Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 22 June 2016 in the Senate Room

Present:
Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Cindy Callaghan (attending in place of Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative), Ms Morag Deans SRC Assessor, Professor Lindsay Farmer Senate Assessor, Dr Carl Goodyear Senate Assessor, Professor Nick Hill Senate Assessor, Professor Karen Lury Senate Assessor, Mr Liam King SRC President, Mr Brian McBride General Council Assessor, Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson General Council Assessor, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor’s Assessor, 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) (to item 3), Professor Jon Cooper (Vice-Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange), Professor Frank Coton (Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation), 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) (to item 3), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court),

Observing:
Ameer Ibrahim, Elizabeth Passey

Apologies:
Members: Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Cllr Pauline McKeever Glasgow City Council Representative, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee 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 Roibeard O Maolalaigh (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal), Professor Miles Padgett (Vice-Principal Research)

CRT/2015/42. Announcements

Elizabeth Passey, Convener of Court from 1 August 2016, and Mr Ameer Ibrahim, SRC President elect, were welcomed as observers.

Brian McBride and Liam King were attending their final meeting of Court. Court thanked them for their contributions to Court and wished them well in the future.

David Ross was attending his final meeting as Convener of Court and General Council Assessor. On behalf of Court and the University, the Principal thanked him for his tremendous contribution to Court, to the University and to Scottish Higher Education governance over the last 12 years. The University had recently recognised these contributions by the award of an honorary doctorate of the University to Mr Ross.
CRT/2015/43. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 13 April 2016

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2015/44. Matters Arising

CRT/2015/44.1 Glasgow Student Villages (GSV)

At the last meeting, Court had 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 campus redevelopment. The refinancing of GSV as proposed would provide greater University control over the accommodation arrangements and reduce fixed cash commitments in the short term. Routine maintenance would continue to be undertaken by Sanctuary Housing, GSV’s owner. Court had agreed in April that subject to satisfactory terms being negotiated, the refinancing of the Glasgow Student Villages debt should go ahead.

Court received an update from Robert Fraser on the status of the GSV deal and on key elements that would change from the current arrangements; and details of cash flows. In response to a question about the benefits of the proposed refinancing, Court noted that it would take advantage of present low interest rates, provide more flexibility with regard to the financing of the campus redevelopment, and enable the University better to address student accommodation needs in the context of significant competition from high quality newer buildings that were being provided locally by the private sector. Robert Fraser agreed to provide David Milloy with further information about amortisation.

CRT/2015/45. Strategic Plan and KPIs, Budget 2016/17 and Financial Forecasts

Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice Principal, briefed Court on the University’s current performance against its strategic KPIs and on the 2016-17 budget and four year financial forecasts.

June 2016 had marked the first anniversary of the launch of the new strategic plan, *Inspiring People - Changing the World*. The strategy provided a route map for the actions and investments needed to ensure Glasgow that built on its position as a World-class, World-changing University. These investment priorities included: developing underlying student infrastructure; investing in improving the student experience; continuing to invest and build towards REF 2020; preparing for the major development of the Gilmorehill campus; improving business intelligence by investing in improving data quality and the implementation of a data warehouse; and investing in change programmes, for example by growing leadership capability and improving efficiency and effectiveness. The budget and capital plan had been developed to ensure that these investments could be made.

Court heard that 2016/17 would see the combination of 3 significant cost pressures on the budget: a cash reduction in the grant from the SFC; the increase in employer NI contributions; and increases in employer contributions to the USS pension scheme. However, the financial forecast showed that the University would maintain cash generation at or above the KPI target of £24.5m. This was achievable through a modest growth in international student numbers, the implementation of a premium fee policy for popular PGT courses, small growth in the level of contribution from research and commercial activity, and control of costs. In response to a question about the ability of the University to accommodate additional students, Court noted
that the predicated spread of additional student numbers across the Colleges was such that this would be manageable. Discussions had taken place with regard to additional demands on University Services arising from the growth. Court noted that the staff:student ratio should not be adversely affected.

Court noted a summary of the University’s annual performance against the 22 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) approved by Court in June 2015 and detailed in the strategic plan; and also noted trends in KPIs where these measures had been recorded over a number of years. A smaller number of newer KPIs were in their first year, and therefore trends were not available. Court also noted a summary of the University’s performance in domestic and international league tables for the 2010-2016 period.

With respect to the University budget, the 2016/17 draft budget would result in a cash generation of £24.5m, which corresponded to a management accounting surplus of £13.2m. The budgetary forecast to 2019/20 predicted cash generation of £24.4m, £26.2m and £27.0m in financial years 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20 respectively. This corresponded to management accounting surpluses of £13.3m, £14.7m and £9.9m respectively.

Court noted details of Income and Expenditure as restated under the new Financial Reporting Standard (FRS) 102, noting also that there would be more volatility given the required revised treatment of capital income receipts.

University surpluses to 2018/19 were based on a number of assumptions, including the SFC grant letter’s 150 additional widening participation undergraduate places to be funded in 2016/17; overseas student fee growth, Research and commercial growth and RUK student fee growth (net of discounts) as determined by Colleges; and assumed salary voids and Pay awards.

Court approved the 2016/17 Budget and financial forecasts, and approved the Capital Plan spend for 2016/17 and forecasts thereafter, in the knowledge that the forecasts for 2017/18 onwards would be subject to review in the autumn of 2016 and presented to Court in December 2016.

Court thanked Professor Juster for the briefing.

CRT/2015/46. Report from the Principal

CRT 2015/46.1 Higher Education and Research White Paper

The White Paper had been published on 16 May 2016. Core elements included 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 focused 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 were also present as cross-cutting themes.

It was intended that Stage 1 of the Teaching Excellence Framework would 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. The HE sector in Scotland generally valued the Scottish Framework for Enhancement (its focus was on enhancement, rather than audit) and did not wish to jeopardise this approach and ethos in favour of the TEF, although not being in the TEF could lead to no apparent means of benchmarking teaching quality against a common UK-wide...
assessment methodology. It was hoped that a UK wide recognition of the Scottish quality enhancement framework could be achieved, with an understanding that it was at least as demanding as the intended levels of the TEF.

**CRT 2015/46.2 University Rankings**

There had been two recently published UK League Tables. In the Complete University Guide, the University had risen one place from 30th to 29th since 2015 (30th in 2014); and the University had been placed 26th in the Guardian league table, down from 24th in 2015 (25th in 2014).

**CRT 2015/46.3 New Regius Professorship of Precision Medicine**

Her Majesty the Queen had 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, had been created to mark the Queen’s 90th birthday.

**CRT 2015/46.4 Guild of European Research Intensive Universities**

A group of world-leading universities, including Glasgow, had held an inaugural meeting in Brussels to found the Guild of European Research Intensive Universities. The Guild brought together universities that had 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. The Principal would be Vice-Chair of the Guild, which would be formally launched in November 2016.

**CRT 2015/46.5 Growing Value Scotland Task Force (GVS)**

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, had been launched on 25 May, contributing 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.

**CRT 2015/46.6 Chartered Institute of Public Relations (CIPR) Excellence Awards 2016**

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

**CRT/2015/46.7 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 and Alumni events.

---

**CRT/2015/47. Report from the Secretary of Court**
Since the April Court meeting, Court members had been advised that Finance Committee had met in May and, among other things, had approved expenditure of £1.162M to continue design work on the Learning & Teaching Hub. This work would help inform the full business case for the development, which would be brought to Court in December 2016.

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

The Court Estates Strategy Working Group had recognised that there was a significant amount of work to be done in relation to bringing the Learning & Teaching Hub project to a point where there was a robust business case that Court could consider in December 2016; and had recognised the need for reviewing, individually and collectively, the progress of the other projects so that, if Court decided to proceed with the Hub, it would do so in the context of an overall strategy that was sound and affordable.

SMG had 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 would require choices and prioritisation. In addition, a short-term working group of senior executives and some Court members – which it was agreed would include lay members and a Senate Assessor - would meet over the summer, and a full briefing would be provided to Court at its annual Strategy Day in September. It was noted that the boards associated with individual projects would continue to operate under the terms previously advised to Court.

The Strategy Day was scheduled for 26 September. The day would include a briefing on the Estates Strategy and an opportunity for Court members to contribute to the ongoing discussion about this. The draft programme would also include some external speakers. Lindsay Farmer asked for it to be recorded that he had raised a point about the event being held on the Monday of the September holiday weekend and that, albeit that the University no longer observed this holiday, staff might have family and childcare responsibilities that continued nevertheless, and that holding the event on a day when some members of Court might be unable to attend was not consistent with the family-friendly HR policies of the University. David Newall had advised him that the corresponding weekend next year would be avoided.

Court approved a recommendation from the Nominations Committee that Heather Cousins take on the convenership of the Audit Committee with effect from 1 August 2016, and up to March 2018, the end of her current term as a member of Court.

Professor Matthew Walters had 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 had been appointed as Head of the School of Chemistry for four years from 1 August 2016, succeeding Professor Stephen Clark.

CRT/2015/47.5 Senior Vice-Principal

Court approved the reappointment of Professor Neal Juster to the role of Senior Vice-Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, for a further 3 years to 31 July 2019.

CRT/2015/47.6 Court Procedural Review Group – Interdisciplinary Studies

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

Since the last meeting of Court, CPRG had given management the authority to take forward an organisational change proposal in the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, based at Dumfries. The proposal related to curricular changes which had been implemented in recent years and which now meant there was a reduction in the requirement for staffing resource. The proposal would result in a reduction of up to 1.5 FTE staff.

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

CRT/2015/47.7 Higher Education Governance Act

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

CRT/2015/47.8 Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance

The current Governance Code for Scottish Higher Education had been published by the Committee of Scottish Chairs in July 2013. At the time of publication, the chairs had committed to a review of the Code after 3 years. A Review Committee had now been established, and as part of the review, the University would receive a visit, with members of Court likely to be interviewed as part of the process.

CRT/2015/47.9 Signature of Documents - Glasgow Student Villages

The Secretary of Court would be absent on annual leave during part of June and July 2016. It was expected that during this time, documentation relating to the refinancing of the Glasgow Student Villages (GSV) debt would require to be signed. Court had agreed at its April 2016 meeting that, subject to satisfactory terms being negotiated, the refinancing of the GSV debt could proceed. At the present meeting, Court had noted an update on the status of the GSV deal and on key elements of the new arrangements; and details of cash flows. As had been explained at the previous meeting, the refinancing would provide greater University control over the accommodation arrangements and reduce fixed cash commitments in the short term.
The University’s Ordinance on the matter of signature of such documentation, Ordinance 177 Execution of Deeds, provided that a deed, instrument, or document executed on behalf of the University Court was valid if it was sealed with the Common Seal of the University Court and signed by one member of the Court and the Secretary of the Court, or some other person duly appointed by the Court for this purpose in place of the Secretary.

Court approved the appointment of the Deputy Secretary, Dr Dorothy Welch, to sign in place of the Secretary of Court, Mr David Newall, for the purposes of the GSV-related documentation.

CRT/2015/48. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2015/48.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2014/48.1.1 Budget 2016/17 and four year forecasts

Finance Committee had agreed to recommend the budget and forecasts to Court.

Court had approved the 2016/17 budget and financial forecasts, under item CRT/2015/45. Strategic Plan and KPIs, Budget 2016/17 and Financial Forecasts.

CRT/2015/48.1.2 CapEx Application: Decant of Mathematics & Statistics to Modular Accommodation

Professor Nick Hill, Senate Assessor and a member of staff in the School of Mathematics & Statistics, left the meeting for this item.

At its recent meeting, the Finance Committee had 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 had agreed to defer approval to Court, noting the proposed relocation of Mathematics & Statistics formed an integral part of the Learning & Teaching Hub project. For the present meeting, Court had received the CapEx application, together with additional information regarding the alternatives to purchasing the modular building and the cost impact of delaying a decision.

In discussion, comments were recorded relating to: i) the level of contingency element in this particular CapEx budget, which some members considered to be high, the Director of Estates explaining that a contingency was needed because of the building requiring engineering to achieve the desired quality and because of a ground survey being necessary; ii) the potential effect on recruitment and retention of staff and students during the period of decant, where it was noted that discussions had been taking place for several months with the School - now to their satisfaction - with regard to the functionality and configuration of the temporary building, that the modular accommodation was of reasonable quality, that much teaching would take place elsewhere on the campus, that steps would be taken along the lines of the Tay House move in order to minimise impact on staff and students, and that potential expansion of the School in the future would not have been possible within the current accommodation in any event; and iii) the lifespan of the modular building in light of the cost, where it was explained that the decant was estimated to be 5 years, although the quality of the modular building would be such that it would be usable for longer.
Court also asked that the Director of Estates Ann Allen discuss matters further with co-opted member David Milloy, with regard to technical questions on which he had sought clarification.

Court approved the CapEx application, subject to management noting the comments made by members and to the discussion being had between Ms Allen and Mr Milloy.

Court agreed that while Court had yet to approve the final business case for the Hub, its approval of the CapEx application was given in the context of the intention and strong wish for the Learning & Teaching Hub to be operational for 2019/20, which would be delayed by a year were there a short-term delay in the modular accommodation being arranged; and of its acknowledgement that the move would inevitably cause some disruption to those affected.

**CRT/2015/48.1.3 Capex Applications**

The Committee had approved CapEx applications relating to: Adam Smith Business School - Finance Refurbishment; Chemistry & Engineering Complex - Advance Works - Fees; and Learning & Teaching Hub - Fees Stage 4.

**CRT/2015/48.1.4 Endowment Investment Report**

Court noted an endowment investment report as at 31 March 2016.

**CRT/2015/48.1.5 Financial reports**

Court noted an overview of performance as at 30 April 2016.

The report was noted.

**CRT/2015/48.2 Estates Committee**

**CRT/2015/48.2.1 Sustainability Strategy**

Earlier in the year, following discussion at Estates Committee, the University’s performance in carbon reduction and sustainability had undergone review, with a Sustainable Environment Working Group overseeing the process. The first stage had involved analysing how the University performed across a range of sustainability issues relative to Russell Group competitors. While there had 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 had not performed well in other areas, including electricity consumption and waste recycling.

In April, SMG had 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.

The Estates Committee had endorsed the Governance structure, the draft Sustainability Strategy and Sustainability Action Plan, which Court also now endorsed.
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**CRT/2015/48.2.2 Estates Strategy**

Court noted the progress made in respect of the Estate Strategy.

**CRT/2015/48.2.3 CapEx Applications**

Court noted Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications relating to: Adam Smith Business School (Finance Refurbishment) in the sum of £690,700 subject to final review; Learning and Teaching Hub (Modular Accommodation for Mathematics and Statistics) in the sum of £8,307,792, which application had also been reviewed and approved by Court under the Finance Committee item; Chemistry and Engineering Complex - Joseph Black Building (Professional Fees) in the sum of £830,000; 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.

The report was noted.

**CRT/2015/48.3 Audit Committee**

**CRT/2015/48.3.1 Risk Management**

Court was ultimately responsible for Risk Management within the University. This function was largely delegated, through the work of the Audit Committee. In the light of recent discussions at Court and at Audit Committee, Court was asked to consider modifications to the current approach, and agreed:

1. that Court should, through the Audit Committee, receive the University’s strategic risk register together with the mitigating actions proposed by SMG. This would happen next at the October 2016 meeting of Court, and annually thereafter;
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; the date would be confirmed with members as soon as possible.

Subject to these two changes, the University’s approach to risk management would continue as currently, and Audit Committee would continue to provide oversight of risk management on Court’s behalf, including the arrangements relating to the Colleges.

**CRT/2015/48.3.1 Other Audit Committee business**

At its recent meeting, the Audit Committee had received reports on recent internal audits, had approved the 2016/17 Internal Audit Plan and had approved the External Auditors’ approach to preparing the financial statements for the year to 31 July 2016. The Committee had received an update on the HE Governance (Scotland) Bill, and briefings on cyber security and Risk Management.

The report was noted.

**CRT/2015/48.4 Human Resources Committee**

**CRT/2015/48.4.1 Equal Pay and Gender Pay Equality**
Court considered a paper on Equal Pay and Gender Pay Equality, which had been provided following discussion at the April Court meeting. At that meeting, Court had agreed to support the desire to reduce the University’s gender pay gap, but had 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 explained the challenge faced by the University, and the HE Sector, in addressing the underlying issues which resulted in the current Gender Pay gap. It had been recognised by the HR Committee that occupational segregation played a key role in the gap, and that there were challenges in maintaining gender parity in more senior grades, primarily within the R&T job family. The Committee had agreed that a multi-pronged approach was required, and that while there was a genuine challenge for the University, there were also potential opportunities to be a leader within the sector. By actively addressing the underlying factors impacting on the gender pay gap and becoming a leader in this area, the University could secure competitive advantage in both the attraction and retention of top talent.

Court agreed that the University should have a high, but realistic, ambition in terms of equality in pay and occupational structures, and should aim to be a leading University in this area. The HR Committee would consider what would be realistic targets for the University to adopt. Court agreed that there would be competitive advantage to be gained by being one of the leading universities which committed to stem the loss of female research talent, and - by extension - sought to attract such talent for professorial succession planning.

Court noted that relevant actions might include the wider adoption of succession planning management tools for academic and leadership roles, continuing targeted support and proactive encouragement of females ready for promotion, continuous review of recruitment practices, and increased targeting of top female talent. Actions might also include promotion of greater achievement of Athena Swan across the University; and an expectation that all senior managers and professorial grades were actively addressing relevant gender imbalances in their structures, and encouraging innovative action; and the adoption of specific targets.

While acknowledging that the statistics were required to be presented in a certain way by national monitoring bodies at present, Court agreed that institutional data should be drilled down as much as - and as soon as – possible, to provide a more accurate profile, rather than high level raw percentages being used.

Court would be kept updated on progress and on key milestones, later in 2016.

**CRT/2015/48.4.2 Other HR Committee business**

The Committee had received updates on: industrial action by members of UCU in relation to the national pay dispute; developments to the P&DR and Academic Promotions processes; and the 2016 Staff Survey, which has had a record level of participation. The Committee had also received briefings on strategy within the College of Arts, and on researcher development across the University and the focus on attracting and retaining top talent. The Committee had approved two newly reviewed HR Policies, namely Grievance and Attendance.

The report was noted.
CRT/2015/48.5 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

The Committee had reviewed the Safety Risk Register, and noted actions arising from an audit of Business Continuity Management. The key actions that were being put in place with regard to this latter area included: 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.

The report was noted.

CRT/2015/48.6 Remuneration Committee

The report was noted.

CRT/2015/49. Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate 2 June 2016

The Council of Senate had received briefings on the Estate Strategy and the draft University budget 2016/17; and updates on: the Unit of Assessment reviews leading to the Mini REF; the Higher Education and Research Bill; and the UK Government Higher Education & Research White Paper.

The communications were noted.

CRT/2015/50. Any Other Business

Professor Anna Dominiczak was congratulated by Court on her recent appointment in the Queen’s Birthday Honours List, as a Dame Commander of the Order of the British Empire, in recognition of her services to cardiovascular and medical science.

On his retirement from Court, six years of which has been as Convener, David Ross recorded his thanks to Court members and attenders for their time and contributions, and to the Principal, David Newall, Deborah Maddern and colleagues in the Court Office for their support; and wished the University well in the future.

CRT/2015/51. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 12 October 2016 at 2pm in the Senate Room.
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Principal’s Report

Items A: For Discussion

1. Guild of European Research Intensive Universities
In previous reports I have referred to the formation of the Guild of European Research Intensive Universities, founded by a group of world-leading universities, including Bologna, Göttingen, Groningen, Krakow (Jagiellonian), Oslo, Tübingen, Uppsala, Warwick and Glasgow. In recent times the Universities of Ljubljana and Tartu have now formally committed to joining.

The Guild brings together universities that have demonstrable excellence in teaching, research and policy formation, to collaborate on the creation of innovative solutions to scientific and social challenges.

