that future activities would include building upon existing strategic partnerships for which a six-month secondment had been agreed, identifying and implementing some demonstrator projects such as Kelvin Heat Exchange, Boyd Orr sensors; development of a Building Efficiencies Measurement Strategy; exploration of research opportunities; establishment of a Governance framework; and some key communications initiatives.

A full Smart Campus proposal report would be completed in July 2016.

**EC/2015/36.1.3 Learning and Teaching Hub (Full Business Case)**

The Committee welcomed Dr Dorothy Welch, Deputy Secretary who had been invited to provide an update on the Learning and Teaching Hub business case.

The Committee noted the full business case for a new Campus Learning and Teaching Hub. The project would deliver a building with a gross internal floor area of 14474m² incorporating 1100 study seats, 1931 teaching seats, a café and would include refurbishment of 2818m² of space within the existing Boyd Orr Building. It was noted that following completion, 33% of all campus teaching would take place within the new building.

Total project costs of £94m were noted which included a sum for the temporary relocation of the School and Mathematics and Statistics.

The Committee noted the full business case would be taken to the December 2016 meeting of Court for approval by which time there would be an agreed target price, a well-developed, costed operating model, planning permission, stage 4 drawings and that risks relating to the over-cladding of the Boyd Orr Building would be fully understood. The Committee noted that Court approval in December 2016 would be critical if completion was to be achieved by June 2019 in order to allow utilisation and full operation by the start of the 19/20 academic year.

The Committee noted that the business case had been fully considered by the Governance Board which challenged costs, particularly assumptions relating to £11m for inflation. It noted that a further value engineering review was scheduled.

**EC/2015/36.1.4 Update Dashboards, Route Map, Master Programme, Risk Register**

The Committee noted the update dashboards. It specifically noted the update in respect of Workstream 8 (£50m Capital Receipts Disposal Strategy) and requested that a report be provided to the September 2016 meeting detailing the pipeline for achievement of the required receipts.

It also requested that the content of future dashboards and related documentation be aligned to ensure consistency and accuracy.

The Committee noted the April 2016 Risk Register and Master Programme and May 2016 Route Map.

**EC/2015/36.1.5 Programme Delivery Partner Pre-selection**

The Committee noted the update provided on the Programme Development Partner procurement process.

At its January 2016 meeting the Committee approved delegated authority to a sub-group of members to approve the evaluation panels recommended short-list of bidders to be Invited to Participate in the Dialogue Process after which an Invitation to Submit Outline Solutions was issued.
on 23 March 2016, return to be made by 27 May 2016. An Assessment Panel would evaluate submissions and prepare a draft recommendation to assist shortlisting from four bidders to two. Each of the final two bidders would be asked to submit a Detailed Solution for full consideration.

The Committee noted that in order to maintain programme dates, approval of the proposed shortlist would be required prior to the next scheduled Estates Committee meeting. It therefore approved delegated authority to a sub-group comprising of the Secretary of Court, Convenor, Directors of Estates and Finance and the Senior Vice-Principal to approve the short-listing of bidders from 4 to 2.

**EC/2015/36.1.6 Community Benefits Strategy**

The Committee noted that as part of the competitive dialogue process, Delivery Partners were required to develop a Community Benefits proposal built around six core themes which support the University’s role to deliver benefits to the West End and wider community: Targeted Recruitment and Training; SME Supplier Development; Social Enterprise Development; Community Enhancement; Student Learning Opportunities; and Research Opportunities.

The Committee confirmed that it was supportive of the approach being adopted and of the six core themes identified.

**EC/2015/36.1.7 Draft Capital Plan 2017 – 2020**

The Committee noted the annual update of the draft four-year Capital Plan, noting specifically those projects which had been completed during 2015/16 with a combined total cost of £67m:

- District Heating Scheme and infrastructure improvements (£21.3m);
- Stevenson Extension and new nightclub for GUU (£14m);
- Kelvin Hall Phase 1 (£11.5m);
- GLaSS Building and external works at Garscube (£8m);
- Quantum development (£5.9m);
- Refurbishment of Library Level 2 & 3 (£3.6m);
- Refurbishment of the Bell Tower (£1.8m); and
- 2015/16 CTT rooms refurbishment programme (£1.7m)

It noted the movement from the previous annual Plan, approved by Court in February 2015 which had provided a budget of £450m for major investment of the agreed prioritised project list. The current cost plan estimate was noted as £650m. This would be reviewed by SMG with a view to maintaining the original £450m budget.

A revised ten-year Plan would be provided to the Committee in November and thereafter to Court in December 2016 after which an adjusted four-year Plan would be prepared.

**EC/2015/37 Carbon Management**

**EC/2015/37.1 Sustainability Strategy**

The Committee noted and endorsed a suite of strategic Sustainability documents which had been endorsed by SMG in April 2016. These included a Sustainability Strategy and Action Plan, together with details of the governance arrangements to promote and review strategy, engage students and to manage sustainability reporting and to co-ordinate and drive delivery of the Action Plan and embed cultural change throughout all Schools, Colleges and Services.

In terms of membership, David Newall, as Chair/Convenor of the Sustainability Delivery Board, should be accountable to the Sustainability Governance Board and not a member of it.

The Committee endorsed the approach and the documentation and approved that these be taken to Court for further endorsement.
EC/2015/38 Projects

EC/2015/38.1 Approved Projects Status (RAG) Report

The Committee noted the current status of all current projects.

It noted that since its last meeting in March 2016, two projects had been completed:

District Heating Scheme (Steam Main replacement) - approx. 2% over CapEx approved budget anticipated; and Gilbert Scott works (completion anticipated second week of May).

Red Projects

Wind Tunnel (Acre Rd) – Health and Safety compliance/certification requirements, including installation of bespoke safety system had resulted in delay to completion with associated increase in scope and cost. Final outturn programme and cost information would inform further CapEx application.

New Strategic Developments – The latest Order of Costs exceeds original budget level in the Capital Plan for: Chemistry and Engineering Complex; Joseph Black Building refurbishment; College of Arts (new build); Institute of Health and Wellbeing; New Social Justice Hub; and Research Hub and Data Centre. The Committee noted the programme would be fully reviewed and a re-prioritisation would be considered if required.

Amber Projects

Learning and Teaching Hub – The latest Order of Cost review, based on the current project brief, exceeds original budget level in the Capital Plan and, accordingly, the associated programme implications are also subject to further review.

Green Projects

The Committee noted that all other programme projects were currently reported within the Green category.

EC/2015/38.2 CapEx Applications

EC/2015/38.2.1 – Adam Smith Business School (Finance Refurbishment)

The Committee noted the application in the sum of £690,700 to support continued growth in both teaching and research within the School and for the refurbishment of space in the vacated Finance space (Gilbert Scott Building) to accommodate additional staff. It noted that the sum requested included 25% for prelims and contingencies post-tender. The Committee requested that this be reviewed by a delegated group comprising of the Secretary of Court, Convenor and SRC President. It agreed that the request would be progressed electronically where it was satisfied that all necessary actions had been taken to fully understand the rationale for this contingency level.

EC/2015/38.2.2 – Learning and Teaching Hub (Modular Accommodation for the Temporary Relocation of Mathematics and Statistics)

The Committee noted and approved the application in the sum of £8,307,792 for a project to provide temporary modular accommodation for the Department of Mathematics and Statistics which would vacate the site and allow for the progression of the Learning and Teaching Hub.

EC/2015/38.2.3 – Chemistry and Engineering Complex - Joseph Black Building (Professional Fees)
The Committee noted and approved the CapEx Application in the sum of £830,000 for the payment of professional fees for survey and design works (RIBA Stages 1 – 4) for building fabric repairs.

EC/2015/38.2.4– Learning and Teaching Hub (Part (60%) Stage 4 Fees)

The Committee noted the CapEx application in the sum of £1,162,282 for payment of (part) Stage 4 fees. This sum included £78,451 in respect of a fee adjustment to the completed RIBA Stage 3. Prior to approving this sum the Committee requested clarity about whether this was a retrospective claim for a completed Stage or whether it was in respect of a change which had been subsequently agreed. It agreed that if it transpired to be the latter a robust change control process should have captured this.

However the Committee recognised the need to maintain momentum in respect of the project and therefore approved the application in the reduced sum of £1,083,831 and would consider the outstanding amount when the required clarity had been provided.

EC/2015/39 Any Other Business

The Committee requested that a BIM presentation be scheduled for the new meetings cycle.

EC/2015/40 Schedule of Meetings for 2016/17

Friday 2 September 2016
Friday 4 November 2016
Friday 6 January 2017
Friday 10 March 2017
Friday 12 May 2017
Court - Wednesday 22 June 2016

Report from the Audit Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on Tuesday 16 May are attached. They are for information only, but there is one related item, on the matter of the approach to Risk Management, referred to in minute 35 and for which an additional paper is provided. This item is carried forward from the April 2016 meeting of Court, at which it was agreed that Court members would provide comments to David Newall ahead of the matter being discussed again in June.

Action requested of Court

Court is ultimately responsible for Risk Management within the University. This function is largely delegated as described in the paper at Annex 1. In the light of the recent discussions at Court and at Audit Committee, Court is asked to consider the following modifications to the current approach:

1. that Court should, through Audit Committee, receive the University’s strategic risk register together with the mitigating actions proposed by SMG. This would happen next at the October meeting of Court, and annually thereafter, or more regularly if Court should so wish;

2. that Court members should be advised of the next annual SMG strategic risk workshop with a view to a small number of Court members contributing to that exercise.