As a Vice-Chair, I have already participated in meetings of the Guild Board (28 June and 17 August) and the Guild will be formally launched on November 21, 2016, in Brussels.

In the meantime, in the light of the UK’s decision to leave the European Union, the current members of the Guild have called for enhanced European university collaboration.

The Guild has made three specific demands:

.1 The Guild has called on the UK Universities and UK Government to:
   • guarantee security of funding for all UK scientists funded under Horizon 2020, even after the UK leaves the EU;
   • guarantee Erasmus or Erasmus-equivalent funding for UK students beginning their degree programmes during EU membership; and
   • guarantee home fee levels for all EU students beginning their study whilst the UK is still a member.

The Guild recognizes that it is equally important that all EU member states guarantee existing fee levels for all UK students beginning their study during UK membership of the EU, and that students and researchers across Europe need as much certainty as is possible at this time.

.2 The Guild has called on the national governments in the UK, as well as the EU, to recognize the importance of Higher Education and to prioritise the free flow of students, academic staff and scholarly interaction as a key objective of Brexit negotiations. The Guild has said that the close collaboration of Europe’s world-leading universities is indispensable for delivering groundbreaking research, the ability to translate this into innovate products where appropriate, and
educating tomorrow’s innovators and leaders. The Guild has pointed out that the European Union has succeeded in creating highly effective cross-border funding mechanisms for collaborative research, innovation and mobility, and that to compromise these as a result of Brexit would cause irreparable damage to the knowledge societies of Europe.

3 At this time of uncertainty, the Guild has urged European universities and their staff and students to underline their important role through concrete action. The Guild will set an example of its own by committing to increase the level of student mobility amongst its members. It will also create a series of collaborative research workshops for the coming academic year and support growing the number of collaborative funding bids over the next three years, involving the best researchers within any of its institutions.


At the last meeting I reported that the White paper was published in May, with core elements including 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 including the creation of an Office for Students (OfS) and a new UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) body.

As I mentioned before, from a Scottish perspective the TEF presents a dilemma given that the HE sector in Scotland generally values the Scottish Framework for Enhancement and would not wish to jeopardise this approach and ethos in favour of the TEF. There is, however, a potential 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.

TEF will have three levels:

- (Entry level) Bronze
- Silver
- Gold

At this stage, the Department for Education in England has published a list of Higher Education Providers (HEPs) – including all Scottish HEIs – that have met the baseline ‘Bronze’ grade. This entry level (TEF Yr 1) is awarded to HEPs that have successfully undergone ELIR/other form of institutional review. TEF will be progressively developed over the next few years from an institutional (Provider) level assessment to a subject level assessment according to the following timetable:

- 2016-17 (Yr2): Provider-level TEF (which will allow classification above “Bronze”)
- 2017-18 (Yr3): Provider-level TEF and subject-level TEF piloted
- 2018-19 (Yr4): Subject-level TEF and likely to include PGT provision

Most Scottish Universities will not enter the Provider-level TEF stage until the rules of engagement for Scottish Institutions are clear and there is confidence that Scotland will not be disadvantaged. Universities Scotland has established a working group to provide advice on
Scotland’s position on TEF, in particular subject-level TEF. The group has met once and will meet as required. Glasgow is represented on the group by Dr. Jack Aitken, Director of Senate Office. The group has agreed Scotland should be party to the development of TEF, on the basis that further adaptation to Scottish circumstances can be negotiated and it is easier to do so from ‘inside the tent’. The outcome of these negotiations will determine whether Scottish Institutions participate in the TEF in the longer term.

3. Student Admissions including RUK
Admissions to the University for 2016/17, for Undergraduate and Postgraduate (PGT/PGR), Home, RUK and International students, is summarised below.

Undergraduate
A total of 4,840 undergraduate students will be admitted to the University this September versus a total target of 4,752. The sections below detail the intake by funding category.

Non RUK (Scottish & EU Admissions)
A total of 3,582 students were admitted from Scotland and EU versus a funded target of 3,464 (118 above target).

MD20/MD 40
Within the 3,464 Scottish Funded Target, the University was required to recruit a minimum of 783 students from areas of Multiple Deprivation (MD20/40 postcodes). A total of 788 students have been admitted in this category, meeting our SFC funded target.

RUK Admissions
A total of 751 RUK students have been admitted this year compared to 731 in 2015.

International
A total of 507 International students have been admitted this year compared to 462 in 2015.

Postgraduate PGT/PGR
While the registration process for PGT and PGR is not yet complete, indications are that all targets will be exceeded.

Total PGT intake is anticipated to be 4,953 (split 2,289 Home/EU and 2,664 international), compared to 4,509 in 2015 (split 2,076 Home/EU and 2,434 International). This represents a year on year growth of 9.8% (10.2% Home/EU and 9.4% International). It also represents an over-achievement versus target of 124 students with both the Home/EU and International targets being exceeded.

Total PGR intake is anticipated to be 1,964 (split 1,306 Home/EU and 658 international), compared to 1,962 in 2015 (split 1,335 Home/EU and 627 International). The 2016 intake of 1,964 is 34 above the 2016 target, with Home/EU 16 above target and International 18 above target.
3.1 rUK/EU Admission strategy for 2017/18

At a meeting of SMGr (12 September) members in liaison with the Director of MaRIO and Director of Planning & Business Intelligence discussed the level of tuition fee for rUK students for 2017 entry and agreed that if certain HEIs in England move to a £9,250 per annum fee, then the University should also move to charge £9,250, capped at 3 years, with no charge for 4th year. The agreement to lift the fee cap in Scotland to £9,250 has been reached with Scottish Government. If HEIs in England do not implement the increase, the fee level should remain at £9k.

It was also agreed not to amend/increase the level of tuition fee during the course of a student’s programme.

Looking ahead to 2018/19 entry, SMGr agreed that in May 2017 there should be a discussion around whether to continue the policy for rUK students of charging fees for 3 years or move to charge for 4 years.

EU Students

At the same meeting SMGr noted that there were many factors and variables at play making it difficult to predict the likely impact of Brexit on EU student numbers. There was a discussion regarding potential scenarios and possible admissions strategies.

SMGr agreed that in the absence of certainty around future government policy, the University should not undertake to maintain current fee arrangements for EU students for 2018 entry and beyond.

Agreed actions:

1. Expand the gathered field in order to increase the potential pool of home students.
2. Monitor EU applications closely to determine levels of demand for places.
3. Take a further view on admissions policies, depending on the developing state of play, around January 2017.
4. Set notional targets, reducing overall target number of EU students, in order to address the significant potential exposure.
5. Prepare statement to appear on website to keep potential applicants informed.

Items B: For Information

4. Standing Council on Europe

In late June, I was appointed by the First Minister, Nicola Sturgeon, to chair a group of experts to advise the Scottish Government on securing Scotland’s relationship with the EU. The Standing Council on Europe comprises specialists in legal, financial, business and diplomatic matters and encompasses a range of political and constitutional opinions. Our role is to advise the FM and the Scottish Government on three strategic areas:

- To provide expert advice on securing Scotland’s relationship with the EU;
- To consider the impact of any proposed changes to the UK’s relationship with the EU on Scottish interests;
• To advise Scottish Ministers through negotiations in order to secure Scottish interests and objectives.

Our role is to offer independent non-political advice on these matters. The council has now met twice.

5. Capital Stimulus Funding
In the recently published Programme for Government and confirmed in the Interim Letter of Guidance (2017-18) to the SFC issued by the Minister for Further Education, Higher Education and Science (29 September), £33m accelerated capital is to be awarded to support capital maintenance across FE and HE and £23m has been allocated to the HE Sector with an expectation from the Scottish Government that this is match funded by the sector. Of this £23m, Glasgow has been allocated £3.27m.

Also confirmed in the letter, is an additional £1.3m to be used to support capital investment in physical infrastructure for HE research. This funding, which will be match funded by the UK Government, is intended to ensure the University sector in Scotland continues to produce world class research. Glasgow has received £257k from the SFC, match funded by the UK Government. In total this is an extra £3.8m in capital funding bringing our overall capital funding up to £11.3m.

6. University Rankings and Awards
At the time of the last report, we had details from two of the UK League Tables: the Complete University Guide (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).

Since then, and in international league tables, the University has been placed 88th in the THE World Rankings, down from 76th last year (94th in 2014). In the QS World University Rankings, the University was placed 63rd, one place lower than last year (55th in 2014).

This year’s National Student Survey (NSS) rankings put the University of Glasgow in joint third position in Scotland and joint 24th among all UK higher education institutes, excluding specialist and private providers. The University is joint 7th in the Russell Group. Despite a continued decrease year on year, overall satisfaction for Glasgow continues to exceed all sector, Russell Group and Scotland averages. The sector, as a whole, remained flat year on year.

Glasgow continues to exceed all comparator groups for all teaching-related questions, with a slight decreasing trend across all comparators. For Assessment and Feedback, all comparator groups have made improvements in this area, with the exception of ‘Assessment arrangements have been fair’. Glasgow fell back further on this measure than did our comparators, and has not made the levels of improvement in line with them.

SMG has a League Table Group which is looking at how we can optimise our outcomes in future years. More importantly, we have set up a number of actions, led by Frank Coton to respond to the NSS outcomes and to work with Schools/Institutes and subject areas on improvement strategies.
For the second year running, the University of Glasgow has won the top title – **Higher Education Institution of the Year** – at The Herald’s Higher Education Awards. The University was also successful in the following student categories: **Student Support Team of the Year**: Counselling and Psychological Service; and **Outstanding Contribution from a Student**: Claudia Wasige. The award is given in recognition of an outstanding contribution to the institution and wider community, for work both on and off campus. Claudia worked in a wide variety of areas linked to overcoming inequalities, including establishing the Glasgow Oral Health Improvement Student Society (GOHISS) and its work in food banks, and other public engagement activities.

In terms of academic activity and research the University won the **Research Project of the Year**: Gravitational Waves (with the University of Strathclyde); **Outstanding Contribution to the Local Community**: Superhero Science Aspects of A.W.E.S.O.M.E, a project to promote STEM subjects to young people; and the **Innovation Technology Excellence Award**: School of Mathematics and Statistics.

### 7. 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, in the main, provided brief headings and can expand on any items of interest to Court.

#### Academic Development and Strategy

5 July: Lloyds Bank visited the University in connection with due diligence work relating to the financial transaction secured by the University. I gave a presentation on the University strategy and colleagues Professor Anna Dominiczak, and Ann Allen, provided presentations on MVLS/research and the Estates Strategy respectively.

23 August: Chaired interviews for the Chair in Structural Biology and the Head of Adam Smith Business School.

5 September: Hosted a dinner in the Lodging for the International Scientific Advisory Board of the Institute of Health and Wellbeing.

6 September: Met with senior representatives of Lipman Hearne the Chicago based agency that has been appointed to support the development of the Fundraising Campaign.

9 September: Spoke at a University in-house Masterclass for Research Leaders.

12-13 September: The University was visited by senior executives from the Wellcome Trust. They were taking part in a leadership development programme, facilitated by the Oxford Group, and used the University campus strategy as the focus for their work. The lines of enquiry they followed covered Cultural Changes, the Physical & Structural Environment. They talked to a range of staff at the University about aspects of our strategy and then considered what we were trying to achieve, reporting to members of the SMG on 13 September, with their observations and suggestions. I participated in elements of the exercise.
15 September: Along with appropriate colleagues, I participated in a meeting with consultants in relation to the Review of Higher Education Governance Code.

**Internationalisation Activities**

26 August: I attended the German Ambassador's Reception in Edinburgh.

5 September: Received a delegation from the Chinese Academy of Social Science (CASS). The Academy is a leading academic organization and comprehensive research center in the fields of philosophy and social sciences. The delegation was led by Prof. Yang Li, Chairman of CASS. He is a leading economist in China and specializes in the fields of monetary theory, banking and public finance.

12 September: Met and welcomed President Fernando Leon-Garcia, CETYS University, Mexico, who was visiting the University.

20 September: Opened and welcomed dignitaries and delegates to the Confucius Institute Conference organized by the University’s Confucius Institute, hosted a lunch, and participated in the closing ceremony. Mr. Wang Yongli, Minister Counsellor for Education, Chinese Embassy, Mr Ma, Deputy Director General, Hanban, Mr Pan, Consul General and Shirley–Anne Somerville, Minister for Further Education, Higher Education and Science all participated at some point throughout the conference.

28-29 September: Attended the 60th anniversary of UESTC, in Chengdu, China. I spoke on behalf of all the partner universities to offer congratulations, and, as a member of a panel, gave a presentation on the topic: *Innovative Talent Cultivation in the Context of Globalization*. Professors John Marsh and John Chapman took part in an unveiling ceremony to mark the establishment of our JEI partnership and the formation of the Glasgow College at UESTC.

3 October: Welcomed a visit by the Italian Consul General.

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

24 June, 26 August, 23 September, 4 October: participated in SFC meetings.

27 June: Attended a Civic Reception in the Hunterian as part of the French Studies international conference, welcomed the delegates and introduced Baillie Liz Cameron, who was representing the Lord Provost.

4 July: Chaired the first meeting of the Glasgow Commission on Economic Growth. A second meeting was held on 15 September.

5 July: Met with Karen Watt, Director of Culture, Tourism & External Affairs at the Scottish Government

6 July: Attended the third REF Review Steering Group (Stern Review) meeting.

12 July: Attended USS Board meeting and again on 22 September.
15 July: Attended a lecture in Cambridge delivered by Professor Peter Diamond in honour of Sir James Mirrlees’ 80th Birthday.

19 July: Managing Director Rangers Football Club, Stewart Robertson paid a courtesy visit.

20 July: Met with Project Director, Mike Emmerich of Metro-Dynamics. The company has been appointed by Renfrewshire Council on behalf of the 8 Glasgow City Region Local Authorities (LA) to develop a long term strategic economic plan for the Glasgow City Region (GCR). I was asked to give my thoughts and views on developing the strategy and its implementation. This was followed by a meeting with Metro-Dynamics and the GCR Commissioners.

21 July: Travelled to London for the USS Investment Committee. Prior to that meeting, I had a breakfast meeting with Philip Rycroft, Head of UK Governance Group and Francesa Osowska, Director for the Scotland Office in the UK Government. Attended a further USS investment Committee on 8 September.

18 & 19 August: Attended Council of Economic Advisers meeting, St Andrews House.

22 August: Received a visit from Tavish Scott MSP, Scottish Liberal Democrat, spokesperson for Education, Sport and Europe.

23 August: Met with Sandra Black, CEO Renfrewshire Council, Jenny Stewart KPMG & colleague Des McNulty, Public Policy Knowledge Exchange Officer to discuss Glasgow City Region Strategic Economic Plan.

25 August: Met with Susan Deighan, Director of City Marketing and External Relations and Chief Operating Officer of Glasgow Life as part of my induction to the Glasgow Life Board and to be briefed on the work of Glasgow Life and its Governance. On the 7 September I attended the Culture and Sport Annual General Meeting.

30 August – 1 September: Attended the CASE-Europe conference in Brussels for advancement professionals. Co-presented with Cathy Bell on Creating a University Master-plan for Expansion (30th), chaired the Leadership Summit (31st), and hosted the Graduate Trainee Breakfast on the morning of the 1st.

5 September: Welcomed Shirley-Anne Somerville MSP, Minister for Further Education, Higher Education and Science for an introductory visit to the University.

5 September: Hosted an introductory visit from Tony Carlin the new MD of the Glasgow Herald.

6 September: Participated in a Holyrood Magazine conference - Politics Explained: The Scottish Government and Brexit which focused on a range of issues involving various presenters. I was asked to speak on Scotland’s relationship with the rest of the world, post Brexit.
6 September: Met Jenny Gilruth MSP, as PLP for Education at the Scottish Parliament

12 September: Participated in the final session of an IPPI/RSE/DHI conference at Strathclyde University, *Minding Scotland's Money*.

15 September: Dinner with Lena Wilson, Chief Executive, Scottish Enterprise.

21 September: Hosted a dinner, attended by the Deputy First minister, and then a visit the next day by the Board of Governors of the Wellcome Trust headed by the Chair Baroness Eliza Manningham-Buller, to hear about some of the work supported by the Trust. I provided a presentation on our Strategy and senior colleagues presented on some of our key areas of research undertaken in MVLS and with Wellcome Trust connections and support.

4 October: I was invited to speak at Economic Development Association Scotland Event on: *Scotland’s Economy and Brexit Implications, Challenges and Opportunities*. Mike Russell, Scottish Government Minister for UK Negotiations on Scotland's Place in Europe and Dr Fabian Zuleeg, Member, Scottish Government Standing Council on Europe, and Chief Executive & Chief Economist, European Policy Centre, Brussels, also spoke.

5 October: Spoke at the Scottish Leaders Forum (SLF) on the Standing Council on Europe and took part in general discussion with SLF members.

6 October: Took part in a PwC Seminar addressing Higher Education and current risks facing HE.

6 October: Attended the Adam Smith lecture – and welcomed and introduced the speaker, Mr Darmono, Founder and Chairman, JABABEKA GROUP, Indonesia.

7 October: Attended Radio 4 Reith Lecture and hosted dinner in the Melville thereafter.

10 October: The Royal Society of Edinburgh and the David Hume Institute will be hosting a joint lecture by Professor Sir Angus Deaton, winner of the 2015 Nobel Prize for Economics. As part of the event, Sir Angus will formally be admitted to the RSE’s highest accolade of Honorary Fellowship and will be presented with a Royal Society of Edinburgh Royal Medal for his outstanding career in economics. I will be chairing the lecture and introducing Sir Angus.

11 October: I will be participating in a private briefing session with the House of Lords Select Committee on Science & Technology, together with Mark Walport, CSA to UK Government, and Lord Willetts. The session is looking at the role which Universities can play in developing the knowledge economy.

**Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events**

23 June and following: Presided over several of this year’s summer graduation ceremonies.

7 – 11 July: Travelled to USA and California for meetings with alumni, supporters and St Andrew’s Society Trustees.

13 July: Met with the new Queen Margaret Union President, Jack Smith and continued monthly meetings with SRC President and sabbaticals.

25 August: Chaired a staff/student open meeting on the University, Europe and the implications of Brexit.

8 September: Attended and spoke at a dinner held in Chawton House which involved Campaign Board members and potential alumni supporters and friends.

Over August, September, October I was involved in the selection, interview and appointment process for the new Chief Operating Officer.

8. **Senior Management Group business**
In addition to standing and regular items the following issues were discussed:

**SMG Meeting of 20 June, 2016**
- Inspiring Change – Delivering Excellence
- Reporting the Institutional KPI for Research Output Quality 2016
- Implications of possible staff return rules for REF 202X
- REF Review Reporting
  - UoA 3, Dentistry
  - UoA 4, Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience
- Technology Strategy Priorities
- GlasGOW Language Provision

**SMG Meeting of 20 July 2016**
- Research Themes
- LKAS Fellowships
- Open Access
- Campus Smart ID Card/Access Control Project

**SMG Meeting of 17 August 2016**
- NSS
- Risk List & Brexit Discussion

**SMG Meeting of 22 September 2016**
- Annual Strategic Planning Process
- Estates matters
- SRC – Introducing President and sabbatical officers
- Proposal for Organisational Change in the Learning and Teaching Centre
- Crichton Campus Consolidated Outcome Agreement 2016/17
- Open Access, Research Funders and the Research Excellence Framework
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Mr David Newall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker role</td>
<td>Secretary of Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Description</td>
<td>Report from Secretary of Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic last discussed at Court</td>
<td>Regular report to Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic discussed at Committee and Remuneration</td>
<td>Nominations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee business is referred to in the paper in one item each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee members present</td>
<td>Convener of Court, Heather Cousins, Ameer Murdoch MacLennan, Principal, Duncan Ross (Nominations Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major benefit of proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Cross University application on several items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating stats</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External bodies</td>
<td>Student Villages Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict areas</td>
<td>Competition and Markets Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dexterity**
- Low
- Immediate when relevant

**Topping**
- Green

**Red-Amber-Green Rating**
- Decision/Discussion/Information

**Paper Summary**
- Report from Secretary of Court on a number of items for Court's discussion/decision and/or information, as follows (A items only):
- Strategy Day
- Competition and Markets Authority: Student Debt
- Scheme of Delegated Authorities
- HE Governance (Scotland) Act Transitional Arrangements
- Remuneration Committee Business
- Anti Bribery Policy
- Composition of Audit Committee
- Vice Chairs and Vice Convener

**Topics to be discussed**
- As above plus any B items Court members may wish to discuss

**Action from Court**
- Listed under each item: specific decisions requested under:
  - A2 Competition and Markets Authority: Student Debt - three items to consider/approve; A3 revised Scheme of Delegated Authorities for approval; A5 Remuneration Committee - requested approval by Court for the policy guidance to the Committee for the SMSG salary review process; AB Court's views are sought on the application of University's Anti Bribery policy to lay members; A7 Court approval sought to appoint Senate Assessor member to Audit Committee; AB approval of proposals relating to Vice Chairs and Vice Convener. B items: routine approvals; Court and Committee appointments; proposed changes to Committee remits and Standing Orders.

**Recommendation to Court**

**Operating stats**

**Campus**
- All

**External bodies**
- Student Villages Ltd

**Conflict areas**
- Competition and Markets Authority

**Relevant Legislation**
- HE Governance (Scotland) Act 2016; Bribery Act 2010; Employment legislation (organisational change); Education Act 1994 (Student union constitutions); Enterprise Act 2002 (Student debt policy)

**Equality Impact Assessment**
- Gender balance on Court will improve F:M ratio with new appointment.

**Suggested next step**
- Any other observations:
SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Court Strategy Day

Court’s annual strategy day took place on 26 September, with a substantial session on the Campus Estates Strategy and development of the Capital Plan; and briefing sessions/workshops also on The UK Higher Education Scene, Governance, International Markets, the Internationalisation Strategy, and Managing Successful Projects. Feedback received to date, on the day’s programme, has generally been very positive.

The Court Estates Strategy Working Group met on 3 October and its business included receipt of a summary of feedback from the strategy day discussion on the Estates session. SMG will now take steps to create and present an updated Capital Plan to Court in December 2016. A full business case for the Learning & Teaching building will also be presented to the December meeting of Court.

A.2 Competition and Markets Authority: Student Debt

Earlier this year, the Competition & Markets Authority (the CMA) asked the University to supply information on its policy on collecting student debt. The CMA followed up this request with a letter to the University on 4 July which stated that the CMA believe that the University’s use of academic sanctions to enforce a non-tuition fee debt, as set out on Clause 13.1 of the University Calendar, is unlawful. The CMA has requested that the University amend its debt policy. If the University does not amend its policy to address the CMA’s concerns, the CMA has said it is minded to take enforcement proceedings against the University in the Court of Session with a view to establishing that the debt policy is illegal.

When a student has difficulty in clearing debt, the University’s approach is supportive. While debt must be cleared, we generally do not charge interest on debt, and we offer assistance in the form of flexible payment plans and advice on financial management. However, in common with the large majority of universities in Scotland, we insist that debt is ultimately cleared before the student graduates, or proceeds to the next year of study. That sanction is expressed in Section 13.1 of the Calendar as follows:
No person shall be permitted to register as a student of the University, graduate or receive any degree, diploma or other qualification conferred by the university, unless all arrears of fees for tuition and residence, and any other sums due to the University, have been paid. While the Registry will provide such a person, on application, with an informal statement of examination results, it will be unable to furnish an academic transcript; nor will the Registry provide any official letter or certification of any document to verify details of their period of study. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the University will fulfil its obligation under the Data Protection Act (1998).

The legal aspects of this are fairly complex, but can be summarised as the CMA having two specific areas of concern. The first of these is that the University may apply an academic sanction in relation to a non-academic contract (the most significant of which is the contract for occupying student residences). The second is the CMA’s view that the University applies the academic sanction in a ‘blanket fashion’, in that the threat of the sanction potentially covers all students, many of whom will have small levels of debt.

The Secretary of Court and Director of Finance, together with the University’s lawyer, met with the CMA in early August. At that meeting we gave four undertakings:

.1 that we would work closely with the CMA to seek to resolve this matter;
.2 that we would review the terms of Clause 13.1 and bring revised terms to Court for its consideration;
.3 that we would commission Senior Counsel (Lord Davidson of Glen Clova QC) to review the University’s contractual relationship with students and its debt policy; and
.4 that, meanwhile, should the University prevent a student from progressing to the next level of study in Session 2016/17, this would be specifically on account of unpaid tuition fee debt and not on account of any non-tuition fee debt.

The current position is that, following consultation with Lord Davidson, I have written to CMA challenging their contention that the debt policy is illegal, and have attached the advice note that we have received from the University’s lawyer and which was approved by Lord Davidson. I have also asked for a further meeting with CMA to discuss the conflicting views of their lawyers and ours. Meanwhile, the University has operated the revised approach to Registration for 2016/17 as set out in .4 above. In terms of .2, a review has been undertaken of the debt policy (Clause 13.1). The current wording is stark, expressing the policy solely in relation to the ultimate academic sanction, and it may be helpful to re-define the policy so as to convey the approach the University takes to collecting student debt, the use of academic sanctions being a last resort. A revised formulation of the debt policy is set out below for Court’s consideration. In addition to adopting a revised formulation of the debt policy, the University will also need to amend references to the policy on the University website and related documents.
In accepting an offer of a place of study and completing registration, a student accepts responsibility to pay all sums when due to the University. These sums include annual tuition fees, and also include ancillary charges for the use of University facilities, recreation fees and accommodation fees in respect of University owned / leased student accommodation.

Where any sums remain unpaid at the time of registration the University will seek to consult with the student and endeavour, acting reasonably and taking into account the student’s reasonable representations, to make an arrangement with the student to repay the outstanding sums due within an agreed period.

Where the University is unable to make such an arrangement with the student or where, despite such an arrangement being made, the terms of the arrangements are not fully complied with by the student, the University reserves the right to refuse to permit the student to register as a student of the University, progress to the next level of study and/or receive any degree, diploma or other qualification conferred by the University, unless and until the outstanding sum has been paid in full. Academic sanctions for failure to make payment of non-tuition fee debt will be applied only as a last resort.

Where students experience difficulty in making payments they can seek practical support and advice from the Student Financial Aid Team and independently from the Student Representative Council’s Advice Centre. Students should also contact the Student Collections Team to make them aware of any delay in payment.

Court is asked to
- approve the revised debt policy as expressed above;
- note that the Secretary of Court and Director of Finance will now enter into further discussion with the CMA. and;
- agree that, should this discussion with the CMA lead to further recommendations regarding the University’s debt policy, Court will consider these by email so as to avoid unnecessary delay in reaching agreement with the CMA.

A.3 Scheme of Delegated Authorities

The Scheme of Delegated Authorities formally sets out where responsibilities lie in the University across the main areas of activity. The current Scheme was adopted by Court in 2007 and updated in 2010. It has recently been reviewed and refreshed.

A.4 Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act – Transitional Arrangements

The intention of the Scottish Government is that the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act will come into force in either late 2016 or early 2017. Different provisions may well start at different times, with the more substantial and complex matters commencing later. Amended arrangements
for membership of both Court and Senate, arising from the Act, are subject to a transition period of 4 years. This will allow existing terms of office to expire and will give time for some amendments to the configuration of Court to be agreed.

As previously agreed at Court, there will 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. This semester, discussion will take place with Senate and with the trade unions about possibilities and options to effect the required changes to the composition of Court.

A.5 Remuneration Committee Business

Remuneration Committee will conduct the annual review of the salaries of SMG members at its next meeting, which is scheduled for 23 November. In line with established practice, it will submit a full minute of that meeting to the December meeting of Court, summarising the decisions it has made and setting out their rationale.

Court may recall that in 2014 the Committee of Scottish Chairs issued a Guidance Note for Remuneration Committees. One aspect of it is that ‘each year, in advance of the committee’s annual review of senior salaries, the governing body should provide policy guidance to the committee’. On behalf of the Remuneration Committee, I am seeking Court’s view on whether it is content with the statement provided [Annex] which reflects the policy guidance that Court has approved in each of the last two years.

Is Court content to proceed in this way?

A.6 Anti Bribery Policy

As members will see from the Audit Committee report, it has been suggested that Court consider whether the scope of the University's Anti Bribery policy (available via the link below), including matters relating to training, should be extended to include lay as well as executive officers.

This would include Court members and external members of Court committees. There is online training available.

http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/a-z/briberyandcorruption/

Court’s views are sought.

A.7 Composition of Audit Committee

Court has approved Heather Cousins's appointment as Chair of Audit Committee. Audit Committee currently consists of 6 lay members. Heather has suggested that, in line with good governance practice, Audit Committee should in future include one staff member, identified from among the Senate Assessors. Is Court content to approve this change to the composition of Audit Committee?
A.8 Vice-Chairs / Vice-Convener

The Convener of Court and I have discussed whether there would be merit in Court and its Committees appointing a Vice-convener / Vice-chair.

The Vice-convener of Court would deputise for the Convener of Court in her absence. S/he would be appointed by Court on the nomination of the Convener.

The Vice-chair of each Court committee would deputise for the Chair in his/her absence. The Vice-chair would be appointed by the Committee, on the nomination of the Chair.

Is Court content to approve these proposals?

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Nominations Committee business

i) Court and Committees

- A vacancy arising from Brian McBride leaving Court was advertised over the summer, with the General Council Assessor position that Brian occupied translated to a co-opted position in line with the Ordinance approved last year. A co-opted vacancy on the Finance Committee was also advertised. Following an interview process involving members of the Nominations Committee, the Committee has recommended, and Court has been invited to agree ahead of the October meeting, that Ms Elspeth Orcharton be appointed as a Co-opted member of Court and that she should also serve on the Finance Committee. This would be for a 4 year term beginning 10 October.

- I have been chairing HR Committee on an interim basis over the last year. Nominations Committee recommends that June Milligan now takes on this role, with immediate effect, for the same period as June’s term of office on Court, which runs until October 2019.

- Margaret Morton has recently been appointed to an executive post at the University, and will therefore demit office as a lay member of Court after the December meeting. Given that there will remain a good spread of professional expertise among co-opted members, relevant to Court and its Committees’ work, Nominations Committee has agreed that, in filling the vacancy, the University should seek to attract someone with experience of higher education strategic management in another institution. This post will be advertised as soon as possible.

- Margaret’s departure from Court will leave a vacancy for chair of the Estates Committee. Nominations Committee recommends that Ronnie Mercer takes on this role with immediate effect, and for the same period as Ronnie’s term of office on Court, which runs until October 2019.
ii) Nominations Committee remit

Court’s approval of a minor change to the remit of the Nominations Committee is sought. A part of the remit currently refers to:

To make recommendations to Court on the appointment of Court committee members, and on the convenership of Court committees.

The proposed change would result in this sentence reading:

To make recommendations to Court on the appointment of Court committee members, in consultation with the relevant Committee chairs; and to make recommendations on the convenership of Court committees.

Is Court willing to approve this change?

B.2 Committee Remits

Consistent with the amendment to the Nominations Committee remit, it is suggested that the remit of each Court Committee should be edited to reflect the role of the Committee and its Chair in ensuring that the Committee has the necessary skills and experience to address its remit effectively. The Finance Committee's report contains a specific recommendation to this effect. Court's approval is sought to including a similar requirement in the remits of each Court Committee, i.e.:

To ensure that the Committee's membership includes the skills and experience necessary to address its remit effectively. To this end, the Committee may request that the University Court appoint one or more additional co-opted members to the Committee. The Chair of the Committee will participate in the selection process for a new co-opted member.

B.3 Court Business 2016/17

Standing Orders for Court, with suggested tracked changes included for consideration/approval, are appended. The appendices include details of Court committee dates for this session. The changes to the Standing Orders reflect the outcome of the Court Governance Working Group’s consideration (earlier in 2016) of the HE Governance Act and areas within the Standing Orders that required reviewing as a consequence.

A list of Court Committee remits and memberships is attached, with the Nominations Committee and other Committee remits subject to change as above in sections B.1 ii) and B.2, if approved by Court. Although individual Committees review their remits annually, Court members are asked to consider if any further changes should be considered during this session.

Annex contains the Statement of Primary Responsibilities and the Schedule of Court Business for the coming year, for reference.

The above items are also available on the Court website at http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/courtoffice/universitycourtandcourtmeetings/ along with other resources for Court members.
The attendance lists for meetings of Court and its Committees for 2015/16 have been reviewed; there are no issues to report in connection with this.

A Fast Facts document, and a list of acronyms used in HE and the University, were circulated for the Court Strategy Day and are also available from the Court Office.

B.4 Review of Code of 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 been established, whose evidence-gathering process had included consultative visits to each of the Scottish HEIs to hold a set of structured meetings. In September, the University received a visit for input to this process, involving representatives from the Leadership Foundation meeting with some Court members and senior management.

Court members were also recently emailed with a link to a survey connected to the review, and invited to complete this by 19 October.

The outcome of the review is expected in November.

B.5 Glasgow Student Villages

In April 2016, 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 was updated on progress at its meeting in June 2016. The special purpose working group then concluded its work in July, and a report from the group appears as Annex.

B.6 Court Procedural Review Group

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.

In July, the Group agreed that management should be given authority to implement organisational change in the Law School. The proposal, which was supported by the Social Sciences College Management Group, arose from changes already approved to the curriculum, and involved a reduction in staffing of up to 1.5 FTE.
B.7 Honorary Degree Nominations

In line with the previously agreed arrangement with Senate to allow members of Court to submit observations on nominations for honorary degrees, the Clerk of Senate John Briggs will advise Court of the 2016/17 nominations on a confidential basis. Members of Court should contact the Clerk of Senate should they have observations to make.

B.8 Appointment of Head of School

College of Arts

School of Modern Languages and Cultures

Professor Vicente Perez De Leon, University of Melbourne, has been appointed as Head of the School of Modern Languages and Cultures for 2 years from 1 August 2017, although he will join the University in January 2017. Professor Michael Syrotinski will be acting Head of SMLC until 31 July 2017.

College of Social Sciences

Adam Smith Business School

Professor John Finch has been appointed as Head of the Adam Smith Business School for 4 years commencing 1 September 2016.

B.9 Queen Margaret Union

On Court's behalf I have reviewed and approved minor changes to the constitution of the Queen Margaret Union as approved by the Union's Annual General Meeting in June.
Advice to Remuneration Committee, November 2016

Proposed method of reviewing senior management salaries
Remuneration Committee’s review of the salaries of members of SMG will be informed by:

- a statement of each SMG member's salary for this and the previous 4 years;
- benchmark information, from the Universities and Colleges Employers Association, showing how Glasgow's salary levels compare with those of other UK universities;
- advice from the Principal on the performance of each member of the SMG in 2015/16, following his P&DR discussions with them; and
- in respect of the Principal, advice on performance from the Convener of Court, following her P&DR discussion with the Principal and reflecting the views she has obtained on the Principal’s performance through consultation with staff, students and lay governors.

In considering the appropriate level of reward, the Committee intends to:

- provide tangible reward for excellent performance;
- give consideration to any cases where the salary awarded by the University is substantially out of line with that of managers in equivalent positions at comparable universities; and
- apply a general principle that percentage pay increases for senior managers should not be higher than those for the workforce as a whole.

The Remuneration Committee’s remit is attached for reference.
Remuneration Committee Remit (as approved by Court, 25 June 2014)

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

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

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

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

To advise Court on the University's policy on severance arrangements for staff, and, within parameters agreed by Court, to implement that policy, considering on an individual basis, any severance proposal:
  - that departs from the parameters agreed by Court, and/or
  - that pertains to a member of the Senior Management Group.
Guidance Note on the operation of remuneration committees

in Scottish higher education.

The context
Effective governance is vital to the success of Scotland's higher education institutions, and the remuneration committee is an important part of the governance framework. This guidance note considers the work of remuneration committees and is intended to clarify key principles and elements of good practice. Higher education institutions are autonomous bodies, and each institution must develop its own approach, consistent with the character of the organisation and the expectations of its stakeholders.

The reputation of higher education can be damaged by pay packages for senior staff that are perceived to be out of line with pay and conditions elsewhere. Remuneration committees face a challenge in responding to the global market for talent, while ensuring that pay is clearly justified by performance and that salary increases are sustainable. This is an important reputational issue and therefore one that is of concern to the governing body.

A further important consideration for remuneration committees is that they should operate in a spirit of openness with regard to their policies and practice. There is a legitimate public interest in the remuneration of senior executives in higher education, and there has often in the past been a perception of secrecy surrounding pay decisions. Scottish higher education strives to apply the highest standards of governance, and in that context it is important to demonstrate transparency around remuneration policies and processes.

General Principles
Good governance requires that the governing body has in place a policy and arrangements for determining the pay of senior staff. These must ensure that senior staff are appropriately remunerated with regard to performance and retention. They must also be robust and proportionate in their use of the University’s funds.

Remuneration committees must implement the policy approved by the governing body. They must make pay decisions that are justified, fair and equitable. They must also report to the governing body in sufficient detail to demonstrate that they have applied the policy approved by the governing body and that they have done so in a sound and rigorous manner.

Terms of Reference

Membership. The remuneration committee should include at least three independent members (not necessarily members of the governing body), one of whom should be a member of the finance or equivalent committee, and from among whom a committee chair should be appointed. Among them, these members must have substantial
remuneration committee experience. In addition, the membership should include the chair of the governing body.

The Principal should be consulted on remuneration relating to other senior post-holders and should attend meetings of the committee, except when the committee discusses matters relating to his/her own remuneration.

It is essential that the committee is serviced by an officer of appropriate seniority to provide the necessary advice and guidance. This should be the secretary of the governing body or the director of human resources. The committee's secretary must have the means to commission external professional advice as required.

**The Remit** of the remuneration committee should be established by the governing body, which should review it at least once every three years. The committee must have responsibility, operating within policies approved by the governing body, for setting the salaries of the members of the University’s senior management team. It should also be required to ensure that appropriate and robust arrangements are in place for determining the salaries of all other senior staff (professorial and equivalent).

The committee should oversee implementation of the University’s severance policy, and should have specific responsibility for determining any severance payment to a member of the senior management team.

**Method of Operation**

The policies and processes used by the remuneration committee in reaching decisions on individuals should be discussed by the whole governing body. Each year, in advance of the committee’s annual review of senior salaries, the governing body should provide policy guidance to the committee.

The committee’s decisions on pay must be evidence-based. They should be informed by a robust system of monitoring individual and team performance against agreed objectives. In addition, the remuneration committee must consider comparative information on salaries and other benefits and conditions of service in the higher education sector. Useful UK sources are: the CUC database of salaries, benefits and conditions of service for heads of institution; and the UCEA data on the salaries of senior university staff. Benchmark data of this sort provides useful indicators and a framework for the exercise of judgment: it should not be used in a mechanistic or formulaic manner. It is important also that the benchmarks selected should be regularly reviewed by the remuneration committee.

It is essential that the remuneration committee should meet often enough and for long enough to ensure that its business is transacted thoroughly and with attention to detail.
Severance Payments

The University should have a policy on severance payments, approved by the governing body, and consistent with the terms of the SFC financial memorandum.

The remuneration committee should oversee the implementation of the severance policy. Its specific approval should always be required for any severance payment that:

- exceeds a threshold sum, as defined by the governing body;
- departs from the standard severance terms approved by the governing body; or
- applies to a member of the senior management team.

In considering these matters the remuneration committee must represent the public interest and avoid any inappropriate use of public funds. It should be careful not to approve a severance package which staff, students and the public might reasonably deem excessive.