Subject to these two changes, the University’s approach to risk management would continue as set out in Annex 1, and Audit Committee will continue to provide oversight of risk management on Court’s behalf.

Summary of other Audit Committee business, for Court’s information

Ahead of the meeting, the Committee members received a briefing on the College of MVLS, from VP and Head of College Professor Anna Dominiczak.

In the main meeting, the Committee received reports on audit reviews of Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Management, and IT disaster recovery; Departmental Compliance - Student Feedback; Income and Accounts Receivable; TRAC; and a Special EU Projects Body (SEUPB) Project.

Subject to some minor adjustments and clarifications being made in relation to the document, the Committee has approved the 2016/17 Internal Audit Plan, which is driven by the University’s organisational objectives and priorities, and the risks that might prevent it from meeting those objectives.
The Committee approved the External Auditors’ approach to preparing the financial statements for the year to 31 July 2016.

The Committee received an update on the HE Governance (Scotland) Bill, and briefings on cyber security and Risk Management, following attendance by two of the Committee’s members at a SMG risk workshop.

Prepared by Deborah Maddern, 6.6.16
AUDIT/2015/32 Minutes of the meeting held on 16 February 2016

The minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2015/33. Matters Arising

33.1 HE Governance (Scotland) Bill - update

At the last meeting, the Committee had heard that a number of revisions had been made to the first draft of the Bill, to take into account some of the concerns expressed by the sector. These revisions had included: removal of clauses in the Bill which had involved new ministerial powers and so had raised concerns regarding ONS reclassification; removal of the proposal to cap the membership of a University Senate at 120; and removal of proposed legislative amendments that would have deleted references to the Rector’s role as ‘president’ of Court in the ancient universities.

DN explained that the Bill had been passed on 23 March, although its implementation date was to be confirmed. Key areas of note were: the requirement for an election to take place for the Convener position, the electorate being staff and students; clarity having been provided in the legislation about the role of the Rector as ‘presiding’ at Court, with the Convener’s role to include leadership and effectiveness of the governing body; and the requirement for two Trade-Union-nominated staff members to be on Court. The Court’s Standing Orders would be reviewed in light of the new legislation. The Court Governance Working Group would work with the Senate to achieve the correct configuration of Court, while retaining the membership at its current 25, and retaining a clear lay majority. The Committee also heard that the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance was undergoing a review, having been in force for three years; the Committee would be kept informed about the outcome.

33.2 Anti Bribery policy

Possible application of the policy to Court and Audit Committee members would be discussed at the next Court meeting.

33.3 Research grant audit – update

The Committee noted that actions from the audit were being taken forward.
AUDIT/2015/34. Cyber Security

Hugh Roberts, PWC, and Sandy Macdonald, Director IT Services, attended to brief the Committee.

The Committee heard that the IT environment was increasingly complex, with data in multiple locations, widespread use of mobile devices and large numbers of people, both internal and external to the University, using systems. It was therefore important for the University to focus on key areas of potential vulnerability, such as IP, personal information and key corporate information, and for any responses to potential attacks to be measured. This required to be balanced against the need for easy access to appropriate information. Stakeholder buy-in, in terms of awareness of risks and understanding of the need for security measures, was important, as was targeted monitoring of systems.

It was noted that the University’s actions to avoid security breaches were well developed, and included quick isolation of potentially affected machines, although there was no complacency and work-in-progress was constant. Penetration testing in recent years had resulted in some recommendations, but had generally not found areas of significant weakness. As discussed at previous meetings, it was intended to use different organisations to undertake such testing, to maximise its effect. It was also noted that education of the University community was very important, for example to alert staff to potential phishing messages.

It was agreed that the Committee would receive regular updates on this matter, the next one to be scheduled for 6 months, and to include benchmarking data against other HEIs, if possible. It was suggested that SMG also be given relevant data.

HR and SM were thanked for the briefing.

AUDIT/2015/35. Risk Management

Ian Thomson, the University’s Insurance and Risk Manager, attended for this item.

At the last meeting, it had been agreed that a paper from the Committee, containing suggestions relating to the approach to Risk Management, would be provided to Court. The paper had included reference to the current Risk Management processes, and whether these might be refined, and to the appropriate level and method of involvement of non-executives in the assessment of risk at the University. Mr Newall advised that Court had carried forward discussion of the paper to its June meeting, with Court members to provide comments to him in the meantime, and therefore the Committee would be updated at its September meeting. It was likely however that the Court would wish to have an increased role in its oversight of Risk Management, to include, for example, periodic review of the Risk Register and possible attendance by a number of Court members - in addition to some Audit Committee members - at the SMG risk workshops. HC added that Court’s initial discussion had indicated it did not wish to be involved in the finer details, but at the strategic oversight level, and with assurance that the Audit Committee was reviewing risk management arrangements on a regular basis.

In the meantime, a summary paper arising from the recent attendance by the chair and SB at a Risk workshop had been circulated, along with the University’s Risk Management policy, the current Risk Register and the text of a revised list of risks, which were in the process of being scored by the SMG. It was agreed that it remained the case that the role of identifying risks was one for management, although the Committee might suggest possible areas for consideration, as indeed might Court. PB and SB reported that their attendance at the workshop had provided reassurance that institutional risk management was being satisfactorily addressed by the SMG. It was noted that given that the revised risk list was still being scored, and risk ‘owners’ being identified for the purposes of taking forward actions in mitigation, a further update would be provided to the Committee at the next meeting. It would remain the case that SMG considered two of the risks on the register in detail at each of its meetings.
The Committee agreed that if it could help Court’s discussion of the matter, then it would do so. It was also commented that at the College level, risk registers had now developed, although the Committee’s sighting of follow-through actions was significantly less than it was for the SMG-led register; however, there was an internal audit related to this area scheduled for 2016/17, which would provide information for the Committee. The chair suggested the possibility of some members attending College-level risk meetings in order to inform its thinking. It was agreed that DN would consider how the Committee might best be informed about the progress of Colleges in this area, and how the Committee might contribute if necessary.

**ACTION DN**

It was noted that the Risk Management Policy, which had been circulated with the papers for the present meeting, was being updated to reflect the University’s 2015-2020 strategic plan, such update to include reference to new KPIs and to clarify roles and responsibilities.

The Committee noted from a PWC paper provided for this item that institutions in the HEI sector as a whole were generally in the process of reviewing governing body involvement in risk management.

**AUDIT/2015/36 Internal Audit Risk Assessment and Plan 2016/17**

A paper from PWC had been circulated, setting out the Risk Assessment and Internal Audit Annual Plan 2016/17, including a summary of PWC’s approach to undertaking the risk assessment. The plan was driven by the University’s organisational objectives and priorities, and the risks that might prevent it from meeting those objectives.

It was noted that discussions had been held with DN, DW, RF and GC ahead of the plan being provided to the Committee.

PWC had considered an ‘audit universe’ of auditable units, analysed the University’s corporate objectives and (updated) risks, and subsequently developed an audit requirement rating based on the inherent risk assessment and the strength of the control environment for each auditable unit. A plan had been drafted following this, covering the auditable units - under broad headings of Risk and Governance; Value for Money - Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness; General Assurance Financial Controls; Risk-based Internal Control reviews, and Computer Audit - and indicating the timing of audits that were proposed to be undertaken in 2016/17. It was noted that there was still an element of flexibility within the plan.

Internal audit work would be performed in accordance with PWC’s Internal Audit methodology, which was aligned to Scottish Funding Council Financial Memorandum requirements, and required PWC to report on whether the firm believed that the University had adequate and effective arrangements to address the risks that management’s objectives were not achieved in respect of risk management, control and governance.

In discussion, a number of points of clarification were requested by the Committee, relating to:

i) consideration of Value for Money (vfm), where PWC clarified that, where relevant, all audits covered this area, agreeing however that it would be made more explicit in both the Terms of Reference for audits and the reports, and that a separate section on the outcome of vfm considerations would be included in the latter.

ii) whether the shape of the plan and more particularly the number of proposed days allocated to the University was sufficient, given the size of the institution, and whether consideration had been given to benchmarking data (hours allocated to internal audit) from other HEIs. On this point, it was noted that the number of days proposed was in line with the contract with PWC, and that in
the view of both the auditors and management it was suitable for the breadth of activity undertaken at the University, with quality of output from the reports being more valuable than quantity. Details of benchmarking data would be provided for the next meeting.

**ACTION RF**

iii) whether greater focus should be given to the student experience, through appropriate audits. On this point it was noted that the internal audit of MyCampus was currently being scoped within the 2015/16 plan, but that consideration would be given to the possibility of auditing (for example) aspects of the effectiveness of student support, with PWC advising management what would be feasible.

**ACTION PWC/DN/DAW**

iv) the possibility of including more focus on the adequacy of IT/computing resource and on business continuity aspects. On this point, PWC considered that there was sufficient coverage, although it was agreed that the Terms of Reference of the ‘IT governance and structure’ audit, scheduled for the 3rd quarter, would be provided to the Committee.