Reporting

The remuneration committee’s reports to the governing body should provide sufficient detail (including clarity on the nature of benchmark data the committee has used) to enable governors to assure themselves that a fair, sound and rigorous process has taken place, since overall responsibility for this rests with the governing body.

The remuneration committee should identify those posts in the senior team which are regarded as forming the senior executive team, and it should publish the salaries of this group of staff by salary band.

Transparency serves to maintain trust in an organisation, and institutions should think carefully about what information they can place in the public domain. This is a sensitive subject, with considerations of personal and commercial confidentiality set alongside a legitimate public interest in the salaries of senior university managers. Practice at several Scottish higher education institutions is that reports provided to the governing body are made publicly available.

Review

The work of the remuneration committee should be included within the institution’s Internal Audit Plan.

There should be external review of the remuneration committee’s practices. This may take place through the appointment of an external expert to act as an observer on the committee and/or through a periodic effectiveness review, conducted by an external expert.
The primary responsibilities of the University Court, as the governing body of the University, are:

**General**

To be satisfied that appropriate mechanisms are in place:

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

**Strategic Planning**

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

**Exercise of Controls**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Effectiveness and Transparency**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### (November) • (Induction/Half day briefing Governance/Funding/HE Policy) (if required)

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

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

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

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

Special Purpose Group (the “Group”) of the University Court of the University of Glasgow

Minute of Meeting held on 18 July 2016

Present - David Ross, Robert Fraser and Graeme Bissett
Apologies - Ken Brown
Attending - Anton Muscatelli, David Newall

David Ross was appointed Chairperson for the purposes of this Meeting.

It was noted by the Chairperson that the Group was convened pursuant to the terms of a Minute of Meeting of the University Court of the University of Glasgow (the Court) held on Wednesday 13 April 2016 at the Room L0-006 Teaching & Learning Centre, Queen Elizabeth University Hospital (the Court Minutes).

The Director of Finance explained that, pursuant to the Court Minutes, the Court had approved a financial strategy for campus development as set out in Option 2 of the “(CA/2015/58)Campus Development Financing Strategy (paper 5.4)” relating to campus development including private placements with US and UK institutions and involving the refinancing of Glasgow Student Villages Limited (the Financial Strategy) and had appointed the Group to oversee implementation of the Financial Strategy. He also reported that the implementation of the Financial Strategy proposed by the executive officers required the execution of the Documents (as defined below) on behalf of Court and that the documents had been signed on Court's behalf by the University Principal and the Secretary of Court:-

(a) A Note Purchase Agreement in respect of the Notes (as defined below); and
(b) 2.97% Senior Notes, Series A, due on 20 July 2046; and
   3.01% Senior Notes, Series B, due on 20 July 2051
   (collectively, the Notes)

The Director of Finance summarised the process involved in the negotiation and the main commercial terms and conditions of the documents and confirmed that they accurately reflected the commercial terms and conditions applicable at the point the interest rates and loan terms were committed.

Following discussion, the Group was satisfied that the Financial Strategy approved by Court was being implemented in a satisfactory way by the University's executive officers. It was reported that, following careful consideration and approval by the University's executive officers, the above Notes have been executed (in advance of the proposed closing) on behalf of the Court by David Newall, the Secretary of the Court and Anton Muscatelli, the Principal and Vice Chancellor of the University. The Group asked that the text of these documents should be presented for information to the next meeting of the Court.

[Signature]
Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic discussed at Court</th>
<th>Last Finance Committee Report June 2016</th>
<th>Paper Description</th>
<th>Finance Committee report to Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee members present</td>
<td>Court members present at last meeting: Graeme Bissett, Carl Goodyear, Margaret Morton, Principal, Elizabeth Passey, Duncan Ross</td>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red-Amber-Green Rating</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes of meeting on 14 September: Decision on one item/Information/Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Type</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper Summary</td>
<td>Finance Committee agreed that some text should be added to its remit, noting the role of the Convener in ensuring appropriate skill sets across the membership of the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for noting from Finance Committee meeting of 14 September 2016:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CA/2016/04. Capex application: Western Infirmary Site Enabling Works</td>
<td>Finance Committee APPROVED the application. It was agreed that commitments against the approved spend of £8.651m could be made on the authority of the Western Infirmary Site Governance Board, which comprised: Neal Juster (convener), Robert Fraser and David Newall. Should the anticipated cost rise above the approved sum, then a further report should be brought to Finance Committee.</td>
<td>For noting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CA/2016/05. Capex application: Wind Tunnel, Acre Road</td>
<td>Finance Committee APPROVED the application. CA/2016/06. Capex application: Campus Smart Card/Access Control System</td>
<td>For noting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topics to be discussed</td>
<td>Finance Committee remit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major benefit of proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action from Court</td>
<td>Decision on one item/rest for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation to Court</td>
<td>Noting/Information/Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant Strategic Plan workstream</td>
<td>Agility, Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of University</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other universities that have done something similar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other universities that will do something similar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk register - university level</td>
<td>S. Financial resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk register - college level</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Impact Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested next steps</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Other universities that have done something similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other observations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other universities that will do something similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Relevant Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equality Impact Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggested next steps</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Court Context Card - Finance Committee Report 12th October 2016**

**Speaker:** Mr Graeme Bissett/Mr Ken Brown  
**Speaker role:** acting Chair at last meeting/Finance Committee Chair  
**Urgency:** Low  
**Timing:** Immediate  
**Red-Amber-Green Rating:** Green  
**Minutes of meeting on 14 September:** Decision on one item/Information/Discussion  
**Paper Description:** Finance Committee report to Court  
**Paper Summary:** Finance Committee agreed that some text should be added to its remit, noting the role of the Convener in ensuring appropriate skill sets across the membership of the Committee.

**Items for noting from Finance Committee meeting of 14 September 2016:**

1. **CA/2016/04. Capex application: Western Infirmary Site Enabling Works**  
Finance Committee APPROVED the application. It was agreed that commitments against the approved spend of £8.651m could be made on the authority of the Western Infirmary Site Governance Board, which comprised: Neal Juster (convener), Robert Fraser and David Newall. Should the anticipated cost rise above the approved sum, then a further report should be brought to Finance Committee.

2. **CA/2016/05. Capex application: Wind Tunnel, Acre Road**  
Finance Committee APPROVED the application. **CA/2016/06. Capex application: Campus Smart Card/Access Control System**  
Finance Committee APPROVED the application.

**Cost of proposed plan**

**Major benefit of proposed plan**

**Revenue from proposed plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>% of University</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other universities that have done something similar**

**Other universities that will do something similar**

**Relevant Legislation**

**Equality Impact Assessment**

**Suggested next steps**

**Any other observations**
The Convenor welcomed Elizabeth Passey to her first meeting of Finance Committee.

CA/2016/01. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 25 May 2016

The minutes of Finance Committee held on 25 May 2016 were approved.

CA/2016/02. Matters arising

CA/2015/79. Update on Private Placement / GSV

The Director of Finance provided an update on the GSV purchase, and the Committee noted a positive NPV of £5.5m.

The Committee’s view was sought on the detail of the accounting of the transaction, and whether regular revaluations of the asset class (i.e. all student residences) should take place in order to allow net assets to be increased.

Finance Committee requested some further information on different scenarios to inform their view: firstly showing the detail with assets revalued, and secondly how the 2015 SORP changes would affect the accounting without revaluation.

Committee members congratulated the Director of Finance and his team on a good outcome.
CA/2016/03. Conflicts of Interest

No new conflicts of interest were reported.

CA/2016/04. Capex application: Western Infirmary Site Enabling Works (paper 5.1.1)

The Committee received a capital expenditure request for £8.651m for enabling works on the former Western Infirmary site.

Finance Committee noted that there had been very recent developments on the site superseding some of the information in the Capex application. There were surveys ongoing, and the situation was currently very fluid.

The Director of Estates provided some information on the latest developments and requested that the Committee approve the application at this point, while acknowledging that there may be changes required to what was proposed.

Following a discussion, Finance Committee approved the application, recognising the need for a flexible approach given the rapidly evolving situation. It was agreed that commitments against the approved spend of £8.651m could be made on the authority of the Western Infirmary Site Governance Board, which comprised: Neal Juster (convener), Robert Fraser and David Newall. Should the anticipated cost rise above the approved sum, then a further report should be brought to Finance Committee.

CA/2016/05. Capex application: Wind Tunnel, Acre Road (paper 5.1.2)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for an additional £143k of funding for the Wind Tunnel facility.

The Committee noted that the application had been the subject of detailed discussion at Estates Committee, reflecting on multiple lessons learned.

Finance Committee approved the final application relating to the Wind Tunnel project.

CA/2016/06. Capex application: Campus Smart Card/Access Control System (paper 5.1.3)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for £926k to replace the University’s aging access control system. The current funding request would allow replacement of the existing system as a first phase. The Committee noted that proceeding with the first phase would in principle allow the future replacement of all local solutions, delivering a single integrated access control solution for the entire estate. It would also involve the use of a smart card, able to support a range of functionality that the University might choose to adopt at a later stage. These possible further developments of the system would be reviewed once the first phase was complete.
Finance Committee approved the application for the first phase of funding.

CA/2016/07. Finance Committee Remit (paper 5.2)

Finance Committee noted that each Committee of Court was required formally to review and approve the committee’s remit on an annual basis.

The Committee agreed that it would be beneficial to add some text to the remit noting the role of the Convenor in ensuring appropriate skill sets across the membership of the Committee. The Secretary of Court and the Committee Secretary would circulate a suitably edited remit for review along with the draft minute of the meeting.

A discussion took place around the levels of approvals for Capex applications. The Committee was content with the thresholds set out in the current remit.

CA/2016/08. Insurance Renewal 2016/17 (paper 6.1)

The Committee received a report on insurance activity including a note of the premium costs for the coming year. It was noted that most of the University’s main insurance policies were subject to competitive tender last year, subsequently entering into Long Term Agreements (LTAs) with the insurers. Therefore the 2016/17 renewal was primarily concerned with providing the insurers with up-to-date information and premiums being calculated accordingly using the agreed rates.

The total premium costs for 2016/17 were £1.4m, an increase of just over £100k (6.9%) on the previous year. This reflected an increase in the level of business activity.

The estimated cost for the year would be within the insurance budget for 2016/17, which was £1.6m.

The Committee noted that, as always, the final position against budget would depend on the incidence of uninsured losses occurring throughout the year and any additional premiums that may be levied on activities falling outside the normal scope of cover.

Finance Committee noted the insurance renewal report.

CA/2016/09. Endowments Investment Reports (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee noted the endowments investment reports. The Committee noted progress with the Smart Beta tender process, with a final interview next week.

CA/2016/10. Minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee held on 13 May 2016 (paper 6.3)
Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee from 13 May 2016.

Members noted that the Principal, Robert Fraser and David Newall were in attendance at IAC meetings and would be in a position to bring updates to Finance Committee.

CA/2016/11. Corporate Structure (paper 6.4)

The Director of Finance presented a paper describing the various entities which are consolidated into the University’s annual accounts as well as a number of other entities which are dormant or for which the University has responsibility as a guarantor. The Committee noted that reference to “University Court as a Guarantor” meant that Court had a £1 stake in each company listed with no further exposure to the University.

The Committee noted the paper.


The Group Financial Controller explained the changes in financial reporting which would come into effect for the 2016 accounts. The Committee noted that the new regulations would bring elements of volatility into the University’s Income & Expenditure statement from year to year. The transition required the 2015 accounts to be restated in order to enable a comparison between 2016 and prior year. The Committee noted that the restatement of the 2015 accounts would result in net assets increasing by £67m.

The Committee noted the areas of potential change and the Group Financial Controller would lead a further discussion at the November meeting of the Committee when the University financial statements were considered.

CA/2016/13. Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2016 (paper 7.1)

The Director of Finance provided a report on the overview of performance to 31 July 2016. The Committee noted that the University achieved a management accounting surplus of £23.7m which was a £12.2m improvement against full year budget of £11.5m. The movements which contributed to the improved surplus included tuition fees at £2.4m higher than budget, salary savings of £5.9m, other general income £3.1m higher than budget, and depreciation £1.7m lower than budget.

The Committee noted that although the target for research income had been missed, research activity continues to grow, with research contribution £1.3m higher than 2014/15.

At year end the University had £183.7m net funds. This reflects a cash inflow of £37.1m for the year to date.
Finance Committee Wednesday 14 September 2016

CA/2016/14. Debtors Report as at 31 July 2016 (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 July 2016. The Group Financial Controller reported that total debt stood at £28.88m, representing a decrease year on year relative to July 2015 (£30.3m).

The Secretary of Court updated the Committee on a challenge to the University’s student debt policy which had been received from the Competition and Markets Authority. The University was seeking legal advice at present and Court would have an update at its meeting in October.

CA/2016/16. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 16 November 2016, 2pm.

Prepared by: Fiona Quinn, Clerk to Committee, Fiona.Quinn@glasgow.ac.uk
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**For Decision**

Court is also asked to decide if it wishes the Anti Bribery policy to apply to lay members on Court and Committees. This item is also referred to in the Secretary of Court's report. The policy is at [http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/a-z/briberyandcorruption/](http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/a-z/briberyandcorruption/)

**For Noting** (summary of meeting of Audit Committee held on 21 September 2016):

The Committee received reports on internal audit reviews of Value for Money - Use of Dowries; EU Partnerships; Contract Management (Printing Contract); and Project Management (Kelvin Hall). The external auditors provided the Committee with an update on the progress of the 2015/16 audit, in particular the FRS102 conversion process; and the Committee received a report on the management's approach to these areas. The Committee received its usual update on the status of outstanding recommendations from previous internal audits; it received details of the University's corporate structure; and received a report on cases of research misconduct in 2015/16, the report made annually to the Committee as required by the Research Councils.

The Committee received an update on the Scottish HE Bill and the review of Scottish Code of Good HE Governance

| **Cost of proposed plan** | |
| **Major benefit of proposed plan** | |
| **Revenue from proposed plan** | |

| **Demographics** | Cross University application on several items |
| **% of University** | Relevant Strategic Plan workstream |
| **Relevant Legislation** | Anti-bribery Act 2010. Finance Reporting standards |
| **Risk Register/Application of anti bribery policy** | Decision on one item/Rest for Noting/Information/Discussion |

| **Topics to be discussed** | |
| **Action from Court** | |
| **Recommendation to Court** | |

| **Relevant Risk register - university level** | |
| **Other universities that have done something similar** | |
| **Other universities that will do something similar** | |

| **Campus** | All |
| **External bodies** | |
| **Conflict areas** | |
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Audit Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 21 September 2016
in the Melville Room, Main Building

Present:
Mr Simon Bishop (SB), Dr Paul Brady (Chair) (PB), Ms Lindsay Campbell (LC), Ms Heather Cousins (HC), Mr Neil Menzies (NM), Mr David Watt (DJW)

In attendance:
Mr John Boyd (Ernst & Young), Mr Gregor Caldow, Group Financial Controller (GC), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance) (RF), Ms Denise Gallagher (PWC) (DG), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk) (DM), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court) (DN), Ms Lindsey Paterson (PWC) (LP), Mr Stephen Reid (Ernst & Young) (SR), Dr Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary) (DAW)

Apologies: Ms Lesley Sutherland (LS), Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young) (KB), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal) (AM)

AUDIT/2016/1 Announcements

John Boyd, Senior Partner Ernst & Young, was welcomed to the meeting.

Dr Paul Brady was attending his last meeting. On behalf of the University, David Newall thanked him for his service both as chair since 2014 and as a member of the Committee since 2009. Heather Cousins would take on the chairship of the Committee from the November 2016 meeting.

AUDIT/2016/2 Minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2016

The minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2016/3. Matters Arising

1. 2016/17 Audit Plan
The plan had been signed off following the May meeting, and was now noted for information at the first meeting of 2016/17. It was noted that value for money considerations would be included in relevant audit reports in the coming session.
ACTION PWC

With regard to coverage of the student experience in audits, which coverage had been discussed at previous meetings, the Committee agreed that a briefing on how this area of University activity was managed would be welcomed. The briefing should include details about the consideration by the sector and University of the possible effects on Scottish institutions of the UK Government’s Teaching Excellence Framework proposals. In addition, Heather Cousins, David Newall and relevant senior managers would meet to discuss the matter.

ACTION HC/DN

With regard to the proposed 2016/17 audit of Performance Management (staff), it was agreed that the remit would be discussed by the incoming chair, PWC and David Newall ahead of the audit starting.
ACTION HC/PWC/DN
.2 Scottish HE Bill and Scottish Code of Good HE Governance
The intention of the Scottish Government, subject to Parliamentary timescales, was that the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act would come into force in either late 2016 or early 2017. Amended arrangements for membership of both Court and Senate, arising from the Act, were subject to a transition period of 4 years.

The current Governance Code for Scottish Higher Education had been published by the Committee of Scottish Chairs in July 2013. At the time of publication, the chairs had committed to a review of the Code after 3 years. A Review Committee had now been established, and the University had recently received a visit for input to this, involving Review Committee meetings with Court members and senior management.

.3 Anti Bribery policy
The Committee agreed to ask Court to consider whether the scope of the University's Anti Bribery policy, including matters relating to training, should be extended to include lay as well as executive officers

.4 Internal audit HEI benchmarking
Committee members had received some benchmarking details relating to average days per year allocated to internal audit across the HE sector. The incoming chair would discuss the matter further with PWC and David Newall.

ACTION HC/PWC/DN

AUDIT/2016/4. Internal Audit Update

4.1 Value for Money - Use of Dowries
In order to attract top research talent within each field of study, the University used ‘dowries’ as a recruitment tool for professorial and research staff. The funds that the dowry provided were principally used to fund PhD students/other research support personnel, equipment and consumables to support the achievement of research goals. In order to assess the value for money being obtained from the use of dowries in the lead up to the REF 2014, the review had looked at the controls and arrangements in place relating to their award and administration. The overall report classification was High risk, with one high risk finding, which identified that controls could be improved, given the absence of formal documentation of strategy and related policies and procedures, and to awards being made without formal upfront consideration or reporting of the potential value against total investment. The report had also found that the form of dowry agreements was not consistent across the Colleges and that there was a lack of visibility at SMG level as to total dowry spend.

The Committee noted that the SMG was reviewing the area and that policies would be developed. The Committee requested that outcomes should cover both a suitable structure, and mechanisms for accountability. It was also noted that future practice might include building details into employment contracts, and thereafter into the P&DR process. In terms of value for money considerations, it was noted that income generation associated with staff recruited with dowries was an area that might be used as a measure of value against investment.

The Committee would be kept informed.

4.2 EU Partnerships
At April 2016, the University had 140 live projects funded under FP7 or Horizon 2020 European funding, with total funding to the University of c€80M. There were 96 active EU research projects with collaborations ranging from 1 to 37 different partners. The review had looked at the control design and operating effectiveness of key controls relating to such partnerships arrangements. It had identified areas of good practice, including the Transforming Research Management project looking to strengthen controls and processes for effective project administration, and the Research Management System (RMS) providing a mechanism to address the due diligence review gap on partnerships. The overall report classification was Medium risk, with two
medium risk findings, relating to: only limited documented guidance being in place for PIs and new Project Coordinators for the existing EC portfolio, that would provide standards for effective project administration; and no due diligence currently being undertaken at the pre/post award stages, with the review process to be built into the new RMS yet to be defined.

It was noted that the RMS would address the matter of due diligence. It was agreed that due diligence should also be an area for focus generally in respect of partnerships, taking account of previous audit report recommendations to this effect.