**ACTION PWC**

v) the nature and frequency of liaison between External and Internal audit, on which matter the Committee heard that there was regular discussion between the two and that, where relevant, the external auditors took cognisance of internal audit findings, for the purposes of the University’s financial statements.

vi) whether the plan included sufficient consideration of the campus development/capital plan, including related processes and risks; on this point the auditors considered that there was sufficient coverage.

With regard to the specific internal audits included in the document, it was noted that the Terms of Reference would expand in much more detail on the brief descriptions provided in the plan. The Committee requested that the number of reports presented at each meeting be spread as evenly as possible, across the year.

The Committee agreed that subject to the above points being addressed, the plan was approved. A final version would be emailed to the Committee for sign-off.

**ACTION DN**

**AUDIT/2015/37. Internal Audit Update Report**

37.1 Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Management, and IT disaster recovery

The background to the review was that emergency planning and business continuity management were areas of increasing focus for management across all institutions, with the need to embed arrangements into their operations. Robust emergency planning was vital for the University, given its duty of care to students and staff. It was therefore important that strategies were documented, understood and tested.

The report had given overall risk classifications of High to both the Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Management aspects of the review, and a Medium overall risk classification to the IT disaster recovery aspect. It had been concluded that the business continuity arrangements within the University were not of the level of maturity expected for an organisation of its profile, size and nature, and while there had been a number of attempts to initiate policies and procedures, these had often not been realised in practice. It was noted that arrangements were already in place to support emergency planning within the institution, but there were areas requiring improvement to ensure that the University was fully capable of protecting its staff, students and assets.
in the event of an emergency, including (relating to a high risk finding) documentation being in place to support actions in response to emergencies.

The Committee noted that the management response committed the University to establishing effective governance arrangements, to include participation of SMG members and a focus on key areas through a structured approach. Management would also put in place additional short-term resource to assist Schools and Institutes in establishing robust Business Continuity Plans and to assist services in improving the quality of their plans. With regard to Emergencies Planning, there was an established structure in place for managing and preparing for emergencies, which would be reviewed for improvements. An update would be provided to the Committee at its next meeting.

**ACTION DN**

37.2 Departmental Compliance - Student Feedback

The review had looked at the design and operating effectiveness of key controls relating to student feedback processes operating in 2015/16, such feedback being obtained by the University from a variety of sources, both internal and external, including: Course feedback; the National Student Survey (NSS); the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES); the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES); and the International Student Barometer (ISB). The overall report classification was Medium risk, with some areas for improvement identified, relating to student feedback processes and procedures, including: there being no defined ownership for the results of the ISB and action monitoring by the University; and a current lack of early engagement with the Equality & Diversity Unit when developing the Course Evaluation Questionnaire Policy and an absence of management information capturing the experiences of minority group students from current surveys.

It was agreed that PWC would advise the Business School that the Committee was not content with non-provision of information, and that documentation should be shared if requested by the auditors for the purposes of an audit.

**ACTION PWC**

37.3 Income and Accounts Receivable

This audit had considered the controls and processes across the various income streams, to identify areas of good practice and areas for improvement. The overall report classification was Medium risk, with the results of the testing showing that all key controls identified were operating effectively during the period of the audit, but with some areas for improvement including: student and sponsor aged debt reports not being able to be accurately generated from MyCampus; and sponsor statements not generated unless there had been activity in the account during the month.

37.4 TRAC Review

The audit had reviewed TRAC, the activity-based costing system which had been customised for the Higher Education sector and which aimed to meet the information needs of the University’s key financial stakeholders and funders. It required universities to analyse their costs across the primary activities of Teaching (T), Research (R) and Other/Commercial Activities (O). The overall report classification was Low risk, with a number of areas of good practice identified and no findings resulting in recommendations. The Committee agreed that the frequency of TRAC audit reviews should be reduced, albeit that such reviews were required periodically.

37.5 Special EU Projects Body (SEUPB) Project

An investigation had been undertaken into the procurement of courses run as part of an EU-funded project, in order to identify whether the procurement requirements of the project had been adhered to, since the funder had requested this be examined. The conclusion had been that procurement requirements for a first course had not been
adhered to. The procurement issues identified would be considered in more detail as part of an audit review of Partnerships.

AUDIT/2015/38. Implementation of Outstanding Recommendations

38.1 Finance Office
Since the last meeting, 16 new audit actions had arisen; six actions against audit reports had been completed; three partially implemented; 20 were being progressed; and there were five recommendations where action had not yet commenced. It was noted that a number of the actions being progressed related to the Research Management System, for which user testing had been completed, with a number of issues identified and retesting due to commence in May; and a number of supplier fixes required by Agresso, due to be delivered in June - with latest ‘go-live’ date planned for August 2016.

38.2 Departments other than the Finance Office
Since the last meeting, nine new audit actions had arisen; 12 actions against audit reports had been completed; 17 partially implemented or being progressed; and there were two recommendation where action had not yet commenced. There were no points arising from audit reports not previously reported to the Committee where overall Medium Risk (or higher) classification reports had been made.

The Committee received a report setting out the proposed External Audit approach for the year to 31 July 2016, in accordance with the requirements of auditing standards and other professional requirements. The report summarised Ernst & Young’s (E&Y) assessment of the key issues which drove the development of an effective audit for the University, taking consideration of relevant market factors and the operational, finance, and business risks which drove the University’s financial statement. The report also discussed levels of materiality that would be applied, at a consolidated level such assessment being based on total group income. A separate materiality level would be used for the subsidiary entities and the Trust, reflecting the scale of their operations.

As well as auditing the consolidated financial statements of the University, the scope of the audit work would include statutory audits of the University’s UK subsidiaries, audit of UGlasgow Singapore Pte, and certification/opinions in respect of Hardship and Childcare funds, US Loans compliance and the US GAAP financial statements.

The risk-based approach would involve analysis of the risks inherent in the external influences, the key strategic, operational and financial risks for the University and the auditors’ knowledge of other factors that might impact the University’s financial statements. These outputs would then be compared with risks identified through the University’s own risk management process, and mapped to the financial statements, where applicable. As such, the key financial statement focus areas would be: income recognition, in particular in respect of project and research accounting; estates development and capital funding; fraud risk and management override; the financial position; recognition of pension scheme obligations; and compliance with the new SORP, including implementation of Financial Reporting Standard 102 (FRS 102).

E&Y had been working with the University to consider the implementation of the revised Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) and introduction of FRS 102. A report would be provided to the September meeting of the Committee to update members with further details of, and reassurances about, this work.

ACTION E&Y
E&Y would issue a report expressing opinions on audits of the University and consolidated financial statements. In compliance with SFC requirements, the auditors’ opinion would report on whether:

i) the financial statements had been prepared in accordance with the Statement of Recommended Practice: Accounting for Further and Higher Education;

ii) income from the Scottish Funding Council, grants and income for specific purposes and from other restricted funds administered by the University during the year ended 31 July, had been applied for the purposes for which they had been received; and

iii) income had been applied in accordance with the University’s statutes and, where appropriate, with the financial memorandum with the Funding Council.

The report would express opinions on the results of audits of the separate statutory financial statements for subsidiary companies, in accordance with UK company law and the new FRS102; the separate statutory financial statements for the University Trust, in accordance with the Charity SORP; the University’s compliance with specific requirements of the US Department of Education’s Foreign School Audit Guide relative to the University’s participation in the Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program; and the University US GAAP financial statements.

In discussion, it was noted that key changes in the approach since last year were the development of a more controls-based approach, for example including budget monitoring (outturn vs. budget) and consideration of purchase to pay processes. This approach would be further refined to cover sales processes, more data analytics, analysis of tuition fee movements, and introduction of more journal-entry analysis software. It was agreed that the outputs of these exercises would be shared with the Committee.

**ACTION E&Y**

With regard to materiality levels, it was noted that these were percentage based, and while in isolation the figure appeared high, it was based on the University’s total turnover. The Committee heard that there was no historical cause for any concerns in this area, and that the exercise would be qualitative as well as quantitative, with both the external and internal auditors involved if required.

The Committee noted that E&Y were content with the University’s level of preparedness in respect of FRS102. E&Y would share some briefing material on the FRS with the Committee, and if necessary a briefing session would also be arranged at the September meeting.

**ACTION E&Y**

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

**AUDIT/2015/40. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**AUDIT/2015/41. Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 21 September 2016 at 2pm in the Melville Room

*Prepared by: Deborah Maddern, Clerk to Committee, deborah.maddern@glasgow.ac.uk*
Risk Management

Background
As the governing body, and in the context of its statutory role to “administer and manage the whole revenue and property of the University”, Court is ultimately responsible for the University’s systems of internal controls and accountability, which include risk management. The SFC requires Court to include a statement on such matters in the University’s annual financial statements.

The Court has largely delegated the more detailed oversight of these areas to its Committees. Court receives regular reports from the Committees, including an annual report from the Audit Committee, which includes its opinion on the adequacy of the institution’s risk management arrangements. Two lay members of Court, Heather Cousins and Lesley Sutherland, are members of the Audit Committee. The other members are co-opted externals with accountancy and/or audit experience.

The Risk Management process
At an operational level, in preparing the University’s strategic risk register, a risk analysis is undertaken by SMG annually, involving a fresh assessment and prioritising of the strategic risks facing the University each year. Input to this process is informed by the annual planning and budgeting round, thereby involving consideration of institutional-level risks that may arise from both University and College activity. The Colleges also have their own risk registers. The internal auditors’ professional expertise is used to inform the scoring of risks for inclusion in the register compiled by SMG, with the auditors also providing details of approaches within the HE sector, to facilitate benchmarking. The University’s Internal Auditors are providing continuing support for the development of arrangements at College level, their advice to the Committee having been that arrangements remain less well developed than at SMG level.