**ACTION PWC**

4.3 Contract Management (Printing Contract)
In 2011, the Carbon Management Committee had proposed that the University review its printing and print management strategy, after audit work had determined that there were over 4,000 printing devices across the estate. A Managed Print Project had ensued, and there was now a managed printing contract which, when fully implemented through a managed print system, would have benefits including a significant reduction in CO2, reduced electricity usage and financial savings. The audit had focused on monitoring financial and carbon saving targets, and on compliance with policy and device management. The overall report classification was Medium risk. Findings had listed some benefits, including reduced waste, improved security and easy access. There had been two medium risk findings relating to: contract management, where there was no currently active owner/sponsor, one impact of which was that multi-functional devices were not being used to their full potential; and Post implementation review, where there had been no recent involvement of the Carbon Management Committee or any formal post implementation review of the system to assess the achievement of both financial and carbon saving targets.

4.4 Project Management (Kelvin Hall)
The review had focused on project initiation and governance relating to, and the move to, Kelvin Hall. The overall report classification was Medium risk. Areas of good practice reported had included: good communication amongst the several project partners in a complex project; good staff engagement; and strong project management. Two medium risk findings had been made, relating to: some lack of completeness of collections asset listing; and the ongoing additional operational costs of the move not having been considered during budgeting.

**AUDIT/2016/5. Interim external audit report including SORP/FRS102 Conversion**

5.1 Ernst & Young (External Auditors) update report
The purpose of the report was to provide the Committee with an update on the progress of the 2015/16 audit, in particular the FRS102 conversion process. The report summarised the findings of the external auditors’ evaluation of management’s transitional arrangements to prepare financial statements in accordance with the new FRS102-based Higher Education SORP.

The procedures to date and on-site fieldwork had focused on areas including the following: updating the auditors’ understanding and assessment of the University’s key underlying processes and systems; completing walkthroughs of key processes, including review of design, implementation and operational effectiveness of controls around significant risks and areas of audit emphasis; and updating the auditors’ understanding of the areas of audit emphasis and any new or emerging potential audit risks.

Some year-end fieldwork remained to be completed.

The assessment was positive, with the auditors reporting continuing good cooperation from management, and a proactive approach continuing to be adopted by management with regard to emerging accounting issues, including sharing detail and
validating initial views with the auditors, for example relating to the ‘buy out’ of the Glasgow Student Villages contract. It was agreed that Gregor Caldow would provide an analysis of the figures relating to this latter area, for the Committee’s information.

**ACTION GC**

The auditors were satisfied with the approach adopted by management, in respect of the transition to the new Higher Education SORP. There has been one finding that enhancements could be made to the University’s IT change management controls, where governance and documentation around IT changes to finance applications and infrastructure should be improved to ensure that there was sufficient oversight and review of changes made and that key IT controls continued to operate as designed and thereby mitigate risks to the University. The Committee noted that this point related to the non-retention of some documentation logging changes to systems, and not to the control framework itself, and that the matter had been addressed.

It was requested that the internal auditors cover aspects of change control as part of the assessment of control undertaken within the 2016/17 audit plan.

**ACTION PWC**

The update report was noted.

5.2 Management update

The University management’s paper outlined the impact on the University’s 2015 Financial Statements of the transition to the new FRS102 based Statement of Recommended Practice (2015 SORP). The first year that the University had been required to prepare accounts using the 2015 SORP had been the year ended 31 July 2016. However, since year-on-year comparisons needed to be shown in the accounts, this had meant that the 2015 financial statements had also required to be restated.

As a result of the transition, Net Assets had increase by £67m, with a reduction of £23m in the 2015 surplus.

The main areas where the 2015 SORP had an impact on the financial statements were: revaluation of property, plant and equipment; revenue recognition of donations and grants; pensions schemes; liability for unused employee annual leave; and reclassifications of endowments and GSV-related deferred income.

As well as a change in the values reported in the financial statements, the presentation of the financial accounts would also require changes, including: the removal of the Statement of Total Recognised Gains and Losses, with movements now captured in a Statement of Comprehensive Income and Expenditure, which also replaced the previous Income and Expenditure Account; and the Balance Sheet being renamed the Statement of Financial Position.

It was noted that the changes would result in greater volatility in the financial statements and would also require increased and very clear narrative to communicate the details to a ‘lay’ readership.

The update report was noted, with both management and the auditors being thanked by the Committee for their respective reports.

**AUDIT/2016/6. Risk Management - Risk Register**

It was noted that an internal audit of Risk Management policy and practice had recently been undertaken as part of the scheduled audit plan, and would be reported at the next meeting.

The current University Risk Register was noted. It was also noted that it would be reviewed at the forthcoming SMG meeting and updated thereafter. It was agreed that additional information, relating to timescales for mitigating actions, would be added, in
addition to the further clarification of action owners, which updating would occur anyway during the SMG review. It was also requested that the wording for Risks 1 and 3 be reviewed to remove or clarify any overlap.

**ACTION RF**

It was noted that the Risk Register would be provided to Court at its October meeting, as part of Court’s agreed refinements to its level of involvement in the area of risk management.

**AUDIT/2016/7. Implementation of Outstanding Recommendations**

**7.1 Finance Office**

Since the last meeting, nine new audit actions had arisen; four actions against audit reports had been completed; five partially implemented; 21 were being progressed; and there were seven recommendations against which action had not yet commenced. It was agreed that a column describing mitigating actions would be added for actions arising from recommendations that were more than a year old.

**ACTION GC**

**7.2 Departments other than the Finance Office**

Since the last meeting, 16 new audit actions had arisen; 10 actions against audit reports had been completed; 15 partially implemented or being progressed; and there were 10 recommendations against which action had not yet commenced. A number of recommendations had been made in the report of the review of Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Management; some of these related to the governance structure, with implementation estimated to be undertaken over the next 1-2 years following the appointment of a dedicated member of staff. It was noted that the implementation plan would prioritise major services and large schools.

**ACTION DN**

It was agreed that the (currently separate) Finance and non-Finance update reports would adopt a fully common format, and be combined into a single paper if possible, for future meetings.

**ACTION GC/DAW**

**AUDIT/2016/8. Corporate Structure**

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

The governance of subsidiaries had been the subject of a recent internal audit review, reported in early 2016, with some recommendations made about Board-related matters, including induction of members, and the need for a formal conflicts of interest policy. The Committee requested a future update on these areas, to be provided in 2018.

**ACTION DAW/DM**


A report had been provided to the Committee, as required by the Research Councils. Two formal investigations relating to research misconduct had been completed during the 2015/16 academic year, with a recommendation for a third investigation having also been made. The incidence of alleged misconduct had increased slightly since 2014/15.

**AUDIT/2016/10. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.
AUDIT/2016/11. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 8 November 2016 at 1pm in the Melville Room

Prepared by: Deborah Maddern, Clerk to Committee, deborah.maddern@glasgow.ac.uk
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### For Noting

1. The pending review of the Capital Plan and the potential impact on previously identified development priorities (EC/2016/4.1.1 refers);  
2. Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications in respect of:  
   i) Western Infirmary Enabling Works (CP15/695) in the sum of £8,651,000 (EC/2016/5.2.1 refers);  
   ii) Development of Supersonic Wind Tunnel, Acre Road in the fourth and final additional sum of £143k (EC/2016/5.2.2 refers); and  
   iii) Smart Card Access Control in the sum of £926k (EC/2016/5.2.3 refers).  

### Action from Court

Recommendation to Court

- For information/noting
- For noting

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of proposed plan</th>
<th>Various as described in Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major benefit of proposed plan</td>
<td>Student experience, research impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from proposed plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relevant Strategic Plan workstream

- Empowering People, Focus, Agility
- Relevant KPI that will help the university to achieve
- Effective Use of Estate

### Risk register - university level

- 1. Estates Strategy

### Other universities that have done something similar

### Other universities that will do something similar

### Relevant Legislation

- Building and Planning legislation; Health and Safety legislation

### Equality Impact Assessment

- On a building by building basis/by CapEx

### Suggested next steps

- Any other observations
UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW
Estates Committee

Minute of the meeting held in the Hunterian Board Room, Kelvin Hall on Friday 2 September 2016

Present: Mrs A Allen, Mr R Fraser, Mr A Ibrahim, Professor N Juster, Mr D Milloy, Ms M Morton (Convener), Mr D Newall, Mr A Seabourne, Mr D Smith

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

Apologies: Professor K Lury, Professor A Muscatelli (Principal), Professor P Younger

EC/2016/1 Minute of the meeting held on 13 May 2016

The minute was approved as an accurate record subject to the amendment in the final paragraph under EC/2016/6.2.1 of “and would consider the outstanding amount when the required clarity had been provided.” to “and referred the sum of £78,451 in respect of a fee adjustment to a delegated group comprising the Secretary of Court, the Convenor and the SRC President for review and decision.”

EC/2016/2 Matters Arising

EC/2016/6.2.1 Learning and Teaching Hub (Part (60%) Stage 4 Fees (EC/2015/38.2.4 refers)

The Committee noted that following the meeting on 13 May 2016 the necessary clarity had been provided to the delegated group in respect of the £78,451 sum in question. The delegated group had therefore approved an uplift in the sum approved by the Committee from £1,083,831 to £1,162,282.

EC/2016/3 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2016/4 Strategies and Performance

EC/2016/4.1 Estate Strategy

EC/2016/4.1.1 Capital Plan Update

It was confirmed that delivery of the eight major projects which had been previously identified as key priorities would not be achieved within the overall approved budget of £450m.

The Committee noted an update would be presented at the Court Strategy Day scheduled to take place in September 2016 and that a number of scenarios would be developed in time for the December 2016 Court meeting. These would depict a Plan which was deliverable within the approved sum of £450m. A number of alternative potential scenarios for a total plan value in excess of £450m would also be prepared.

It was noted work was being undertaken to identify those projects which would deliver the greatest transformative impact for the University and which would deliver the most significant opportunities to achieve the University’s strategic ambitions.

EC/2016/4.1.2 Dashboards, Route Map, Risk Register and Programme

The Committee noted the update dashboards. It noted that they would be revised to take account of the outputs of the Capital Plan Review, and the debate at the December 2016 meeting of Court.

EC/2016/4.1.2a Workstream 1 – Masterplanning and Infrastructure

The Committee noted the change in RAG status to amber, primarily due to programme delay.

The Director of Estates confirmed that positive dialogue was continuing with Glasgow City Council. The formal consultation process had been successfully completed, the Masterplan had been approved by the Regeneration and the Economy Policy Development Committee on 17 August 2016 and full approval of the Planning Committee was anticipated in October 2016.
The Committee noted that there were a significant number of Asbestos surveys to be undertaken on the Western Infirmary building stock.

**EC/2016/4.1.2b Workstream 2 – Key Projects (Design and Construction)**

The Committee noted that all projects would be reappraised as part of Capital Plan review and that all established Project Development Boards were fully focused on identifying, evidencing and progressing those projects with the greatest cultural and organisational transformation opportunities to enable achievement of the University’s strategic ambitions.

It noted that the contract for the modular accommodation (Mathematics and Statistics) had been awarded and it was anticipated that occupation would be completed by Easter 2017.

The Data Centre had been detached from the Research Hub building and separate proposals were being considered as part of the Capital Plan review.

**EC/2016/4.1.2c Workstream 3 – Procurement and Appointment of Lead Contractor**

The Committee noted the change in RAG status to amber, primarily due to the imminent Capital Plan review.

Outline solutions returned had been received on 27 May 2016 and following appraisal the bidders had been shortlisted to two. unsuccessful bidders had been debriefed. The Committee noted the significant support provided by the University’s Procurement Team throughout the process.

A programme was being developed for the remaining procurement stages, taking cognisance of the overall Capital Plan status of the various projects.

It had been concluded that in order to obtain value for money and cost certainty the dialogue process should be extended to December 2016, with final tender return now expected in January 2017. The Delivery Partner appointment would be made following Court Approval in April 2017.

The Committee noted that this approach would not create a risk to the programme or to any of the projects since the demolition and enabling works phase could proceed under the existing framework.

**EC/2016/4.1.2d Workstreams 4 and 5 – Transfer of Western Infirmary Site/Space Management**

It was agreed that both Workstreams had been successfully delivered and were therefore closed.

**EC/2016/4.1.2e Workstream 6 – Strategic Investment and Disposal**

The Committee noted the change in Workstream status to amber, primarily due to the Capital Plan review and the uncertainty around potential vacant possession of the targeted properties.

The Committee noted that significant progress had been made on understanding the potential of the portfolio. Investigations had been undertaken to understand market conditions and potential interest and analysis of interdependencies and implications of the Capital Plan review on vacant possession would be required in order to give a clear position on delivery of the £50m target. It noted that timescales for delivery and cashflow were being developed and that a review of potential alternative structures and strategies, including joint ventures, were being considered.

**EC/2016/4.1.3 Master Programme, Timeline, Risk Register and Heat Map**

The Committee noted the August 2016 updates and that these would be revised to take account of the Capital Plan review.

**EC/2016/4.1.4 Strategy and Approach to Client Contingencies**

The Committee noted the proposed approach in respect of how project contingency levels might be set at various stages throughout a project lifecycle to ensure that project contingency allowances were correctly calculated and allocated on Capital Projects. This was developed following review of published government (HM Treasury) guidance.
The Committee concluded that the proposal had provided a useful oversight of the theoretical guidance but would like this to be accompanied by a model which depicted a more practical interpretation to assist its understanding, taking account of the level of expertise across the client spectrum.

The Committee debated the term “Client Contingency” and the varied perceptions of this. It concluded that well briefed and managed Governance and Development Boards were critical in order to ensure common understanding of the purpose of contingencies and the types of project costs which would and would not reasonably be covered by this. It also agreed that approval should not be given to projects which were at an embryonic stage and where cost certainty was not achievable.

It was also suggested that a distinction be made between the term “Contingency” and “Application for Variation Budget” to ensure that accountability for changes to the project specification were separately identified and accounted for by the Development Board.

A revised paper, taking account of the Committee’s views would be prepared for the meeting scheduled to place on 4 November 2016.

EC/2016/4.1.5 Investment Strategy

The Committee noted the presentation outlining current thinking in respect of disposal options and proposals to rationalise the Estate, whilst protecting its long-term property asset holding.

It noted options to explore mixed use development, partnership/joint venture development models with key investors and the consequent potential impact on land and property values, and possible scenarios in respect of future use options including residential accommodation for students and key workers. It noted that this would require further analysis following the GSV restructure.

The Committee noted that an updated Investment Strategy would be prepared to take account of the findings of the Capital Plan review. It also noted that David Milloy and Doug Smith would work with the Estates Team to share expertise in respect of the student accommodation market.

EC/2016/4.2 Sustainability Strategy

The Committee noted that Court had approved the Strategy and that Professor Paul Younger had been appointed to lead its implementation.

EC/2016/5 Projects

EC/2016/5.1 Approved Projects Status (RAG) Report

The Committee noted the current status of all current projects. It noted that since its last meeting in May 2016, four projects had been completed:

Environmental Improvements (Library Level 2); Hunterian Museum Storage Facilities (Kelvin Hall); Fire Refuge Developments; and 2&3 Professor’s Square (Kitchen, WC and Service Upgrades).

Red Projects

Wind Tunnel (Acre Rd) – Health & Safety compliance/certification requirements, including installation of bespoke safety system had resulted in delay to completion with associated increase in scope and cost.

Development of Virology/ Vet Research – External Works (Garscube) – External works delayed due to asbestos in the ground which also resulted in additional costs.

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; Research Hub/Data Centre; and Adam Smith Business School. The Committee noted the programme would be fully reviewed as part of the reprioritisation of the Capital Plan

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/2016/5.2 CapEx Applications**

**EC/2016/5.2.1 – Western Infirmary Enabling Works (CP15/695)**

The Committee noted and approved the application in the sum of £8,651,000 to enable the University to meet its statutory and other obligations for the management of the security and health and safety of the former Western Infirmary site, allow for site preparation and clearance in advance of the appointment of the Programme Delivery Partner (PDP) in mid-2017.

It noted the works would give increased understanding of ground and site conditions resulting in greater cost and programme certainty in future contracts. The Committee noted the total cost of infrastructure and associated works was estimated at £50m and that to date £5m had been authorised to progress the design to RIBA Stage 4, take possession and manage the site for an initial 6-month period.

The Committee noted that costs for asbestos removal were predicated upon an assessment of the asbestos identified in the Management Reports provided by NHS GG&C. It noted that whilst it would have been advantageous to conclude all asbestos surveys prior to commencement of the Enabling Works that this would have resulted in a 3 – 4 month delay. The Committee would be updated on the extent of asbestos identified once this was known.

The Committee noted the Risk/Contingency allowance within the CapEx application as £720,000 including VAT (10%) and that the agreed form of contract (NEC3), whilst not removing the risk to the University, provided the best option to enable management of that risk.

The Committee requested that the Contractor be asked to provide a revised sum for full transfer of risk and liability for all unknown ground conditions, including identification of asbestos in order to ascertain if this would offer a better overall option in terms of liability.

**EC/2016/5.2.2– Development of Supersonic Wind Tunnel, Acre Road (CP13/570)**

The Committee noted and approved the fourth and final CapEx application in the further additional sum of £143k for the provision of a necessary safety system required by the University’s insurers. The Committee noted that a lessons-learned paper would be prepared in respect of this project.

**EC/2016/5.2.3 – Smart Card Access Control**

The Committee noted and approved the CapEx application in the sum of £926k to enable replacement of the University’s existing access control and ID card system which was necessary to reduce business risks to the University by improving campus safety and security.

**EC/2016/6 Any Other Business**

**EC/2016/6.1 Court Working Group (August 2016)**

The Convenor requested that the paper from this group be re-circulated to Committee members.

**EC/2016/7 Schedule of Meetings for 2016/17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday 4 November 2016</td>
<td>Friday 6 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10 March 2017</td>
<td>Friday 12 May 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Human Resources Committee

Minute of meeting held in the Melville Room, Main Building on Tuesday 13 September 2016

Present: Mr D Newall (DN), Mrs A Allen (A All), Ms S Ashworth (SA), Mrs C Barr (CB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Ms S Campbell (SC), Mr R Claughton (RPC), Professor L Farmer (LF), Professor N Hill (NH), Dr M Macdonald Simpson (MMS), Professor R O Maolalaigh (ROM),

By Invitation: Prof Neal Juster (NJ)

Apologies: Professor A Muscatelli (AM), Mr R Goward (RG), Ms J Milligan (JM)

HR/16/38 Opening Remarks & Apologies
DN opened the meeting and welcomed the members of the committee. Apologies were noted as above.

HR/16/39 Minute of the Meeting held on 26 May 2016
The Minute was taken as read and approved by the Committee.

HR/16/40 Matters arising from meeting held on 26 May 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/16/41 HR Director’s Report
CB spoke to her report, highlighting the key points.

National Pay Negotiations – CB noted that the ballots for industrial action by Unison and Unite were ongoing. The results would be known later this month and if either receive a mandate from their members, strike action could take place. UCU were consulting their members and an update regarding potential further action in pursuit of their dispute was expected in October. This could involve further specific action short of a strike such as a marking boycott. UCEA recommended that participating Universities implement the final pay offer and University of Glasgow would do so in September with any pay increases back dated to August.

The staff survey results were now being shared and analysed. This was covered under item 7.

PDR 2015-16 – CB updated on the ongoing PDR round which, for the first time, was being carried out using e-forms. Some staff had reported challenges in using the system but queries were now reducing and managers were able to track activity. The members of the committee noted these teething issues and emphasised the importance of managers and staff focusing on the performance and development conversation rather than the process. CB said that there would, as previously, be a lessons learned exercise at the end of the round but the emphasis would be on improving process and experience, including aspects such as the approach to senior management consistency overview (grand-parenting). Members of the Committee supported a proposal that the deadline for completion be extended.

Gender Pay – CB and DN noted that the paper on Gender Pay considered at the last meeting of the Committee had been duly discussed and supported at Court. Members of Court believed that there should be a focused approach on tackling the range of issues which contributed to the overall gender pay gap. CB noted that the HR Function was developing an action plan which would be brought to the November meeting of the Committee for further discussion.
Academic Promotion Criteria – CB updated the committee on a number of developments which had resulted from a review of the Promotion Criteria. Additionally the Research and Teaching track was being expanded to provide alternative career paths for Research Scientists and Technologists primarily within the Colleges of MVLS and Science and Engineering.