Following the risk analysis by SMG, mitigation plans are identified for the items listed in the agreed risk register, with actions in mitigation assigned to the appropriate member(s) of senior management. At each subsequent SMG meeting during the year, two of the risks on the register are considered in more depth, with a detailed update on mitigation provided by the responsible member(s). The register is also updated regularly as actions in mitigation are taken forward across all risks.

The Audit Committee has no direct involvement in this risk management process, although it regularly receives the updated risk register. It also places reliance on regular advice from the Internal Auditors on the fitness for purpose of the Risk Management arrangements at both SMG and College level.

Until 2013, members of the Audit Committee and of Court were more actively involved in the analysis and scoring/prioritisation of University-level risks, via workshops facilitated by the previous internal auditors. However, there is a general consensus that this model did not work well, involving as it did a number of non-executive Committee members in the risk assessment process, when they were in fact not well-placed to identify and quantify key risks, other than at a very general level. It was also a mechanistic process led by the internal auditors rather than by management, and there was little consideration of mitigation.

Future Arrangements for Risk Management
The Audit Committee is broadly content with the risk management process as described above and with the Committee’s current level of scrutiny. It has however continued to
discuss whether there should be a re-engagement of members in observing, if not participating in, risk analysis at University level, in order to discharge governance responsibilities delegated to it by Court. It also suggests that Court members would wish to review the visibility and communication of risk and risk management to Court itself, as part of good governance practice.

An extract from Scottish Code of Good HE Governance is at Appendix 1 for reference.

It remains the Committee’s view that its members are not in a position to analyse major strategic or other risks other than in general terms, and that this is a role for executive management.

Suggestions for Court’s consideration are that:

- A member or members of the Audit Committee attend the annual SMG Risk workshop, in addition to the Committee’s regular review of the risk register; and
- There is greater involvement of Court in risk management, for example by a member or members of Court (other than those on the Audit Committee) attending the annual SMG risk workshop; and/or through Court receiving the risk register annually; and
- There might be some observation by non-executives of the operation of risk management by the Colleges, for example by attendance at the equivalent annual workshop process, given that arrangements for risk management at this level are less well developed.

Should Court prefer not to have greater involvement in the risk management process, it would continue to receive Audit Committee reports at four of its five meetings, such reports to include any areas of immediate concern; and to receive the Committee’s annual report containing an opinion on risk management within the University.

The Audit Committee has also suggested that SMG consider the utility of incorporating assessments of risk appetite across the range of strategic risks into the process, with assistance from the Internal Audit team, whose knowledge of practice elsewhere can help inform decisions

Court’s views on these suggestions are sought.
Appendix 1

Scottish Code of Good HE Governance
(extract)

Risk Management

Effective governance requires governing bodies to adopt a risk-based approach to strategic planning and decision making. Risk can be defined as: ‘the threat or possibility that an action or event will adversely or beneficially affect an organisation’s ability to achieve its objectives’. Institutions are expected to identify and actively manage risks, having particular regard at governing body level to risks which could threaten the sustainability of the Institution. This includes the risk of inaction in the face of such threat or opportunity. An annual disclosure about risk management is required in audited financial statements.

Each Institution’s audit committee is required to provide advice to the governing body annually on risk management, control and governance in advance of the governing body approving the audited financial statements. Institutions must have a sound system of risk management, control and governance. Essential elements of such a control system are:

• effective review by governing bodies, finance and audit committees each with an independent member majority;
• control systems which include policies, objectives and plans, management of key risks and opportunities, monitoring of financial and operational performance, physical safeguarding of assets, segregation of duties, authorisation and approval procedures, and information systems;
• an effective internal audit function which includes right of access to the chair of the Audit Committee; and
• the identification and management of risk embedded in all business systems.

At the highest level, risk management, control and governance must be exercised by the governing body and its committees acting under its explicit delegation. The governing body has overall responsibility for institutional activities and finances. Many Institutions have established a planning and resources committee to consider strategic plans and the allocation of resources to meet such plans. Detailed monitoring of the financial position and prospects is normally delegated by the governing body to a finance committee or equivalent.

The Accounts Directions from the Scottish Funding Council require Institutions to include a statement of internal control in the corporate governance section of the audited financial statements, explaining the risk management arrangements operated by the governing body.
Court – Wednesday 22 June 2016

Report from the Human Resources Committee

Brief description of Report

The draft minute of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Wednesday 26 May 2016 is attached (for noting, including the approval by the HRC of Grievance and Attendance policies); together with a paper on Equal Pay and Gender Pay (Annex 1); and a paper updating Court on the activities of the JCCN (Annex 2) (for noting).

The paper on Equal Pay and Gender Pay (Annex 1) follows discussion at the April Court meeting, at which Court agreed to support the desire to reduce the University’s gender pay gap, but requested that the HR Committee, working with HR colleagues, provide more detail to inform discussion on a realistic institutional target in this area. The paper sets out the current University position with regard to Equal Pay and Gender Pay. It explains the significant difference in these measures and the challenge faced by the University, and indeed the HE Sector, in addressing the underlying issues which result in the current Gender Pay gap. The attached HR Committee minute notes:

Addressing and reducing the organisational gender pay gap of 19.1% formed the heart of the Committee’s discussion. It was recognised that occupational segregation plays a key role in this and particularly the challenge of maintaining gender parity in more senior grades, primarily within the R&T job family. All agreed that a multi-pronged approach was required and the Committee explored possible areas within which targets might be identified. At the previous meeting and subsequently at Court, a potential target of 10% gap by 2020 for gender pay had been suggested. It was felt that this was overly ambitious given the nature of the issues which result in this gap but that the issue needed to be actively addressed and a series of staged targets on the different relevant factors could be further developed. This would build on the positive steps already taken with regard, for instance, to Professorial Zoning and also prompted by work on Athena Swan.

The Committee agreed that the paper represented a genuine challenge for the University but also a potential opportunity to be a leader within the sector in actively addressing the underlying factors impacting on the gender pay gap. Being such a leader would deliver competitive advantage in both the attraction and retention of top talent. The Committee agreed that the paper should be presented to Court for consideration of the strategic positioning appropriate for the University and to agree the role of the HR Committee in working with University Leadership, as guided by HR, to develop a meaningful action plan supported by a series of stretching but realistic targets and objectives.

Action requested of Court on the Equal Pay and Gender Pay paper

Court is asked to consider the three questions set out on the final page of the paper.
Summary of other HR Committee Business contained in the Minutes

The HR Director’s report provided an update to the Committee highlighting a number of substantive areas including the Industrial Action by members of UCU in relation to the national pay dispute, developments to the PDR and Academic Promotions processes and the 2016 Staff Survey which has had a record level of participation.

The Committee also considered a detailed discussion paper, presented by the HR Director in relation to equal pay and in particular the gender pay gap. The Committee agreed that this paper be submitted to Court for further consideration with regard to strategic positioning of this important and challenging topic.

The Committee received two presentations. The first was from Ms Gillian Shaw, Head of HR for the College of Arts who updated the Committee on the strategic people agenda within the college. The second was from Professor Miles Padgett, VP Research who gave an update on the strategic focus on researcher development across the University and the focus on attracting and retaining top talent.

Finally the Committee approved two newly reviewed HR Policies, namely Grievance and Attendance.

Richard Claughton
Deputy Director of HR & Clerk to the HR Committee
08 June 2016
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Human Resources Committee

Minute of meeting held in the Melville Room, Main Building
on Thursday 26 May 2016

Present: Mr D Newall (DN), Mrs A Allen (A All), Mrs C Barr (CB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Ms S Campbell (SC), Mr R Claughton (RPC), Professor L Farmer (LF), Mr R Goward (RG), and Professor N Hill (NH), Dr M Macdonald Simpson (MMS), Ms J Milligan (JM)

By Invitation: Prof M Padgett (MP), Ms G Shaw (GS)

Apologies: Professor A Muscatelli (AM), Professor R O Maolalaigh (ROM), Ms S Ashworth (SA)

HR/16/26 Opening Remarks & Apologies
DN opened the meeting and welcomed the members of the committee. Apologies were noted as above.

HR/16/27 Minute of the Meeting held on 23 March 2016
The Minute was taken as read and, subject to an amendment in section HR/16/19, approved by the Committee.

HR/16/28 Matters arising from meeting held on 19 January 2016
The Committee noted that there were no outstanding actions which were not covered in the HR Director’s Report or other agenda items.

HR/16/29 HR Director’s Report
CB spoke to her report, highlighting the key points.

National Pay Negotiations – CB noted that the two day strike called by UCU was taking place. Full numbers of participants were not known at the time of the meeting but had been relatively low across all areas. There were no reported impacts on the activities of the University. UCU had also called upon members to work to their contracts and there was the potential for a further locally scheduled day of action. The call from UCU for external examiners to resign had resulted in a small number of resignations being received by the University. Impact analysis and contingency plans were ongoing. The impact of any staff “working to contract” will also be monitored to ensure this is not resulting in them delivering partial performance which would result in the University senior management having to consider a response in terms of potential impact on pay. Any action would only be taken following consultation with other member HEIs.