Finally CB noted that a number of key leadership roles were currently being recruited including for the position of Chief Operating Officer/University Secretary following the announcement that David Newall would be leaving the University in April 2017.

HR/16/42 Inspiring People Strategy - update
NJ provided the committee with an update on the progress being made towards achieving the goals set out in the University Strategy. He reminded the members of the key themes and the values which had now been embedded into the PDR process. He reflected on the work carried out by the three working groups looking at Agility, Focus and Empowering People and shared the latest available data against the KPIs set out in the Strategy. The committee agreed that the key themes of the strategy were well understood by staff and the Survey results in this regards were encouraging. It was recognised that the values would mean different things to different groups of staff but that these too could be woven into the fabric of University life. NJ referenced a new section of the website (Inspiring Change) which was being established to share success stories from across the University as well as information such as the Staff Survey Results.

HR/16/43 People Strategy and Plan - update
Following on from NJ’s presentation, CB shared the final copy of the People Strategy which had been developed by the HR function in consultation with managers and the trade unions, to draw out and expand upon the key people themes which were already prominent within the University Strategy. A plan of related actions along with a range of success measures has been developed to enable the HR function to support management and leadership actions across the University and align effort to delivering the strategy. The Committee noted that this was an ambition plan and that it would be a living document with priorities and focus evolving as progress was made. It was suggested that a specific risk around Brexit be included in the attracting talent section.

HR/16/44 Staff Survey and Denison Cultural Survey
CB gave a presentation of the University level results from the Staff Survey. She also shared the outputs from the Denison Cultural Survey which had been carried out with a sample of c.10% of University Staff. The two sets of results together were now being shared and considered across the University with the data broken down to School/RI/Service level as well as at College and University Services as a whole. Participation in the staff survey was encouragingly high at 68% and there were many positive results to be highlighted. CB also noted a number of areas where more work was needed to improve the working lives of all colleagues. 91% of staff consider the University a good place to work and measures relating to senior and local management as well as communication all saw good improvements since 2014. Some areas such as Feeling valued and Management of change saw improved scores but remain below the level we would aspire to. Additionally the fact that a number of staff report having felt harassed or bullied is a cause for concern though the Full Stop Campaign has clearly resulted in a greater awareness of the Dignity at Work policies. Separately, it was hoped that the changes being made to PDR would, in time, see more staff valuing that process. CB noted that the full University level results would be shared with staff via the Inspiring Change Web pages mentioned by NJ.

HR/16/45 HR Data
RPC spoke to the paper and highlighted a new page which included a number of key indicators relating to the University’s non-UK EU population. The University currently employs over 850 non-UK EU staff and they clearly form a critical part of the University community. The data would act as a baseline from which to monitor any potential effects of Brexit.
HR/16/46  AOB
There were no matters to discuss.

HR/16/47  Date of Next Meeting
The next meeting will take place on Monday 14 November 2016 at 10am in the Melville Room.
At its meeting on 20 September 2016, the Committee received: an update on the central recording of overseas travel risk assessments and insurance forms; details of progress on appointment of post of Business Continuity Officer (BCO); a Staff survey overview from the Director of HR. The Committee covered its usual range of business in reviewing standard reports on Occupational Health activities and on accidents that have occurred in recent months; and on uptake of employee counselling.
University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Tuesday 20 September 2016 at 10:00 AM in the Senate Room

Present:

Mrs Ann Allen, Mrs Christine Barr, Mr James Gray, Mr David McLean, Mr David Somerville, Ms Aileen Stewart, Mr Graham Tobasnick, Ms Selina Woolcott, Mr John F Malcolm

In Attendance:

Ms Debbie Beales, Mrs Kathleen Simmonds, Dr Alice Gallagher

Apologies:

Mr David Newall, Mr Deric Robinson, Ms Gillian Shaw

HSWC/2016/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 1 June 2016

The Minute from the previous meeting was approved.

HSWC/2016/2 Convenors Business

Mrs Allen informed the Committee that she would convene the meeting in the absence of Mr Newall. This would be her last HSWC meeting as an ex-officio member with Peter Haggarty attending future meetings for E&B. She informed the Committee that Paul Phillips had retired from the University over the summer and the Committee were awaiting a replacement rep from the College of MVLS. John Malcolm was also due to retire from the University and the Committee thanked him for all his hard work on the Committee over the years and welcomed Kathleen Simmonds as the new rep for the College of Social Sciences. Mrs Barr informed the Committee that this would be her last meeting as an ex-officio member with Richard Claughton attending future meetings for HR. The Committee welcomed Dr Alice Gallagher who was observing as the new Biological Safety Adviser for SEPS.

HSWC/2016/3 Matters arising

HSWC/2016/3.1 Safety for overseas workers (verbal update SW/CB)

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that she and Mrs Barr had met with the University’s Insurance and Risk Manager and discussed the recording of overseas travel risk assessments and insurance forms on CORE. It was still early days and they were currently scoping the suitability of this. Mrs Barr informed the Committee that CORE certainly had the functionality but that the challenge would be engaging management units to implement and enforce the process. She asked the Committee to publicise the fact that all overseas travel should be recorded on CORE. The Committee would be kept updated on the progression of this item.
HSWC/2016/3.2 Safety risk register (Paper 1)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated and were happy with the documented proposals. Ms Woolcott agreed to add biosecurity to the bio hazards section as well as adding a column listing ownership details for each item.

HSWC/2016/3.3 Fire risks (verbal update DMcL)

Mr McLean informed the Committee that Billy Russell was the new Senior Fire Officer. Mr Russell had recently attended a meeting of the Health and Safety Committee for US admin/office staff to discuss fire alarm testing. An audit of records kept by Central Services on alarm testing showed that more buildings than previously thought were doing weekly alarm testing and Mr Russell was working with AFO's to ensure that this continued.

HSWC/2016/4 Health and Safety Policy Statement (Paper 2)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that they had until the end of this week to provide any comments on the document. The Policy would be published at the end of September and publicised in the Campus News.

HSWC/2016/5 Business Continuity (verbal update SW)

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that interviews for the post of Business Continuity Officer (BCO) were taking place on 28 September 2016 and she hoped to have someone in post by the New Year. The post, which was for 18 months, was created to help Schools and RI's review existing BC plans, implement new BC plans and to organise BC governance. A meeting of HoC, HoRI's and the new BCO would take place once the appointment was made and Ms Woolcott would update the Committee once the BCO was in post.

HSWC/2016/6 Staff survey overview (verbal update SW/CB)

Mrs Barr informed the Committee that she had been delighted with the 68% response rate (up 8% from the previous survey). The purpose of the survey had been to measure levels of employee satisfaction and to identify areas of best practice and areas for improvement. The following information came from the survey:

- The respondent profile showed that 53% of respondents were female, 41% male and 6% other/not stated. This was in line with the male/female balance across the staff population.
- Within job family respondents were 42% R&T, 34% MPA, 8% technical and 3% Clinical. 3% did not state their job family.
- 91% of employees felt that the University was a good place to work (compared to 88% in other HEI's using the Capita Survey).
- Areas of good practice included University Leadership/Line Management, Equality & Diversity/Dignity at Work and Pay and Conditions.
- Areas for improvement included Meaningful P&DR, Workload demands/Conflicting Priorities and Harassment and bullying. 4% of respondents still felt bullied or harassed (the same as the previous survey) despite various campaigns on Campus such as the Full Stop campaign.
- An SMG subgroup had picked 15 benchmark questions and compared them to the previous survey. Of these - 11 had shown an improvement, 2 had remained the same and 2 were flagged as red which denoted deterioration.
• Going forward local meetings/roadshows would take place to share the outcome of the staff survey at SMG and local levels. Mrs Barr asked the Committee to encourage staff to attend and engage in these meetings.

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that a subset of questions from the staff survey had been fed through the Health & Safety Executive (HSE) stress indicator tool to show the results from the perspective of HSE management standards. Stress issues flagged up by the survey would be fed back to Schools, RI's and Services, with Ms Woolcott attending management and staff groups as required. The Committee agreed that Ms Woolcott and Mrs Barr should meet to review the support available for managers to assist them on implementing the Stress at Work Policy. Although there were already training courses in place within the University this would be an opportunity to review the provision and profile of the training. The following key issues came from the survey:

• High priority –
  1. Relationships - feeling bullied remained at 4% overall with the poorest score within operational staff. Most respondents identified the source of bullying as someone senior to them with 59% not reporting the bullying due to a belief that nothing would happen or that they would be identified as a troublemaker.
  2. Control - Respondents unanimously agreed that bureaucracy was still a major problem with excessive approvals required for routine decisions.

• Medium Priority -
  1. Demands - workload remained problematic with 28% of staff still struggling to take regular breaks.
  2. Relationships - 25% of Clinical and 37% Operational staff reported strained relationships at work and the Committee discussed the possibility of a drop down box for this question in the next staff survey to seek clarification.

• Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that she had made the following recommendations:
  1. Increase awareness of relevant policies
  2. Review data to identify ill health and adverse behaviour trends
  3. Identify opportunities to reduce ‘red tape’
  4. Make optimum use of P&DR
  5. Encourage openness

HSWC/2016/7 OH Report (Paper 3)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that the volume of activities continued to grow year on year. OH were seeing a significant increase in requests from medical/dental/nursing students for completion of paperwork for electives as well as working for the NHS. As this was directly related to tighter governance within the NHS the requests would only continue to grow.

HSWC/2016/8 SEPS Report (Paper 4)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that as always slips and trips were the biggest cause of reportable incidents on Campus. Injuries with sharps/needles were typically minor but it was hoped that numbers could be reduced and the new Biological Safety Adviser at SEPS had been tasked with exploring all such incidents this year with a view to identifying trends and potential improvement opportunities. Mr McLean tabled a Paper on the audit programme which showed that of the 40 actions from pre 2016 only 11 were outstanding. The majority of these were at least partially closed and Mr McLean would update the Committee on these at the next HSWC meeting.
HSCW/2016/9 EAP Report (Paper 5)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that utilisation of the service had increased by 46% compared to the same period last year with telephone counselling up by 13% and face to face counselling up by 33%. The recent staff survey showed that 65% of respondents were now aware of the service, 7% had used the service and 83% would recommend the service to others. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that the new APUC framework for Counselling Services had been awarded to People Asset Management and she would compare their buyers guide and pricing structure with that of the current provider.

HSCW/2016/10 Draft Minute H&S Committee admin/office (Paper 6)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated and agreed that there were sufficient defibrillators on Campus with the possible exception of the St Andrews Building. This could be discussed further at a H&S meeting that had been set up for users of the St Andrews Building on 26 September 2016.

HSCW/2016/11 Any Other Business

Mr McLean informed the Committee that an online DSE assessment package was being piloted and he would update the Committee at the next meeting

HSCW/2016/12 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Tuesday 13 December 2016 at 10am in the Melville Room.

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales
University of Glasgow

University Court – Wednesday 12 October 2016

Communications to Court from the meeting of Senate held on 06 October 2016

Dr Jack Aitken, Director, Senate Office

(All matters are for noting)

1. Update on Counselling & Psychological Services

At its meeting on 2 June 2016, the Council of Senate had noted with concern the waiting times experienced by some students seeking support from the Counselling and Psychological Service (CaPS). The Head of the Service, Dr Phil Quinn, and the Director of Student Services, Mrs Christine Lowther, provided an update on the position for the 8 October meeting, highlighting the rise in demand for the service the actions being taken to address these.

CaPS had seen a 22% increase in referrals to the service during the last academic year. This approximately translated to an additional 400 students requiring mental health support compared to the previous year. This increase was observed nationally throughout the sector. In the first semester alone there were almost 960 referrals, with the remaining increase continuing throughout semester 2 and over the recent summer period. CaPS would have assisted over 2000 student referrals during last year. However, these numbers did not include emergency ad hoc cases or consultations.

CaPS had made a number of changes and improvements to try and address the length of time that students are waiting for support. While significant improvements had been made, the scale of the challenge around student mental health across the sector could not be underestimated and there was expectation that demands on services would continue to increase. Student demand and waiting lists were closely monitored and would continue to be over the coming months to assess the impact of the changes made and, as part of planning and budget discussions, looking at the potential need for additional resources for CaPS.

It was noted that demand was continuing to rise for the service, with a 22% increase on demand this semester, as compared with the same period last year. Managing the increased demand continued to be challenging. While there was a perception that there may be many more students with mental health issues at the University of Glasgow, the level was lower than the national average, but was nonetheless an issue for the University of Glasgow.

The Principal noted that there was an awareness of dissatisfaction amongst students having to wait for the service due to the fact that demand continued to outweigh resource. This would be considered in the next budget round.
2. Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 Working Group update

A report was provided to the Council of Senate from the HE Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 Working Group concerning the implementation of the Act at the University of Glasgow in respect of its implications for the University Senate. The report noted options considered by the Working Group and the rationales for twenty recommendations.

Council of Senate was asked to consider the report and provide comment on its recommendations. The Working Group would then consider the Council's comments at a meeting later in the autumn, with a view to submitting final recommendations to the Council meeting on 8 December 2016. Legal advice would also be obtained on the Working Group's recommendations prior to the 8 December meeting of the Council of Senate.

Views were particularly sought in respect of the election and appointment of the Clerk of Senate and the gender balance of Senate Assessors on Court.

The Clerk of Senate was presently elected by and from the members of Senate. That Working Group had considered the constituency from which the Clerk of Senate would be selected in future, and whether that should be the full membership of the new Senate, the elected members of Senate only, or whether it should be a requirement that the person elected was necessarily appointed from the membership of Senate as opposed to any suitably qualified member of academic staff. If the constituency was the academic body as a whole, the person appointed could be co-opted onto new Senate if they were not already a member. Consideration was also given to the electorate—whether it should be the full membership of the new Senate or confined to elected Senate members. A decision was also required regarding whether an appointment of the Clerk from the elected membership of Senate would create a vacancy for a further elected member.

If the Clerk of Senate were to be appointed from the new Senate, which would be consistent with current arrangements, that would provide a significantly smaller field, and it may be difficult to find willing and able candidates. As a means of future proofing, the Working Group recommended that the Clerk of Senate be elected and appointed from among the academic staff community, even if the potential candidate was not already a member of the new Senate. Council of Senate shared the concern that the new Senate would only provide a small field from which to appoint a Clerk of Senate; however, the Council was also keen that future Clerk of Senate appointments would have demonstrated commitment to academic governance. The Principal noted that he would expect the Finding Committee that would be established to identify candidates for nomination to the post would wish to see evidence of such commitment. The suggestion was made that the Clerk of Senate could be appointed from existing and former members of the new Senate. Although this would initially be a small field, it would grow in time. An alternative suggestion was that the criteria could state that the appointment would ‘normally’ be drawn from the members of the new Senate. This would indicate that this was the preferred route, but also allow some flexibility. It was agreed that the Working Group would further consider the suggestions of the Council of Senate.
There were also presently six Senate Assessors on Court. However, the composition of the University Court was also affected by the new legislation and Court was also currently considering its future composition in light of the changes. It has been agreed that the Principal would be invited to establish a Court-Senate Working Group to take forward consideration of options/possibilities regarding the number of Senate Assessors\(^1\). While there may be a question regarding the number of Senate Assessors in future, there were other aspects of the appointment of Senate Assessors that could be addressed now.

The essential stipulation was that Senate Assessors on Court were appointed from the membership of Senate. (At present, they were elected from the constituency of the full Senate, not the Council of Senate.) In the past, it had been at times difficult to identify members of Senate to stand for election as Senate Assessors. With a significantly smaller body, it could be expected that this difficulty would increase, and that there would be a commensurately increased requirement for members to take on Senate-related responsibilities.

One means of addressing this issue would be to allow any member of academic staff (whether Research and Teaching, Teaching-only or Research-only) to stand for election as an Assessor, and, in the event that they are not already a member of the new Senate, to include provision in the composition of the new Senate for their co-option as Senate members. (There was already provision in University Ordinances for anyone appointed as an Assessor to retain membership of Senate for the duration of their appointment as an Assessor.)

With the inclusion in future of student members on the new Senate, a stipulation would be needed on restricting or otherwise nomination as a Senate Assessor to academic staff - on the basis that there were already two student members on the University Court.

Traditionally, Senate Assessors had been appointed on a territorial basis. There was, however, concern here also about the need to secure a good gender balance as well as territorial representation. Currently, there was one Senate Assessor per College and two who were not College-specific. The Working Group had considered the alternative whereby Senate Assessors on Court are not selected by College, but by gender, together with the guideline of two women and two men, and two of any gender, regardless of academic background. It had been suggested at the Council of Senate in April 2016 that combining these two considerations might be best.

The Working Group was of the view that Senate Assessors should continue to be selected by College first, to ensure that there was representation from each of the Colleges, as some issues for consideration were College specific. It was agreed that the selection process should also be mindful of the gender balance, but that this should not be prioritised above academic discipline.

\(^1\) Provision for such groups was made several years ago – please see http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_239124_en.pdf
The Working Group had also considered the alternative whereby (as was not the case currently) the Heads of College have the opportunity to speak at Court on College-specific matters. This measure would be pursued in addition to the selection of Senate Assessors on a territorial basis.

Council of Senate supported the recommendation that any member of academic staff should be eligible to stand for election as an Assessor, and, in the event that they were not already a member of Senate, to include provision in the composition of Senate for their co-option to Senate.

Council of Senate agreed that Senate Assessors should continue to be selected to include representation from each College, although it was also the view that greater steps were required in order to ensure that gender balance was achieved, and that, if necessary nominations should be restricted, when necessary, to ensure that the gender balance was maintained.

There was discussion about whether there was a requirement to hold a meeting of the full Senate prior to the changes in relation to the Act being brought into effect. Council of Senate was reminded that it had been established as a sub-committee of Senate, and therefore had the power to make decisions on behalf of Senate; however, it was agreed that legal advice would be sought. The Council endorsed the Working Group recommendation that the Council of Senate should form the basis of the new Senate. Legal advice would also be sought on whether the Council of Senate or present Senate could decide the constitution of the new Senate.

Council of Senate supported the other recommendations made by the Working Group as set out in the report.

3. Research Beacons

Professor Miles Padgett, Vice-Principal, Research presented to Council of Senate about the introduction of Research Beacons, Broad-based themed area of research excellence that had attracted major external investment. The idea for the Beacons was to provide a focus for the development of marketing campaigns and content, raising the profile of the institution with key audiences: prospective staff & students, potential research partners, policymakers and funders, and the media. It was reported that other research intensive universities had adopted a similar approach. Six Research Beacons had been proposed by SMG, these were:

- Precision Medicine & Chronic Diseases
- One Health
- Addressing Inequalities
- Cultural & Creative Economies
- Nano & Quantum Technology
- Future Life

There was recognition that the Research Beacons needed to be dynamic and have flexibility to evolve, however, it was anticipated that they would not change too frequently and if this was the
case, it would suggest that perhaps they had not been correctly identified. There was also recognition that there were a number of areas of specific research that would not fall within one of the Beacons, as they could not capture every area of research excellence across the University. It had been identified that there was necessary compromise with regards to what areas of research were included, but that the Beacons should span Schools and Institutes and capture quality and depth. It was not the intention that the Beacons would represent the direction for investment, although this would not necessarily be disconnected. The Research Beacons would be delivered through a coordinated approach from RSIO and MaRIO. RSIO would work with the Colleges to identify three academic theme leads per Beacon and to ensure that each Beacon captured relevant research and impact activities at Glasgow.

The timescale identified was to have developed and published the new Beacon content on the University website by the end of December 2016. By the end of January 2017 a Beacons toolkit for staff would be in place and marketing campaigns would be implemented between January – December 2017.

It was reported that the Communications and Public Affairs Office would continue to source stories from across the University, the website and main University homepage would still be used to promote research excellence from across the institution and high-profile research stories would continue to be supported by MaRIO.