In response to questions CB outlined the current position of the negotiations. The final offer of 1.1% had not been improved during the dispute resolution meetings. The original pay bid from the unions was 5% and also included demands for further action on casual work and gender pay. No discussions had taken place on the potential for a local Scottish Negotiating Sub-Committee. The University allows contingency in the budget for the annual pay award but CB noted that the 1.1% was at the limit of affordability for some HEIs.

Finally CB noted that the other recognised unions were currently consulting their members on the final offer, UCU had proceeded to ballot early in the agreed negotiation process.

PDR 2015-16 – CB updated on the upcoming PDR process which had now commenced at senior management level. The process would be managed on-line for the first time. CB noted that SMG and USLT members were also taking part in a 360° feedback process which incorporated elements relating to the University values and the Leadership Behavioral Framework.
Academic Promotion Criteria – CB updated the Committee on the revised academic criteria for recruitment, promotion and professorial zoning which had now been approved. The criteria for Learning, Teaching and Scholarship (LTS) had been significantly developed and compare favourably with developments in the rest of the UK in relation to the Teaching Excellence Framework. It was noted that the approach did take into consideration periods of absence due to maternity/paternity and similar leave. CB also updated on the ECDP which is helping to build the university’s talent pipeline.

The Staff Survey was currently live across the university and CB reported that participation was standing at 60% which was in line with the response in 2014. Results would be shared during the summer months and discussed in full at the next meeting of the HR Committee.

Finally CB recorded the submission of the Athena Swan Institutional Bronze Award application which had been discussed at the last meeting of the Committee along with five unit level award submissions (one silver and four bronze).

HR/16/30 College of Arts – Strategic HR Update
GS gave a wide ranging presentation on the HR related activities within the College of Arts. She highlighted the people challenges and opportunities presented by the campus redevelopment programme and by bringing the college together on one site. College leadership were actively engaging with staff on this and other aspects arising from the 2014 staff survey which has resulted in a number of initiatives at both School and College level to increase staff engagement generally. Finally GS also signaled the work that is commencing on Athena Swan within the College following the expansion of its coverage to ASSBL.

HR/16/31 Researcher Development – Update from the VP Research
MP gave an update on the activities and strategic goals of the Research Team within the RSIO. The key focus is on developing, nurturing and attracting high quality research talent throughout the University, to improve our overall publication quality and both increase and diversify research income. MP highlighted the work being done to develop and guide researchers through development activities such as the Glasgow Crucible and Aspiring PI Programme and to attract world-leading scholars via Studentships, Fellowships and investment via a senior professorial recruitment scheme.

The Committee discussed several points arising from the presentation including approaches to mentoring and the importance of encouraging and recognising citizenship amongst the academic community and how to maximise the retention of talent utilising the support frameworks we have in place.

HR/16/32 Equal Pay – Discussion Paper
CB spoke to the paper highlighting the differences between equal pay and gender pay. She noted the University’s positive position with regard to equal pay whilst recognising the importance of monitoring and actively managing pay & reward for performance at Grade 10 to ensure transparency and fairness.

Addressing and reducing the organisational gender pay gap of 19.1% formed the heart of the Committee’s discussion. It was recognised that occupational segregation plays a key role in this and particularly the challenge of maintaining gender parity in more senior grades, primarily within the R&T job family. All agreed that a multi-pronged approach was required and the Committee explored possible areas within which targets might be identified. At the previous meeting and subsequently at Court, a potential target of 10% gap by 2020 for gender pay had been suggested. It was felt that this was overly ambitious given the nature of the issues which result in this gap but that the issue needed to be actively addressed and a series of staged targets on the different relevant factors could be further developed. This would build on the positive steps already taken with regard, for instance, to Professorial Zoning and also prompted by work on Athena Swan.
The Committee agreed that the paper represented a genuine challenge for the University but also a potential opportunity to be a leader within the sector in actively addressing the underlying factors impacting on the gender pay gap. Being such a leader would deliver competitive advantage in both the attraction and retention of top talent. The Committee agreed that the paper should be presented to Court for consideration of the strategic positioning appropriate for the University and to agree the role of the HR Committee in working with University Leadership, as guided by HR, to develop a meaningful action plan supported by a series of stretching but realistic targets and objectives.

HR/16/33  Policy Update – Grievance and Attendance Policies

RPC introduced the paper and highlighted the key changes within the revised policies. These had been developed over a number of months in consultation with the trade unions. The language in both policies is designed to be both clear and supportive and the Attendance Policy emphasises the importance of creating a healthy work place for our staff whilst providing managers with the tools and processes to support staff back to work when they are absent due to illness. RPC noted that there would be training and communications in support of the new policies, in particular attendance which included several changes from the current approach.

The Committee approved both policies.

HR/16/34  Data Analytics

The Committee noted the report, highlighting the significant growth in headcount over the last few years, which was only in part due to the move to reduce the use of Casual and Zero Hours arrangements.

HR/16/35  Draft Minutes for Noting

There were no minutes for noting available at the meeting. The meeting of the JCCN had been cancelled as the Trade Unions had offered their apologies due to the Industrial Action of UCU members and the Equality and Diversity Committee had only taken place the day prior to the HRC. It was noted that, as requested by Court, JCCN had drafted an annual report and that, once finalised, this would be forwarded to the June meeting of Court.

HR/16/36  AOB

There were no matters to discuss.

HR/16/37  Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 13 September 2016 at 10am, venue tbc.
University of Glasgow  
JCCN  - 25 May 2016  
Annual Review of JCCN activity

This paper provides a summary of the matters covered by the Joint Committee of Consultation and Negotiation (JCCN) during the academic session 2015/2016.

The JCCN meets three times a year. Membership includes senior managers and representatives of the four recognised trades unions, namely UCU, Unison, Unite and GMB. The Committee has an independent chair, Alan MacFarlane, former lay-member of the University Court.

The agenda is jointly agreed ahead of each meeting. The minutes are presented to the HR Committee and now also shared with Court along with the draft minute of the HR Committee.

At each meeting the Committee receives written reports on policy developments being discussed at the joint Policy Review Group and also any ongoing local consultations regarding organisational change. This ensures that all parties are clear on the status of these matters. No issues have been formally escalated to the JCCN under either of these topics.

The JCCN held a number of discussions during the development and launch of the University Strategy, Inspiring People - Changing the World and additionally the committee has discussed a range of topics including the People Strategy, the review of the University Performance Development and Review (PDR) processes and the development and launch of the Leadership Behavioural Framework.

Presentations have also been given on the work of the Employee and Organisational Development Unit including the Early Career Development Programme and the implementation of the Workload model across our Academic Units.

The committee has also taken an interest in the campus development plans and the potential impact on staff arising from this.

The meeting due to be held on 25th May was unfortunately cancelled due to the decision of all the Union representatives to submit apologies for the meeting resulting from its coinciding with the industrial action by UCU. As well as the regular items outlined above the committee were due to hear presentations on Athena Swan and an update on the Campus Development. These items will be covered at future meetings.

Recommendation

Members of Court are asked to note the report.

Prepared by Richard Claughton  
Deputy Director of HR on behalf of the members of the JCCN  
May 2016
Report from the Meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee
held on Wednesday 1 June 2016

Brief description of the papers

In June, the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee covered its usual range of business. It reviewed standard reports on Occupational Health activities and on accidents that have occurred in recent months. The Committee also reviewed the Safety Risk Register, and noted actions arising from an audit of Business Continuity Management. The key actions that are being put in place with regard to this latter area include: a short term working group to review Business Continuity documentation, establish a rolling programme to implement/review plans and find resources to support the programme; and the creation of a Business Continuity governance group to oversee and monitor Business Continuity management across the University, reporting to the HSWC.

Action requested of Court

The report is for information.

Author’s Name: Debbie Beales
Title: Clerk to HSW Committee
Date 02.06.2016
University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 1 June 2016 at 10:00 AM in the Senate Room

Present: Mrs Christine Barr, Ms Louise Bowden, Mr David McLean, Mr John F Malcolm, Mr David Newall, Ms Aileen Stewart, Mr Graham Tobasnick, Ms Selina Woolcott

In Attendance: Ms Debbie Beales

Apologies: Mr James Gray, Ms Gillian Shaw, Mr Paul Phillips, Mr Oscar Schafer, Mr Deric Robinson, Ms Una Marie Daragh, Mr David Somerville

HSWC/2015/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 9 March 2016

The Minute of the meeting of Wednesday 9th March 2016 was approved.

HSWC/2015/2 Matters arising

HSWC/2015/2.1 Safety for overseas workers (verbal update DN)

Mr Newall informed the Committee that international travel insurance for UG students had been approved and was now available online. The Committee discussed the fact that COREHR had an option for international travel in the drop down leave menu which could be a possible mechanism for the authorisation of international travel for staff. The system also allowed uploading of documents which could be a method for recording risk assessments for international travel. Mrs Barr and Ms Woolcott agreed to investigate this further and feedback to the Committee in September.

HSWC/2015/2.2 Lighting on campus (verbal update DN)

Mr Newall informed the Committee that E&B had now implemented a more robust inspection regime that would be monitored over the coming months.

HSWC/2015/3 OH Report (Paper 1)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that the volume of OH activities continued to rise and that health surveillance compliance was improving overall, with the exception of Biodiversity. A Chief Technical Officer for this area had recently been appointed who could be approached to progress the issue. Management referrals from the College of Arts had almost doubled in comparison to the previous 3 quarters, CoSE/CoSS remained steady and MVLS numbers had dropped slightly. The Committee thanked the OH team for their continued hard work.

HSWC/2015/4 SEPS Report (Paper 2)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that there were no significant trends to report.
HSWC/2015/5 Audit Report (Paper 3)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that a communication from the Secretary of Court to Units with outstanding actions had led to a significant improvement in the amount of completed actions. New audits had been hindered due to staff vacancies within SEPS but this would be eased with the Biological Safety Adviser post being filled by Alice Gallagher from the Centre of Virus Research on 6th June 2016.

HSWC/2015/6 EAP Report (Paper 4)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that overall uptake of the service had increased by 66% compared to the same period last year. This was mainly due to telephone counselling which had increased by 100%. Face to face counselling remained constant. There were no complaints raised during this period. The current provider of this service, Optum, would continue until June 2017. A tendering process for the next supplier would be run using the APUC framework.

HSWC/2015/7 Safety Risk Register (Paper 5)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that this had last been updated in 2013 and was now due for review. After receiving comments from members of the Committee and service heads she had amended the register. It now listed all current outstanding risks along with 2 new ones (campus lighting and international travel). The Committee split into groups to decide which items should be prioritised and monitored over the next few months. Ms Woolcott agreed to use this input to identify the top risks, grouped as appropriate, into a revised register which could then be used by the Committee to identify key actions and monitor progress.

HSWC/2015/8 Draft Minute US H&S Committee admin/office (Paper 6)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated and considered the concerns that had been raised. Mr McLean informed the Committee that he was due to meet with the Chair of the Committee to discuss issues on fire risks which he would feedback to the HSWC at the next meeting. The issue on building maintenance was already being addressed by E&B. On the matter of mental health, Ms Woolcott agreed that once the staff survey results were available she would look, with the Health and Wellbeing working group, at what options might be available for training and supporting staff. These could include mental health first aid, mindfulness, resilience or other measures.

HSWC/2015/9 Business Continuity Management (Paper 7)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr Newall informed the Committee that an internal audit on BCM had been very critical and various recommendations had been made. As a result the following key actions would be put in place:

- A short term working group to be set up to review BC documentation, establish a rolling programme to implement/review plans and find resources to support this programme. It was anticipated that this group would include the Secretary of Court and College Secretaries.
- The creation of a cross-University BC governance group to oversee and monitor BC management across the University which will report to the HSWC.
- A temporary post to be created to assist School, Institute and Service Heads in establishing business continuity plans - a job description was currently in draft form.
HSWC/2015/10 Any Other Business

- Mr McLean informed the Committee that an incident potentially involving a highly toxic material had occurred in the Joseph Black Building. A PG student had been conducting an experiment without using gloves and felt several drops of liquid on his hand. Unsure what the liquid was, an ambulance was called. The nature of the material involved led to a full emergency response including Police, Paramedics, Fire and Special Hazards Unit. After assessment from the emergency services he was released from the ambulance without further medical treatment. As the person wasn't actually injured this incident was not reportable to HSE.
- Decommissioning of controlled radiation area labs in the Joseph Black Building would be taking place over the next 4 weeks.
- The Chemical Safety Adviser post will be advertised shortly as the current post holder is leaving to work with E&B. However, he will continue to provide Chemical Safety support for University until the post is filled.

HSWC/2015/11 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Tuesday 20th September 2016 at 10am in the Senate Room, Main Building.
Minutes of the Remuneration Committee meeting held on 23 May 2016 are attached, for noting by Court.

Prepared by Deborah Maddern
6.6.16
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Remuneration Committee

Notes of the Meeting held on 23 May 2016

Present  Ken Brown (convener)
         Dominic Cole-Morgan
         Rob Goward
         Anton Muscatelli
         David Ross

Attending  Christine Barr
           David Newall

Apologies  Brian McBride

1. Pre-meeting discussion
The lay members of the Committee met with Duncan Ross, Senior Senate Assessor, to discuss points raised by members of Court regarding the spread of P&DR outcome assessments for SMG members as compared with the spread for the workforce as a whole.

2. Notes of the meeting on 7 October 2015
These were approved.

3. Salary Augmentation
Successive reviews to government fiscal policies in recent years had resulted in a series of reductions to the Annual and Lifetime Allowance for pensions savings. These changes, coupled with reforms to the USS pension scheme, would have a financial impact on the taxation of high earning staff in the University.

The Committee was advised that most Russell Group universities had now introduced policies on salary augmentation, providing an opportunity for high earning staff who withdrew from their occupational pension scheme to receive a salary enhancement. To date Glasgow had not adopted such a policy. However, in view of the approach being adopted by competitor institutions, the Committee agreed it would be prudent for the University to offer a salary augmentation option, specifically to address the issue of tax detriment, so as to ensure competitive remuneration packages for staff who were instrumental in delivering the University’s strategic ambitions. It was agreed that, if a salary augmentation option was to be offered, then some important principles must be observed: it must not serve as a general incentive for staff to withdraw from their occupational pension scheme; it must apply only in a situation where the member of staff secured continuing cover for incapacity and death in service; and it must be financially neutral for the University.
The Committee now discussed and agreed the terms of a salary augmentation scheme for those adversely affected by breaching the Lifetime Pension Allowance. The policy introduced an option specifically for staff who might be affected by increased tax liability as a result of changes to the Lifetime Allowance effective in the period April 2012 to April 2016 inclusive. Eligibility to receive salary augmentation would only be available with effect from 1 April 2016. Augmentation would be conditional upon receipt of a formal request from the member of affected staff, and confirmation by the applicant’s independent financial adviser that this was the most prudent and preferred route for the applicant.

It was agreed that all requests for salary augmentation in terms of the Scheme would require the approval of the Principal, the Senior Vice-Principal and the Secretary of Court; and that a report should be brought to each meeting of Remuneration Committee on the number of requests approved.

4. Internal Audit Report on Severance Payments

The Committee received an internal audit report, dated February 2016, on Severance Payments, and noted the management actions being taken in response to its findings. The area had been summarised by the auditors as ‘low risk’, and its two recommendations had now been addressed by University management.

5. Voluntary Severance Approvals

The Committee was advised that, since its last meeting, University officers had approved 11 severance packages within the standard terms of the University’s VS Scheme. Nine of these had been in University Services and two in Social Sciences. The total cost of the packages had been £350,924 and the average payback period had been 7.3 months.

Whenever voluntary severance proposals: departed from the standard terms approved by Court; or exceeded £100,000; or involved a member of SMG, the matter required to be considered by the Remuneration Committee. There had been no cases in these categories since the last meeting of the Committee.

6. Performance & Development Review

The Director of HR updated Remuneration Committee on the launch of the 2016 Performance & Development Review exercise, which would take place between May and September. Widespread consultation had taken place with University staff on the shape of the P&DR exercise, and this had led to some modifications to the system, aimed at making it less onerous. In particular, a lighter-touch approach was being adopted to moderation, a 4-point performance outcome scale had been introduced, and no forced distribution of outcomes was being proposed. The Committee noted also that in 2016 the system would operate online for the first time.

The Committee expressed a hope that these improvements would help make P&DR more effective and that, after several years of change, the P&DR system could now be maintained in its current form.
7. **Salary Review**

In its annual review of SMG salaries in October 2015, Remuneration Committee had considered how the salary levels of SMG members compared with those of Russell Group and other UK university competitors. While at that time the Committee had decided not to propose any market-related salary adjustments, it had noted that the salary of one high-performing member of SMG was considerably below the median for comparator institutions. The Committee now received a request from the Principal that it review that individual’s salary in view of the comparator information and as a matter of retention. The Committee agreed to implement a salary increase as proposed, with an immediate pay rise in June 2016, and a further increase scheduled for August 2017. The Committee asked that the Director of HR implement this with immediate effect.

It was noted that the salaries of all SMG members would continue to be reported annually to Court, in £10,000 bands.

8. **Thank you**

Remuneration Committee recorded its appreciation of the contribution made over several years by David Ross and by Brian McBride, each of whom would stand down from membership on 31 July 2016.

9. **Date of Next Meeting**

October 2016; date to be confirmed.

DN, 24.5.16
Communications to Court from the meeting of Senate held on 02 June 2016

Dr Jack Aitken, Director, Senate Office

(All matters are for noting)

1. Senate statement in support of Britain remaining a member of the European Union.

At the meeting of Council of Senate in April 2016, during the discussion on the HE Governance Act, Council of Senate voted on whether it should take and express a view on the matter and voted by a ratio of 2:1 in favour of issuing a statement. Council of Senate was then asked to vote on the approach taken in expression of the view that Britain should remain. It was unanimous that it should be expressed in terms of how the University benefited from being Britain being a member of the EU and the risks posed by an exit, while recognising that members of the University would hold different views and endorsing the decision that the University would act as a forum for all sides of the debate. The statement including some key facts was circulated to Senate for input before wider dissemination.