Council of Senate noted that the wording used in the descriptors for each of the Beacons was important both to the internal and external audiences. The Beacons needed to reflect activity and people needed to be able understand where specific areas of research fitted. It was recognised that there was a danger for those who did not identify with one of the Beacons, particularly Early Career Researchers.

There was also recognition that it was important that there was not a negative impact on student recruitment if prospective students did see their subject area as a distinctive area for the University and whether not being included in a Beacon would detract from key areas. Council of Senate was reassured that the proposal was not to replace the home page of the website with the Research Beacons and that the fact that the news reel was to be maintained research excellence from across the institution would continue to be promoted.

There was discussion about whether there should be a rolling programme of Beacons and the requirement for the correct balance to ensure inclusivity without being to general. It was noted that three of the proposed Beacons covered Health and whether this was an appropriate balance. It was anticipated that material used for the Research Beacons would include impact and outputs relevant for the REF.

There was recognition that the Beacons would need to be evolve, however it was difficult to see how some would change, for example ‘Addressing Inequalities’ as this would potentially send a dangerous message that it was no longer a priority if it were to not identified as a Beacon in the future.
It was agreed that the wording used to describe each of the Research Beacons would require careful consideration, to ensure that the messages worked for different audiences. An update would be provided at the next meeting of Council of Senate.

4. Education and Policy Strategy Committee: TEF update

Vice-Principal, Professor Frank Coton, provided an update on the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). Council of Senate was reminded that TEF was, formally, an English initiative by BIS/DFE and participation was voluntary, although the Westminster Government was content for HE providers elsewhere in the UK to participate, and the Scottish Government had indicated it was content for Scottish universities to participate, provided they continued to comply fully with the requirements of the Scottish Quality Enhancement Framework. The TEF would be developed and implemented by the Department for Education (DFE).

HE Providers would be assessed against their teaching quality, learning environment and student outcomes/learning gain. The assessment was by means of a combination of metrics and a submission by the HEP. The metrics to be used were: NSS (Qus on: teaching on course; assessment and feedback; and academic support); HESA (non-continuation); and DLHE – the latter potentially being succeeded by a highly-skilled jobs metric (MHRC may provide). In addition to the metrics, institutions may submit an additional narrative of no more than 15 pages only – though this would likely be weighted much less than the metrics.

The grades that would be available were:
- Bronze (Entry level)
- Silver
- Gold

While DfE had indicated that a strict bell curve would not be applied to the awarding of grades, they expected results would approximately be: 20% Bronze; 50-60% Silver; 20-30% Gold. It would be possible to achieve any/all of these outcomes based on metrics only.

- DfE expect as many as 550 HEPs would participate – the bulk English FE Colleges which offered HE level provision.
- For English participants, outcomes would be linked to fee increases.
- Assessment of higher levels of TEF would be by means of assessor groups overseen by a single panel assessment.
- DfE has published a list of HEPs – including all Scottish HEIs – that have met the baseline Bronze grade. This entry level (TEF Yr 1) is awarded to HEPs that have successfully undergone ELIR/other form of institutional review.
- The intention is to progress from institution-level TEF to subject-level TEF. The timetable for implementation remains as previously announced.
• 2016-17 (Yr2): Provider-level TEF
• 2017-18 (Yr3): Provider-level TEF and subject-level TEF piloted*
• 2018-19 (Yr4): Subject-level TEF and likely to include PGT provision
• 'Pilot' means that the exercise is developmental only; for those involved in the pilot, the
  formal TEF rating for the HEP is the HEP-level score.
• However, the outcome of the 'Technical Consultation', run in the early summer, would be
delayed.

Regarding the Subject-level TEF, there was little that had been decided. The definition of the
units of assessment had not yet been determined. Possibilities included: alignment with REF
UoAs; use of HESA JACS Codes (at what level is also undecided). It had also been suggested
that HEPs might decide on subject areas for themselves. It was not clear how subject-level
ratings would be aggregated to produce an overall institutional rating or whether there would be
a combination of subject-level and provider-level assessment.

There were concerns regarding the metrics: 'POLAR' –v- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation
SIMD. The bases of these measurements were different and had been devised to be able to
capture the specific features of English and Scottish patterns of deprivation. And also regarding
retention – the presumption had long been that the Scottish four-year degree impacted
negatively on this, but the statistics were actually more complicated and work was being done to
identify the detail on this.

Thus far, no Scottish-based academic had been appointed to assessment panel. Herriot-Watt;
Robert Gordon and St Andrews Universities had indicated that they would possibly participate in
TEF2 (provider-level). This followed deliberations between Scottish institutions and a
recommendation that efforts be collectively focused on articulating a 'different but equivalent'
approach.

Universities Scotland had established a working group to provide advice on Scotland’s position
on TEF, in particular subject-level TEF. The group, chaired by Professor Jeffrey, Senior Vice-
Principal at the university of Edinburgh, had met once and would so again on 11 October 2016.
The group had agreed Scotland should be party to the development of TEF, on the basis that
further adaptation to Scottish circumstances could be negotiated and it was easier to do so with
direct involvement.

There were potential risks - global marketing, reputation – to Scottish universities if they did not
participate. If the Scottish sector decided to participate, it would be important to manage to hold
onto the integrity of the national enhancement-led approach by somehow finding a way to
accommodate TEF within the Scottish system without subverting it or incurring a significant
increase in administrative burden.
5. Proposal for Organisational Change in the Learning and Teaching Centre

Council of Senate received for comment a Proposal for Organisational Change in the Learning and Teaching Centre (LTC). Dr Matthew Williamson, Director of the Centre, presented the proposal.

Council of Senate was reminded that the current Centre comprised the Academic Development Unit (ADU), the Learning Technology Unit (LTU), The Media Production Unit (MPU), the Student Learning Service (SLS) and an administrative team which supported staff across the Centre. The Learning and Teaching Centre had been in existence for c. 10 years in its current form, and the identities of the units had remained largely unchanged during that time. The Centre supported and delivered a number of areas of activity. The Centre, unusually for a University Services Directorate, had a number of staff on academic contracts, including one member of staff on a Senior Lecturer contract.

In November 2015, Dr Williamson had been appointed to lead the Centre and tasked with reviewing the structure and role of the Centre and to make recommendations on how the Centre could better support the University’s strategic objectives and enhance and lead the development of best practice in learning and teaching across the institution. As part of this, a new Learning and Teaching Centre strategy had been developed by the Centre Management team. This had been shared with and discussed with all members of staff across the Centre and had been approved in principle by University Learning and Teaching Committee and Education Policy and Strategy Committee.

As the new Director, Dr Williamson had met with key stakeholders across the University and sought feedback regarding opportunities for enhancement. Whilst it was clear that much of the work of the Centre was well-regarded and valued by those who interacted with it and that the staff of the Centre were knowledgeable, professional and hard-working, it had been identified through these discussions that the ‘reach’ of the Centre was not as wide as it could be; that many staff did not interact with the Centre; and that the demand from students for the services the Centre offered was significantly larger than could currently be supported.

In order to enhance and extend the work of the Centre, the vision for the future was:

- Central, not just a centre – the LTC would become a key service within the University, seen as a centre of expertise and experience which could support, enhance and develop the learning experience for students at all levels, on all routes of study and in all disciplines;
- Integral to student success – the work of the LTC would be aimed at improving the quality of the student learning experience both through direct support of student learning, and through support and development of pedagogy and curricula;
- Integral to success of schools and colleges – the LTC would be better linked with the areas of the University that deliver teaching and support student learning. Schools and Colleges needed to be more aware of the work of the LTC and be inextricably linked to the work that the LTC undertakes;
Integral to development of excellent teaching and learning support – the LTC would ensure that all its work linked directly to the aspirations of the University, but it would also be more proactive. The LTC would lead change and enhancement around learning and teaching and support and lead the dissemination of best practice within the University. Also demonstrating the quality of the University’s learning and teaching practices to the wider HE community;

Credible at all levels – The LTC would work with all staff across the University who teach or support student learning and would enhance, develop and maintain a reputation for knowledgeable and professional engagement.

The organisational change proposed, therefore, was that:

- the boundaries of existing units within the Centre would be redefined and the concept of the ‘unit’ removed to enable more cohesive service delivery and effective user support. This would lead to two teams within the new Centre supported by an Admin team. One team would be largely focussed on supporting students and the other largely focussed on supporting staff, but each would inform and develop the work of the other.

- The new student-facing team (Student Learning Development) would include the currently separate Writing and Maths ‘Centres’. The work of the new team would be presented to students as embracing ‘writing advice’, ‘mathematics advice’ and ‘study skills advice’ and the roles within the team refocussed to deliver this.

- The new staff-facing team (Academic and Digital Development) would be created by bringing together staff who lead curriculum and pedagogic development from the current Academic Development Unit (ADU) with those who lead pedagogic engagement with learning technologies from the Learning Technology Unit (LTU) and the Media Production Unit (MPU) team who deliver and support media production for learning and teaching. It was proposed that those staff who work on the technical aspects of learning technology by relocated into IT Services.

- the Learning and Teaching Centre would cease to have a research focus. Staff across the Centre would be encouraged and supported to engage in scholarly activity and to disseminate this, but there would be no expectation that any staff in the new structure would be REF-returnable.

This proposed new structure would mean that the LTC would be able to support Colleges and Schools more effectively by being a coherent and integrated team working across all areas of learning and teaching. This would improve the service that the Centre offers to both staff and students. The LTC would offer an enhanced and wider set of support services to those delivering teaching and supporting learning.

The Centre’s new strategy focussed on the development, identification and dissemination of good practice and the new structure would facilitate this. This would impact directly on the wider academic activities of the University, by supporting and developing more staff, by providing joined-up resources and services to colleagues and by empowering students to take more
control of their learning. The intention was make the new LTC a centre of excellence around learning and teaching, and so enhance learning and teaching across the University.

The proposed changes in makeup and focus of what was now the Student Learning Service would make the services the LTC provides to UG and PGT students better and easier to understand. Increased Maths and Stats support would have a directly beneficial impact on a large number of students. Being clearer about the LTC’s mission, and focussing more closely on development, would mean that LTC should be able to increase its impact on L&T practices and, therefore, have an indirect beneficial effect on students. The proposal was presented on a cost-neutral basis and was not attempting to save money; rather, it was an attempt to use the available resource of the Centre to support and enhance learning and teaching across the University.

The nature of the change proposed was such that there was potential impact on staff, but this would be mitigated as much as possible and would be managed through the University’s Management of Organisational Change process.

The proposal to remove Research from the activity of the Centre and therefore separate from the Learning and Teaching within the Centre, when it was important elsewhere in the University was questioned by Council of Senate. The proposal to not have REF returnable research staff within the Centre was in response to the view that, if returnable in the REF, that research should be done through a School or Research Institute with the infrastructure and income to support that activity.

Members of Council of Senate expressed concerns that the Centre was considered to be working well in supporting scholarship and that that might suffer as a result of the proposed changes. Dr Williamson, assured Council that the intention behind the proposal was to enable the service to be better positioned to work as collaborators with academic staff and to operate as a hub for identifying, encouraging and promoting good practice and to be better placed to help Schools support students.

Members also discussed the proposal in relation to the moving of staff from the Centre who currently supported technology-enhanced activity to IT Services. There was concern that this would be detrimental to enhancing innovation in this area if the LTU were separated from the support around scholarship. Dr Williamson reported that there were staff who were keen to move, as they thought that they would be better placed to support Moodle for example, if they located in IT services.

Dr Williamson highlighted that the aim was for the Centre to be more than a delivery unit and to undertake more co-working, across a broader range of Colleges and Schools.
6. Library Committee: Elsevier Science Direct Negotiation

Ms Susan Ashworth, University Librarian, presented a paper on the progress of renegotiation of access to Elsevier's Science Direct collection of electronic journals for UK Higher Education Institutions. It was reported that the extensive and growing cash and non-cash contributions that UK HEIs make to Elsevier and that the sector had been in negotiations to obtain a fair agreement from Elsevier, an important and highly profitable scholarly publisher. The agreement with Elsevier was one of the largest and most important journal agreement which universities in the UK and globally subscribe to, accounting for roughly 40% of annual spend by the sector on major journal agreements. The sector had maintained a united front, consistently and robustly arguing for the objectives and, had this week, accepted a much more reasonable offer from Elsevier than originally proposed. It was anticipated however, that similar negotiations with other publisher's may follow.

The negotiating team had included experienced Jisc Collections staff (Liam Earney, Carolyn Alderson and colleagues), senior Library Directors: Dr Paul Ayris (University College London) and Phil Sykes (University of Liverpool) together with two Vice Chancellors: Professor Sir David Eastwood (University of Birmingham) and Professor Sir Ian Diamond (University of Aberdeen), supported by a Negotiation Board made up of Library Directors from across the UK.

7. Convener's Business

7.1 Brexit
The Principal reported that there was concern about attitudes towards immigration following the Referendum vote to leave the EU. The HE sector needed to continue to put pressure on the UK Government with regards to the impact on Higher Education and would continue to push for staff and student mobility. It was noted that the Scottish Government had a different view and was more supportive of the HE sector.

7.2 Guild – New University European Network update
The Principal provided an update on the new University European Network – Guild. It was reported that work ongoing to extend the network with the inclusion of two Eastern European Universities, Ljubljana and Tartu. There were now twelve universities within the network, with the aim of reaching twenty. The Guild was lobbying to ensure that UK researchers were not discriminated against as a result of the changes following Brexit.

It was reported that there was concern from PGR students from the EU about fees increasing to the same as current fees for non-EU students. It was recognised that there needed to be care to ensure that no group of students was discriminated against, and legal advice would be sought. Options including Scholarships were under consideration and a further update would be provided at a future meeting of Council of Senate.
Current PG students required reassurance regarding the fact that fees would not change part way through and that the Government were being pressed to continue to provide funded places for 2017.

In terms of UG student numbers, there may be a requirement to take on more Scottish students if the EU figures were not included and therefore numbers may increase, and with no additional resource.

Council of Senate queried whether the uncertainty and concern amongst students in relation to Brexit was contributing to the increased pressure on the Counselling and Psychological Service and also that there might be some reaction to the increased hostility being experienced by EU and non-EU students, following the Referendum.

It was reported that it was not generally the impression that there had been a fall in interest from prospective EU students, in terms of recruitment. However, the Medical School reported that conversion rate was lower for EU students this year, and they were trying to disentangle the figures to establish whether there was any difference before and after the Brexit vote. It was noted that, particularly for longer degrees like the MBChB, there was a greater risk.

There was recognition that there needed to be future workforce planning and that the whole country was dependent on EU workers. The composition of the academic workforce in the UK was such that all disciplines would be affected. The Scottish and UK Governments were willing to invest to support PG student numbers if visa restrictions were tightened.

It was agreed that there would be further discussion at next meeting.

7.3 Funding
The Principal reported that the budget was due to be published on 15 December 2016, and it was anticipated that there would be continued pressure on funding for HE, particularly in relation to spending on healthcare and following on from the cuts made last year.

7.4 Estate Strategy
Senior Vice-Principal Professor Neal Juster reported that the final business case for the Learning and Teaching Hub would be received by Court at its December meeting. It was anticipated that work would start in January 2017. There was ongoing consideration regarding other projects and the potential for borrowing ahead of the next phase.

8. Clerk of Senate’s Business

8.1 Senate Guest Night Dinner

The next Senate Guest Night would be held on Thursday, 24 November 2016 at 7.00 for 7.30pm in the Senate Room. The guest speaker on this occasion would be Louise Welsh, Writer in residence at the University of Glasgow and Glasgow School of Art.
Members of Senate or Court who wish to nominate persons for consideration as official guests of the Senate at this or subsequent Senate Guest Nights should write to the Clerk of Senate. Members of Senate and Court are also encouraged to contact the Clerk of Senate with suggestions for speakers at subsequent Senate Guest Nights.

8.2 Remembrance Sunday

Remembrance Sunday falls on 13 November 2016. This year, the Service of Remembrance would be held in the Bute Hall at 10.45am.

Members of Senate who wish to join the academic procession are requested to assemble in the Hunterian Museum by 10.30am (dress: academic gown, hood and dark tie). Members wishing to attend are asked to advise Michelle Leatham, ext. 3292, e-mail: Michelle.Leatham@glasgow.ac.uk by 12 noon on Monday 7 November 2016.

8.3 Honorary Degrees 2017

Senate received the oral report from the Honorary Degrees Committee concerning recommendations for the conferment of honorary Degrees in 2017. The Clerk of Senate would provide a report to Court at its meeting on 12 October 2016.
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Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council
Institution-led Review of Quality and Governing Body
Statement of Assurance for AY 2015-16

Brief Description of the Paper

A copy of the University’s draft annual report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) on institution-led review of quality for AY 2015-16 is attached. The contents are specified by the SFC. The statement summarises review activity undertaken by the University of its provision for students, i.e. Periodic Subject Reviews (PSR), Graduate School Reviews and the University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP) carried out in respect of student-facing University services. Information concerning review activity carried out at the University by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies is also included.

The deadline for submission of the report was 30 September, and the Council requests that we confirm to them when the report has been approved by Court in the event that Court does not meet until after that date. The draft nature of the statement has been duly reported to SFC.

Court has duly approved the annual report for the last several years. Court will recall that a new requirement, the ‘Statement of Assurance’ was introduced in 2013. The prescribed text is quoted below and should be signed off by the Chair of the Governing Body with an indication of when it was endorsed.

“On behalf of the governing body of [University of Glasgow], I confirm that we have considered the institutions arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for AY 2014-15, including the scope and impact of these. I further confirm that we are satisfied that the institution has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision. We can therefore provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at this institution continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.”

Action Required
Court is requested to approve the draft report and endorse the statement of assurance above.
How we assure the effectiveness of arrangements for maintaining academic standards and quality

Under the terms of its constitution, at the University, Senate has responsibility for teaching. This has been understood as meaning responsibility for academic standards and quality. Senate employs a range of mechanisms to ensure standards and quality are maintained. The main methods used are:

- The external examiner system
- The annual monitoring of all courses
- The periodic review of programmes by subject (involving external subject experts)
- The periodic review of the Graduate Schools
- The scrutiny of all new courses and degree programmes
- Gathering and analysing feedback from students

Many of the University’s degrees are also accredited by professional or statutory bodies and these degrees are reviewed by the relevant body on a cyclical basis.

The findings from the range of mechanisms detailed above are analysed and responded to by committees at School, Research Institute, College and Senate levels. This includes normally annual consideration of ways to enhance the effectiveness of the mechanisms themselves and of the committees that receive and consider them also. The framework of these arrangements is detailed in the University's Academic Quality Framework, which may be found at: [http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_127773_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_127773_en.pdf)

The University’s quality arrangements must also conform to the terms of the Scottish national Quality Enhancement Framework. Details of this may be found at: [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/SCOTLAND/ABOUTUS/Pages/Quality-enhancement-framework-in-Scotland.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/SCOTLAND/ABOUTUS/Pages/Quality-enhancement-framework-in-Scotland.aspx)

Compliance with the Quality Enhancement Framework is assessed at the four-yearly Enhancement-led Institutional Reviews (ELIRs).

The ELIR reviews check (in detail) compliance with the terms of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education published by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). This Code includes detailed provisions for each of the main quality assurance mechanisms we employ. ELIR reviews also check compliance with national Subject Benchmark Statements and with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework.

The University has received the best result possible in each of the reviews it has undergone. Court will be aware that the most recent ELIR took place earlier in 2014. This exercise resulted in an excellent outcome. The reports from the 2014 ELIR may be found at: [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007794](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007794)

The QAA also checks the University's compliance with the requirements of the annual report to the Scottish Funding Council. No notes of concern have been received on these reports since they began to be required.
As a separate measure, the Secretary of Court also maintains a rolling programme of reviews of service departments within University Services. In compliance with the requirements of the Scottish national Quality Enhancement Framework, the panels for these reviews include a student member as well as external representative(s).

Quality arrangements and monitoring of external requirements are managed for the University by the Senate Office.
1. Introduction

The University’s annual report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) includes a summary of Periodic Subject Reviews (PSR); reviews by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB); Graduate School Review and University Services Administrative Review Programme. Below is a report on each process.

2. Periodic Subject Review (PSR)

The University’s process of internal subject review is known as Periodic Subject Review (PSR). The process for PSR is consistent with the SFC’s guidance on the characteristics of institution-led review (e.g. they are conducted on a cycle of not more than 6 years; include a student member and at least one external member on the review panel). The outcome of the review is a report which commends the strengths and achievements of the subject and includes recommendations aimed at enhancing and strengthening teaching provision and the student experience.

The University’s Academic Standards Committee (ASC) review and endorse the report and monitors the responses to the recommendations made. More detailed information on the PSR process is available at:

http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/periodicsubjectreview/

2.1 Subject Areas Reviewed in Session 2015-16

Eight\(^1\) reviews were conducted during 2015-16, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Development Unit (Learning and Teaching Centre)</th>
<th>7 December 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>25 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental School</td>
<td>17 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>11 March 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Nine reviews had originally been scheduled to be undertaken in 2015-16, but a request had been made and approved by the Scottish Funding Council to postpone the Review of Accounting and Finance by one year. This was due to the Subject being accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Although many subjects undertake both PSR and Accreditation within the same year, the AACSB process makes extensive use of student input and the School did not wish for their students, in particular, student representatives, to be overloaded by involvement in both the PSR and the AACSB processes in the same period. The PSR and the AACSB are different exercises and therefore unlikely to be any positive/synergistic gain in running both in the one year, but there was a risk of the opposite.
Details of the programmes covered by the reviews are included in Appendix 1. The University’s confirmed PSR review reports are publically available and can be found at the web address stated above under item 2.

2.2 Update on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2014-15

Six months following each Review, Progress Reports were considered by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for the following subject areas. The outcomes of which were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Subject</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>ASC sought further progress on 5 of the 16 recommendations. Updates are to be provided at the October 2016 meeting of ASC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School of Chemistry</td>
<td>ASC was satisfied with the School’s responses to all of the recommendations and no further updates were required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ASC sought further progress on 8 of the 11 recommendations to be provided at the March 2017 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School of Geographical &amp; Earth Sciences</td>
<td>ASC was satisfied with the School’s responses with one of the responses identified as good practice to be disseminated across the University. The School had established a Learning and Teaching Moodle site, promoting a culture that actively encourages staff to publish on their teaching expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>A further update on 4 of the 8 recommendations was requested for the September 2016 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre, Film and TV Studies</td>
<td>A further update on 4 of the 12 recommendations was requested for the September 2016 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>ASC considered that the responses were overall, excellent; however, a further update was requested for one recommendation, regarding the development of learning and teaching strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Further progress reports on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed prior to Session 2013-14

Further updates had been requested from ASC for the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Subject</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td>ASC was satisfied with the progress made with no further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Subject</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic &amp; Social History</td>
<td>The one outstanding issue had been satisfactorily addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Community Development &amp; Adult Education</td>
<td>All outstanding issues had been satisfactorily addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Health care</td>
<td>ASC was satisfied with the progress made with no further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Studies</td>
<td>No resolution has been found in relation to one outstanding recommendation regarding the unsuitability of the Art Room. ASC agreed that as the next PSR of Open Studies was scheduled for Session 2017-18, this issue should be referred to the PSR Panel for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>ASC was not fully satisfied with 3 of the College-level responses and agreed that these should be referred to the PSR panel of the next review due to be held in Session 2019-20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>All outstanding issues had been fully resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology &amp; Religious Studies</td>
<td>ASC was satisfied with the progress made with no further action required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From Session 2012-13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Subject</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celtic &amp; Gaelic</td>
<td>The one outstanding issue had been satisfactorily addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>All outstanding issues had been fully resolved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From Session 2011-12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Subject</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>The outstanding recommendation concerned dialogue between the College and the School the regarding provision of dedicated administrative support for teaching. This had taken place and the recommendation has, strictly, been fulfilled. ASC noted that dialogue was continuing between the School and College on how teaching support would be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Subject Reviews to be conducted in Session 2016-17

The following six reviews are scheduled to take place in Session 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounting and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central and East European Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Advanced Technology and Information Institute (HATII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Reviews by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRB)

3.1 PSRB Reviews conducted in Session 2015-2016.

Please note that the reviews listed below are those reported to the SFC in Autumn 2015 as expected in 2015-2016. The reviews shaded in grey will be carried over to the 2016-2017 report and will be noted there. Those marked in italics provide updates to reviews which took place in 2014-15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PSRB</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Chartered Accountants in Scotland (ICAS)</td>
<td>Programmes have been reaccredited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFMD Quality Improvement System (EQUIS)</td>
<td>Report received. Programmes have been reaccredited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC)</td>
<td>Report received. Programmes have been reaccredited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)</td>
<td>Report received. Programmes have been reaccredited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Physics and Medicine in Engineering (IPEM)</td>
<td>Review undertaken in May 2015. Report now received. Programmes have been reaccredited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 While the reviews may have taken place in 2015-2016, some reports of reviews were not available at the time of writing. These programmes will be noted in the 2016-2017 listing with appropriate comment.
3.2 PSRB reviews to be conducted in Session 2016-17

The following PSRB reviews are anticipated in 2016-17. Subjects noted in grey are reviews carried over from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PSRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Standards Council for Scotland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following subjects were reviewed in 2015-2016 but reports of accreditation reviews have not yet been received. The reports from the accrediting bodies listed below are due to be received/confirmed in 2016-2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PSRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Institute of Mathematics and its Applications (IMA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Graduate School Reviews**

The College of Medicine, Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences was reviewed during Session 2014-15 but the report had not been available for inclusion in last year’s report. The final report highlighted that the current College was established in 2010 following University restructuring, bringing together 3 Graduate Schools into one single School, from across 3 Schools and 7 Research Institutes. The final report commended a number of areas including: the progress made towards functionality and integration despite the challenges of its size and complexity, the well-developed PGT strategy, the Researcher Training Programme, student-led activities, support provided for establishing industrial partnerships, leadership provided in developing new processes and approaches and excellent completion rates. A number of challenges had also been identified including issues associated with size and diversity, improving student recruitment, in particular, international PGR recruitment, linking to developing Doctoral Training Partnerships and other cohort based funding structures, effective community building across Schools and Research Institutes and sharing of good practice and developing effective strategies for interaction with funders. The overall conclusion was that supervision was excellent with student having an overall positive experience. Challenges were mainly due to the size and diversity of the Graduate School, but the School was very much aware of this and was attempting to address this by introducing a number of processes.

No review was undertaken in Session 2015-16, with a review of the cycle undertaken. The Deans of Graduate Studies Committee reviewed the self-evaluation questionnaire competed as part of the review and, as a result, some amendments would be made to the next cycle of reviews. This included:

- Changing how the admissions process is covered as the majority of activity is undertaken at School or Research Institute.
- Inclusion of an overall question that reflects a strategy for Equality and Diversity, rather than a question at the end of each section.
- Removal of the section on Destinations. Graduate Schools collect this data but have no responsibility or mechanism for doing so. The Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey was considered a better source for this data.

Revisions to the process were expected to be approved at the first Graduate Studies Committee meeting of Session 2016-17.

PGR Annual Reporting was introduced for the first time in Session 2015-16. This ‘light touch’ annual reporting from all Graduate Schools would provide useful and support ongoing quality processes. The collated annual school reports would be published on the PGR Service web pages as well as forwarded to Research Planning and Strategy Committee (RPSC)

The Graduate School in the College of Science and Engineering will be reviewed during Session 2016-17.

5. **University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP)**

A review of the Research Strategy and International Office (RSIO) was undertaken during Session 2015-16. The report has yet to be approved and will be noted in next year’s report. It is still to be confirmed which service will be reviewed during Session 2016-17.

6. **The Outcomes of the Institution-led Review Processes**

The outcome of a subject review visit at the University of Glasgow is a report produced by the Review Panel identifying the key strengths of the School or Subject Area along with conclusions...
and recommendations for improvement or change. There were no recommendations during the 2015-16 PSR reviews and Graduate School reviews that called into question the continuation of any programme for reasons relating to quality or standards.

The University makes the reports of its institution-led quality reviews publicly available through its website: including PSR reviews, Graduate School reviews and University Services’ ARP reviews. Responses to the recommendations arising from PSR reviews are also published.

7. The Role and Nature of Student Involvement in Institution-led Review Processes
The University continues to work closely with the Students’ Representative Council (SRC) with students involved with all review processes at the University of Glasgow. The University considers its relationship with the SRC to be very strong.

The SRC had raised concerns in Session 2014-15 regarding some disappointing low attendance at the PSR meetings scheduled with the students. Following discussion with the SRC, it was agreed that both the Senate Office and SRC would be more pro-active. In Session 2015-16, the Senate Office sent a general email to all students within subjects being reviewed to advise them of the review and the importance of student involvement in the process. A number of students across levels and backgrounds were directly invited by the Senate Office to meet with the Panel. Following this, the SRC contacted students identified to emphasise the importance of their attendance. It is unclear whether this additional interaction improved student attendance, with the Senate Office still relying on the School or Subject to ask students to attend. This will continued to be monitored.

8. Development Needs and the Identification of Good Practice
8.1 Development Needs
As in previous years, an examination of the recommendations made by PSR Panels during Session 2015-16 has been undertaken. In total, 87 recommendations were made from 8 reviews. As part of our standard practice, a report on the examination of the recommendations will be submitted to the 30 September 2016 meeting of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). ASC’s attention will be drawn to the groupings with specific attention drawn to any recommendations that have potential for University-wide consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic standards[6]</th>
<th>Setting, maintaining and reviewing</th>
<th>Appropriate quality processes</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course/Programme approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Examining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation and other external references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing good practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context and Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of provision</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes since last review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall aims and linkage to University strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancing the Student Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions, Retention, Success</td>
<td>Student numbers and trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers destination data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality and Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting students</td>
<td>Support mechanisms</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition and Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internationalisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback mechanisms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Learning &amp; Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>Curriculum design and development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum design and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conclusion of the review of the recommendations is that, whilst the recommendations cover a number of themes, the following themes contain the most recommendations: Supporting staff (15), GTA support and training (9), Student support mechanisms (8), Range of provision (8), What/how students receive feedback (7), and Strategic Approach (7).

A number of issues highlighted under ‘Supporting staff’ are noted under the review of the Academic Development Unit where recommendations revolved around supporting staff on the PGCAP and establishing local support network as well as developing continued relationships between the Learning and Teaching Centre and Schools. The introduction of peer review and mentoring and support for developing and introducing innovative ways of learning and teaching was also proposed as ways to support and develop staff.

A number of recommendations drew attention to GTA support and training, identifying the need to develop clear and transparent processes in relation to appointment, remuneration, development and support.

Student support mechanisms covered a spectrum of issues, including providing additional support for the PGT community and ensuring course handbooks and Moodle (VLE) included all relevant material and information.

Range of provision mainly covered consideration be given to rationalisation but there was some examples of extending PGT provision and insuring appropriate staffing to cover aspects of the curriculum.
Recommendations relating to What/How students receive feedback mainly covered inconsistencies, timing and communication. One referred to the limitation of Moodle to provide feedback.

Strategic approach mainly covered long term vision for the Subject or School and developing strategy for enhancing the student experience.

There were no concerns raised this year that required urgent attention. In summary, a substantial number of recommendations reflected the need to develop and support staff (including GTAs) and to provide consistent information, advice and feedback to the UG and PGT student community.

Fuller details on this year’s recommendations can be made available, if required.

### 8.2 Key Strengths and Good Practice

A total of 74 areas of good practice/key strengths were identified, out of which 22 have potential for University-wide dissemination. Good practice was identified in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic standards [3]</th>
<th>Setting, maintaining and reviewing</th>
<th>Appropriate quality processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course/Programme approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External Examining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsiveness to student feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation and other external references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context and Strategy [5]</td>
<td>Range of provision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment (strong sense of community/student focused)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes since last review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic approach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective and high quality Self Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall aims and linkage to University strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancing the Student Experience [25]</strong></td>
<td><strong>Admissions, Retention, Success</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student numbers and trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention and Progression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leavers destination data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality and Diversity</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting students</strong></td>
<td>Support mechanisms 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition and Induction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widening participation 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Graduate attributes 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employability 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internationalisation 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback mechanisms 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Learning &amp; Teaching [41]</strong></td>
<td><strong>Learning &amp; Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum design and development 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approaches to ILOs 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work based learning and placement 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology enhanced L&amp;T 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative Teaching 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment &amp; Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Range of/Innovative assessment methods 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement with Assessment policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What/how students receive feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What/how students receive feedback</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying/ extending good practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for L&amp;T</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging and supporting staff</td>
<td>Supporting staff (including Equality and Diversity) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA support and training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of good practices identified covered a large number of themes; with Support mechanisms (10), Range of assessment methods (8) Innovative Teaching (7), Supporting staff (6) and Curriculum design and development (6) being the categories with the most practices identified. Combining Feedback Mechanisms and What/How students receive feedback totalled (8), which is an increase to previous years which could possibly reflect strategic attempts to improve this area following National Student Survey (NSS) results where ‘Assessment and Feedback’ tends to score lower than other categories.

Good practice is regularly identified under ‘Support mechanisms’, reflecting staff commitment to providing a supportive environment, responsive to student needs both academic and pastoral. It is evident that Schools and Subjects are also committed to introducing innovative teaching and assessment methods with a number of methods being highlighted by Periodic Subject Review.

Dissemination and tracking of good practice

At the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) on 21 September 2016, good practice identified from Periodic Subject Review was discussed. LTC highlighted that a majority of practices/commendations identified, where areas that Colleges and Schools were aware of and identification of original innovation would be of greater benefit. As a result, LTC proposed that it may be more beneficial for Dr Matthew Williamson, Director of the Learning and Teaching Centre, to liaise with the Senate Office, in relation to reviewing and identifying good practice worthy of dissemination. Academic Standards Committee has been requested to endorse this proposal.

Further details on Key Strengths and Good Practice can be made available, if required.
Periodic Subject Reviews

Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2015-16

Academic Development Unit

- Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP)
- MEd in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (online)

Archaeology

Undergraduate

- Single Honours degrees in Archaeology in both the College of Arts (MA) and the College of Science and Engineering (BSc).
- Joint Honours degrees in Archaeology and another subject offered in the College of Arts (MA) or Social Sciences (MA)
- Joint Honours degrees in Archaeology and Earth Science, and Archaeology and Geography, through the College of Science and Engineering (BSc).
- A non-Honours designated degree in Archaeological Studies (BSc) in the College of Science and Engineering
- Level 3 options contribute to non-Honours designated degrees in the College of Arts (MA in Ancient Studies, European Civilisation, Historical Studies and Scottish Studies).

Postgraduate

- MLitt/PGDip Archaeological Studies
- MLitt/PGDip Celtic & Viking Archaeology
- MLitt/PGDip Material Culture and Artefact Studies
- MSc Landscape: Integrated Research and Practice
- Contributes to:
  - MSc/PGDip in Museum Studies, including Artefacts and Material Culture strand
  - MLitt in Ancient Cultures
  - MLitt/PGDip Conflict Archaeology and Heritage
  - MLitt in Celtic Studies
  - PGT course in Public Humanities

Dental School

Undergraduate

- Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS)

Postgraduate

- MSc Endodontics
- MSc Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery
- Doctorate in Clinical Dentistry (Orthodontics)

English Language

Undergraduate

- MA in General Humanities
- MA Honours in English Language (Single)
MA Honours in English Language (Joint)

Postgraduate
- MSc English Language and English Linguistics

English Literature

Undergraduate
- MA (Hons) English Literature (Single)
- MA (Hons) English Literature (Joint)
- MA General Humanities

Postgraduate
- MLitt Creative Writing
- MLitt Fantasy
- MLitt Modernities
- MLitt Victorian Literature

Interdisciplinary Studies

Undergraduate
- MA(Hons) Health and Social Policy
- MA Primary Education with Teaching Qualification
- BSc Environmental Science and Sustainability

Postgraduate
- MSc Tourism, Heritage and Development
- MSc Tourism, Heritage and Sustainability
- MSc Environmental Science, Technology and Society
- MLitt Environment, Culture and Communication
- MSc Enhanced Practice in Education

Mathematics and Statistics

Undergraduate – Mathematics
MSci in Applied Mathematics ♣
MSci in Applied Mathematics and Statistics ♣ Φ
MSci in Applied Mathematics and another subject [being phased out]
MSci in Mathematics ♣
MSci in Mathematics and Statistics ♣ Φ
MSci in Mathematics and another subject
MSci in Pure Mathematics
MSci in Pure Mathematics and Statistics Φ
MSci in Pure Mathematics and another subject [being phased out]
MA (Honours) in Mathematics ♣
MA (Honours) in Mathematics and another subject
BSc (Honours) in Applied Mathematics ♣
BSc (Honours) in Applied Mathematics and Statistics ♣ Φ
BSc (Honours) in Applied Mathematics and Accounting [being phased out]
BSc (Honours) in Applied Mathematics and Finance [being phased out]
BSc (Honours) in Applied Mathematics and another subject [being phased out]
BSc (Honours) in Mathematics
BSc (Honours) in Mathematics and Statistics
BSc (Honours) in Mathematics and Accounting
BSc (Honours) in Mathematics and Finance
BSc (Honours) in Mathematics and another subject
BSc (Honours) in Pure Mathematics
BSc (Honours) in Pure Mathematics and Statistics
BSc (Honours) in Pure Mathematics and Accounting
BSc (Honours) in Pure Mathematics and Finance [being phased out]
BSc (Honours) in Pure Mathematics and another subject [being phased out]
BSc in Mathematics
BEng/MEng (School of Engineering) – 2 core courses

**Undergraduate – Statistics**
MSci in Statistics
MSci in Statistics with Work Placement
MSci in Statistics and another subject
BSc (Honours) in Statistics
BSc (Honours) in Statistics and another subject
BSc (Honours) in Statistics and Accounting
BSc (Honours) in Statistics and Finance
BSc in Statistics
BSc in Statistical and Mathematical Studies
BEng/MEng in Biomedical Engineering (School of Engineering) – 1 core course

**Postgraduate Taught – Mathematics**
MSc in Applied Mathematics
MSc in Mathematics
Courses for the Scottish Mathematical Sciences Training Centre (SMSTC)

**Postgraduate Taught – Statistics**
MRes in Advanced Statistics
MSc in Biostatistics
MSc in Environmental Statistics
MSc in Social Statistics [being phased out]
MSc in Statistics
MSc in Data Science (School of Computing Science) – 3 optional courses
MSc in Financial Modelling (Adam Smith Business School) – 6 core courses
Courses for the Scottish Mathematical Sciences Training Centre (SMSTC)

**Collaborative Provision – Mathematics**
BSc (Honours) Applied Mathematics – 2+2 Degree with the Northwestern Polytechnical University, China
BSc (Honours) Mathematics – 2+2 Degree with the Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, China
Collaborative Provision – Statistics
BSc (Honours) Statistics & Laurea in Scienze Statistiche (Classe L41) – Double Degree programme with the University of Bologna, Italy Φ
BSc (Honours) Statistics – 2+2 Degree with the Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, China Φ

◆ programme accredited by the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications (IMA)
Φ programme accredited by the Royal Statistical Society (RSS)

Scottish Literature

Undergraduate
- MA in General Humanities
- MA Honours in Scottish Literature (Single)
- MA Honours in Scottish Literature (Joint)
- JYA course for Principia Consortium - ‘The Scottish Enlightenment: Ideas and Influence’