The Statement can be found at: [http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_459227_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_459227_en.pdf)

2. Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 – update

At the meeting of Council of Senate on 4 February 2016, it had been agreed that a small sub-group would work on proposals related to the implications of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016, which it would bring back to Council of Senate. This working group would be composed of a subset of the Council of Senate Business Committee (equal numbers of ex officio and elected members, plus the Clerk of Senate [Convener] and Director of the Senate Office). It was reported that the Group had met once and made considerable progress. It was anticipated proposals would be bought back to the October meeting of Council of Senate. Guidance on implementing the new Act was expected to be produced by the Scottish Government in the Summer and this would be taken into consideration by the Working Group as it formulated its proposals.

3. Estates Strategy Update

Mrs Ann Allen, Director of Estates and Buildings and Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice-Principal, provided an update on the Estates Strategy. Mrs Allen reported that the context for the changing campus was to support people by providing the place to foster world changing education, research and communities. The focus was on delivering against the university strategy and that investment in the estate was crucial to support the ambition of The University.

The primary aim was to create a world leading learning and research environment, designed to encourage opportunities for collaborative working and sharing of knowledge. It was reported
that the focus in recent months had been to ensure that the ambition was reflected in the
development plans.

Examples of developments were reported from other institutions including Massachusetts
Institute of Technology and Stanford University, where spaces had been designed to ensure the
community could come together. These spaces had been used to transform the universities and
had been revolutionary in creating opportunities for interaction and collaboration. Spaces such
as these were the inspiration for the University of Glasgow’s campus development plans. It was
recognised that buildings and spaces should be inspiring and empowering, and could be used to
transform how the University operates, which reflected the aspirations of the University’s vision.
Examples of internal redesign to existing buildings, such as at New York University and Harvard
University, were also provided as examples of where historic buildings had been enhanced by
redesign of the internal space to change how staff and students interact. These examples were
reflective of plans for the Joseph Black Building.

It was reported that there had been great progress in terms of taking the overarching programme
forward:

There had been extensive public consultation and engagement, including meetings with the
West End communities, Community Councils and Historic Scotland, who were generally
supportive in terms of the aims, but were concerned about the traffic, noise from construction
and dust etc. caused by demolition.

The University was currently in a competitive dialogue process with four delivery partners. At the
second phase, this would reduce to two potential partners which would happen over the next
two months. A delivery partner would then be appointed before the end of the summer. It was
explained that competitive dialogue was different to a tendering process because it allowed for
greater understanding of the plan and also the client. It was a process increasingly used in
business as the results tended to be much better than a tendering process, due to the greater
level of understanding.

AECOM had been appointed to work on the masterplan and were working with Estates and
Buildings to ensure that that development had the right structure and shape, in line with the
framework approved by Glasgow City Council two years ago.

The campus development framework had shaped the master plan and Masterplanners from the
Olympic Park in London had undertaken a peer review exercise. The masterplan had been
submitted for planning approval, which was a key milestone.

The purpose of the masterplan was to:

- set the shape of the campus – the existing buildings have expressed vertical and
  horizontal articulation
- provide a palette of materials to work in order to help provide a cohesion to the campus, the west end and to Glasgow – red sandstone and brick also mixed material
- create opportunities for people to gather, which should be reinforced by buildings
- lanes - these have become active routes within the City, not just service access routes.

The design guide also considered specification for the internal design, so that, although each building would have a unique feel, there would be some standard features which would be beneficial in terms of efficiencies and, in the longer term, in relation to repair and maintenance.

In April 2016, the University took possession of the Western Infirmary site. The site was now boarded off while intrusive surveying was carried out, with demolition expected to start later this year, subject to approval of the master plan.

The Learning and Teaching Hub was the first project to be progressed on the site of the Boyd Orr car park. The Hub was of particular strategic importance to the University and would create greater learning and teaching space for students. The planning application was ready to submit, which was a significant milestone. Consultation had taken place and students had been pivotal in helping to shape the building and to define specification and requirements. A key focus was to develop robust buildings that met current needs and would continue to do so for many years to come. The full business case was being developed, prior to work commencing.

Plans initially had been to build the Hub as phased development; however, this had proved too costly so it would now be built as a single build. This meant that the School of Mathematics and Statistics would be relocated to a temporary site initially. The project had been reviewed and the location tested and it was believed that for the University this was the right approach. The length of time that the School would occupy the temporary sight was not yet known and would be dependent on review of the capital plan to determine the order of development projects. The School were reassured that the temporary location was a prime site and therefore there would be an impetus to develop the new permanent location to free up the site for further development.

Opportunities to reduce the cost were being explored while not compromising the functionality of the Hub.

The Boyd Orr Building would be physically connected to the Hub on three levels. As part of the design process, refurbishment of the common areas of Boyd Orr were being considered, including a ground floor café area. The Building had a relatively limited life span due to its external condition so external cladding, similar to the work undertaken on the Library, would be carried out, to greatly improve the condition.

There was concern raised in discussions about the potential loss of teaching space caused by the relocation of the School of Mathematics and Statistics and the redevelopment of the Boyd Orr. Council of Senate was reassured that it was not anticipated that the loss of teaching space in these buildings would occur at the same time, the work would be phased to ensure that the impact on space was minimised.
It was reported that there were a number of challenges ahead and that there nine-ten projects underway. There were some challenges ahead around individual projects; some proposed projects had been identified as exceeding the budget, or failing to demonstrate how they would support the ambition of the University. There was also ongoing discussion about engagement with research teams at the University in terms of a better defined a Smart campus, in the first instance in terms of energy, innovation in construction and sensors. That information would be used to inform decisions about how to run the estate more efficiently.

In terms of next steps, Professor Juster reported the following activities:

- Review of projects
- Submission of the full business case for the Learning and Teaching Hub
- Consideration and approval for the move of Mathematics and Statistics
- Appointment of a delivery partner

Construction of the Learning and Teaching Hub was expected to be completed for 2019-20. The full business case was due to be presented to Court at the December 2016.

The order of further developments would be determined over the summer to present plans to Court in December 2016. It was anticipated that the next project after the Learning and Teaching Hub would be approximately a year after the Hub development.

It was reported that demolition was a separate phase. Demolition was anticipated to be completed by the middle of next year. Construction would then start straight away. It was critical that service routes were established and in operation as a matter of priority. Construction was then anticipated to start by the end of next year.

4. Draft Budget Forecast

Senior Vice-Principal, Professor Neal Juster, provided a presentation on the University’s draft Budget for 2016/17 and four-year financial forecast. The final draft Budget would be submitted to Court for approval on 22 June 2016. It was reported that it had been the most challenging budget round in a number of years due to a real cash reduction of £3.8M through loss in SFC income.

Key features that would continue to affect the budgetary position in the next four years were the balance between salaries and overseas fees. The recent changes to the pension scheme, and resulting increase in pension contribution had an impact on the salary bill, which would also be affected by changes to the National Insurance contribution being introduced next year. However, the International and RUK student recruitment was currently buoyant, which balanced the staff/salary costs. It was reported that this was these were the greatest areas of risk to the University.
In discussion concern was expressed that the salary costs appeared to be balanced against the International student income. Concern was also voiced about the need to invest in existing staff as well as in order to recruit stars. Professor Juster reminded Council of Senate that there were limitations in terms of the income streams that could be grown. International fee income had allowed growth of staff numbers and the size of the University. The two streams were not set out to equate to one another, it was just the case that they were the largest income stream and largest expenditure.

The forecast surplus for 2015-16 was £17.3M. The draft budget surplus for 2016-17 was £13.2M, reducing to £9.9M in 2019-20. The surpluses were required to support the Estate Development.

The following investments 2016-20 had been identified:

- Star researcher fund (£2m/year)
- LKAS fellowships (£1.8m/year)
- Targeted reductions in SSRs
- Targeted research leadership
- Targeted enhancement of support services
- Teaching administration support
- Protection of library consumables

Post-election, initial discussions to allow planning for investment and development had taken place. It was not anticipated that there would be cash growth over the next three years. There would be clarity on the multi spending review later in the year.

There was recognition of how well the University’s academic community had done in terms of increase in research income to a position of 5th in the Russell Group, from 17th. The growth however, inevitably put additional pressure on space.

Professor Juster reported that further growth of student numbers was dependant on the development of the Learning and Teaching Hub. International student demand continued to increase. Although there were some challenges faced in terms of immigration and visas, the share of international students at the University of Glasgow continued to grow, which was not the case across the sector, including some competitor institutions.

Distance Learning opportunities would further augment international recruitment of students to Glasgow. PGT numbers were not expected to grow as significantly and it was recognised that there needed to be a greater emphasis on distance learning to enhance growth. It was still early stage and potential had yet to be fully realised. In the short to medium term, growth was restricted: however, more groups of programmes were due to be introduced, increasing the total number of PGT programmes by distance learning to 15. If growth in numbers was evident, distance learning would be and a priority for investment.
Financial Pressures identified were:

- Overseas student demand
- Cuts in overall SFC budget post-election
- USS pension deficit
- Salary budget
- Potential exit from the EU
- Funding the estates development

The University Superannuation Scheme (USS) assets were steady, and ahead of targets. Low interest rates were an area of risk. It was identified that the next few years presented a real opportunity to move the University of Glasgow on, to see growth and great success.

The introduction of the new district heating system would result in significant savings.

Mitigation against the Financial Pressures were identified as:

- Increasing the price of high demand courses
- Introducing new full fee paying courses
- Distance Learning
- TNE
- Expand activity in current partnerships
- Efficiency of processes

In discussion concern was expressed that potential efficiencies involved the removal of some courses. It was reported that it was not anticipated that there would be significant shifts in academic activity, and that, if that was the case, Council of Senate would be involved in the decision making. However, there was need to be mindful of areas where small class sizes were operating, which was not efficient.

Council of Senate were interested to hear about why the planned route for expansion was not to borrow the required funds, when this was the approach that had been taken by other institutions and when there was incentive to do so at the current low interest rates. It was reported that the profile of spend meant that cash was not needed for the next four years. To borrow the £100M required to finance the development would present a risk to the University. However, if Court approved the Budget, the option to borrow would be considered, but it would need to be incorporated into the balance sheet, when the money was not needed yet. To borrow later would likely be at a higher interest rate. There were discussions taking place with lenders to secure borrowing at less than 3% interest rate, which would create a cash flow and savings of £1.5M, however the servicing of the loan would be an additional expense. If this option were pursued, there needed to be consideration of when and the right level of borrowing, taking into account
the associated risks. There was a lot of borrowing being undertaken at other institutions, but that could be considered a risky strategy.

It was observed that, although the figures changed year on year, the financial risks to the University seemed to remain the same. It was reported that the University was in a much stronger financial position than it had been six years ago.

Council of Senate also asked about consideration of opportunities for TNE. Professor Juster reported that initial upfront costs would be substantial and some opportunities were prohibited due to regulations. It was reported that a campus in Penang had been considered, but that analysis indicated it would be an insecure investment, without guaranteed income stream. There was recognition that there was price sensitivity and that potential students who could afford to pay the level of fees required to make it a financially sustainable operation would be in a position to pay to study in Glasgow. The strategy was to focus on collaborations that would enhance the profile of the University. The partnerships with campuses in Singapore and China were already contributing substantially to the University’s financial position. It was important that projects were not undertaken that would pose a risk to the investments in the campus development.

It was noted that the activity undertaken to reduce staff:student ratios would be subject specific.

5. Education Policy and Strategy Committee: Report from the meeting held on 4 May 2016

Professor Coton highlighted two items from the EPSC report:

5.1 Topic Update: Final Report from the Commission on Widening Access

It was reported that following the Scottish Parliament elections in May, the report would receive further attention.

It was noted by Council of Senate that the report noted that there were greater challenges faced in opening opportunities to study Medicine than other subjects. Professor Coton reported that the University of Glasgow had set the pace and was the leading institution for widening access places to study Medicine. It was acknowledged that there were challenges with competing targets of gender balance with the widening access commitment but that widening access was recognised of being of central importance. The gender balance was contrary to gender equality and it was noted that the report was highlighting the fact there needed to be a holistic approach. It was reported that there were 10 additional widening access places to study Medicine, but there had been a hope that there would be more, and a continued hope that there would more in the future. It was also noted that Dentistry was exceeding its targets for widening access places.
5.2 Student Teaching Awards Report 2015-16

Professor Coton reported that the 2015-16 Student Teaching Awards (STAs) had been a great success and he congratulated Ms Gratton, SRC Vice President (Education) and the SRC for organising the awards.

6. From REF2014 UoA Reviews to Mini REF

Professor Miles Padgett, presented an update on the UoA reviews leading to the Mini REF. Professor Padgett reported that the project was to review University of Glasgow submissions to each REF2014 Unit of Assessment - a forward looking exercise about how to collectively realise potential. The process was about to enter the third phase and was due to be completed in July 2016. The reviews so far had proved to be valuable, aside from the preparation for the next REF, which was expected to have a census date of 2020, to be reported in 2021.

The review panel consisted of a Vice-Principal as Chair, a University of Glasgow cognate member and 3 external members; an output assessor from REF14, an impact assessor from REF14, a leading academic.

Moving forwards with the Mini REF, there was recognition that the REF was not purely about distribution of funding, but also about driving behaviour. The key would seem to be quality, rather than quantity.

In terms of the next REF, it was evident from the Green Paper on HE Reform; Lord Stern review of REF that solutions were being sought to reduce the cost and administrative burden of REF.

Lord Stern review of REF would:

- Consider other models of research performance assessment
- Provide options for future iterations of the REF focusing on a simpler, lighter-touch method of research assessment, that more effectively uses data and metrics while retaining the benefits of peer review

7. Convener’s Business

7.1 Guild – New University European Network

The Principal reported the launch of a New University European Network, the agreement for which had been signed on 1 June 2016. The network - a group of world-leading universities held an inaugural meeting in Brussels to found the Guild of European Research Intensive Universities. The Guild brought together universities that have demonstrable excellence in teaching, research and policy formation from across Europe to collaborate on the creation of innovative solutions to some of Europe’s most intractable scientific and social challenges.

Amongst the institutions represented in Brussels were the universities of Bologna, Glasgow, Göttingen, Groningen, Krakow (Jagiellonian), Oslo, Tübingen, Uppsala, and Warwick.
Preliminary discussions had also been had with a number of central European universities and other members would be announced when the Guild was formally launched on November 21, 2016, at an event that would also be held in Brussels.

Professor Ole Petter Ottersen (Oslo) had been appointed as the Chair; Professor Anton Muscatelli Vice-Chair. Professor Stanislaw Kistryn (Krakow) was Treasurer; and Professor Jan Palmowski (Warwick) Secretary General.

7.2 Higher Education and Research Bill

The Principal reported that the Higher Education Research Bill had now been published. The Bill contained details of provisions for the abolition of HEFCE and OFFA and the creation of the Office for Students (OfS) and UK Research and Innovation.

The OfS, would take over some of the responsibilities of HEFCE and would be the regulator for higher education teaching. The Bill gave OfS the autonomy to assess or make arrangements for assessment of quality and standards applied to higher education by English providers. There was a subtle change that allowed the OfS to conduct the assessments itself if it wished and to determine the quality standard to be used. The OfS would have the power to remove university titles.

Research Councils would be dissolved as separate legal entities and their Royal Charter would be revoked. Councils would act as committees within United Kingdom Research and Innovation (UKRI) – a non-Departmental Public Body. The Bill proposes that the Secretary of State would have considerable power over the setting and direction of funding for research.

The legislative protection for dual support promised in the White Paper states that the Secretary of State must have regard to the balanced funding principle, however it was anticipated that the balance of dual support would likely to change.

7.3 TEF White Paper


The White Paper included provision for the “Teaching Excellence Framework”

The Principal reported that for Scotland there were specific concerns. Scottish Universities could opt in, if they wished, but would also have the opportunity to opt out of stage 1 of TEF in the next 2-3 weeks.

Next year, pilots of TEF 2 would be carried out across England. It was anticipated there would be a bell-curve of outcomes, with few earning the higher grades. Commitment to TEF 2 would be expected in July this year. The proposed metrics were considered poor proxies for teaching
quality and included, for example retention which would compare Scottish four year programmes with 3 year programmes in the rest of the UK, when dropout rates for longer courses would inevitably be higher.

It was also anticipated that there would be a link with HMRC to ascertain salary levels after graduation.

TEF 3 was anticipated to be at subject level, with external panels, much like the REF. It had already been established that the sector would be expected to pay for TEF. The burden on the Sector would be significant. Subject level assessment of Learning and Teaching had not taken place in the UK for almost 15 years.

There were great concerns that TEF would not be a measure of teaching excellence, but would likely be used by English institutions to set fee levels. If the University and other Scottish institutions did not participate, there would be a risk to recruitment, a matter that was currently being considered by Scottish Government.

It was reported that there were also discussions around REF staff submission and whether there would be a review of the balance between Research and Teaching.

The Scottish Government had indicated that Scottish universities could participate in TEF 1, but would be required to continue to participate fully in the Scottish Quality Enhancement Framework. It was noted that TEF 2 would be seen as equivalent to ELIR. There was also concern about the prospect of potential risk to the Scottish Quality Framework.

8. Clerk of Senate’s Business

8.1 Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee

The Clerk of Senate reported that the following person had accepted the invitation issued by the Principal, on behalf of the Senate, to receive the award of an Honorary Degree in June 2016 (the morning of Tuesday 28 June):

DOCTOR OF SCIENCE (DSc)

Professor Jim Hough, Scientist, University of Glasgow

Council of Senate members were encouraged to attend the graduation ceremony for their students.

8.2 Extra item: Report of the UCU action on the examination process

Members of Council of Senate were informed about the possible consequences of the current UCU dispute on the approval of exam results, and particularly the impact of the resignation of some external examiners on the process.
The Clerk of Senate assured Council that the University would remain compliant with its obligations on quality and standards as expressed in both the UK Quality Code and its own Code of Assessment. In particular, there are two Indicators in the UK Quality Code which were particularly

Council of Senate was assured that there would be no compromising of academic standards as it was essential to protect students as well as the University's reputation. It was recognised universities would doubtless be under considerable external scrutiny at this time.

It was reported that the Senate Office continued to offer advice to Schools and Research Institutes on how to proceed if an external examiner on one or more programmes had resigned in support of the UCU action.

Council of Senate noted the extent of resignations of external examiners. Of the 389 external examiners across the institution and up to the morning of 2 June 2016, nine had resigned following the UCU advice.

In these circumstances, students would be supported as far as possible, particularly those expecting to graduate this summer. Consideration of options available to ensure students received the awards to which they are entitled, was currently taking place.