

WEB COPY

Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 22 June 2011 in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr David Anderson General Council Member, Ms Susan Ashworth Employee Representative, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Dr Olwyn Byron Senate Member, Professor Muffy Calder Senate Member, Mr Peter Daniels Co-opted Member, Ms Susan Dunsmore General Council Member, Dr Robin Easton Co-opted Member, Professor Eleanor Gordon Senate Member, Mr Tommy Gore SRC President, Dr Gordon Hay Senate Member, Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP Rector (Chair), Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Member, Cllr Jim Mackechnie Glasgow City Council Representative, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor's Representative, Professor William Martin Senate Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Mr Alex Ross Employee Representative, Mr David Ross General Council Member (Convener of Court), Professor Michael Scott-Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Adrienne Scullion Senate Member, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Member

In attendance:

Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Ian Black (Director of Human Resources), Professor Steve Beaumont (Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise), Professor Graham Caie (Clerk of Senate and Vice-Principal), Professor John Chapman (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Vice-Principal Strategy & Resources), Mr Jim McConnell (Director of Estates & Buildings), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Andrea Nolan (Senior Vice-Principal), Professor Murray Pittock (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal), Mr Stuart Ritchie (SRC President elect, observer), Ms Susan Stewart (Director of Corporate Communications)

Apologies:

Members: Mr Matt Morrison SRC Member on Court, Dr Alan Owen Senate Member

CRT/2010/46. Announcements

Three Court members were attending their final meeting. Members of Court thanked Dr Olwyn Byron, Professor Muffy Calder and Mr Tommy Gore for their contributions to Court and wished them well in the future.

CRT/2010/47. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 13 April 2011

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2010/48. Matters Arising

With reference to minute CRT/2010/37.3. *Student Occupation – Independent Investigation*, Court noted that the investigation was ongoing.

CRT/2010/49. Strategic Plan Update/Key Performance Indicators and Budget 2011/12

Professor Neal Juster, Vice Principal Strategy and Resources, provided an update on progress against the University's Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the 12 months to June 2011. The KPIs were described in the University's strategic plan: *Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision*.

A KPI dashboard at University level provided details on latest available data for 2014/15 targets. Many of the targets had not yet been reached, which was not unexpected given that the target date was 2014/15 and it was not envisaged that many KPI targets would be achieved until that year. Details on progress in the last 12 months indicated that nearly all KPIs were moving in a positive direction. Details were also provided against the Russell Group. The areas covered were Research, Student Experience, Global Reach and Reputation, Staffing, Finance and the Estate, in line with key areas in the strategic plan. Although many of the University's KPIs did not influence the league tables, the general improvement had resulted in a small rise in the University's position in recently published UK league tables.

A summary of performance at College level over the last 12 months, including current performance against the Russell Group, was also provided.

The UK University funding bodies had commissioned the development of "indicators of sustainability for use by HEIs in managing their futures, and to provide assurance to their funding and regulatory bodies about the good management of the institutions which they fund". A recommendation of the related report was that each HEI governing body make a formal annual assessment to assure itself about the sustainability of the institution in the expected environment and with the academic and other strategies being pursued. Governing bodies should use a small number of relevant strategic KPIs, leading to assessments of sustainability in five key areas. The SFC had yet to state whether it would expect an annual report, but it was likely that the annual reporting of KPIs to Court and the need for Court to formally assess them would be a requirement from 2012/13. It was hoped that the processes of KPI monitoring, adopted since the introduction of the new strategic plan, would form the basis of any such reporting. Court would be updated as more information became available.

With regard to future steps, based on the University's current performance and trajectory, the planning and budget cycle would continue to concentrate at the University level upon agreed priorities, including: generating sufficient surplus to improve the estate and academic facilities; investing in staff to protect the student experience and grow research; developing and marketing postgraduate courses attractive to overseas students; monitoring recruitment of home undergraduate students to prevent over-recruitment; implementing mentoring schemes to improve the size of the cohort of female staff able and willing to take on leadership roles.

Court noted the KPIs and thanked Professor Juster for the update.

Court had earlier received a detailed presentation from Professor Juster on the 2011/12 University Budget and financial forecasts and had received associated paperwork for the present meeting.

A management accounting surplus of £7.8m was predicted for the 2011/12 budget and forecast surpluses of £6.8m, £4.6m and £1.5m were predicted in financial years 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15 respectively. The projected surplus figures for 2011-15 were informed by the SFC Grant Letter for 2011-12, with Teaching, Research,

Knowledge Transfer and Museum grants forecast to remain flat in cash terms thereafter (a real terms decrease). Other Horizon Fund grants had been removed from 2012/13 onwards. The overall impact was a £12.1m reduction in SFC income versus the 2010-11 budget. The main growth area was in overseas students with £8.7m of growth projected by 2011/12 and a further £14.8m projected in the years thereafter. Wage inflation has been budgeted at 1.0% in 2011/12 and 2.0% per annum thereafter. Incremental drift had been included at 1.5% per annum. These assumptions increased salary costs by £20.4m over the four years to 2014-15. Utility costs were forecast to increase significantly and additional consumable costs had also been included to support the projected growth in student numbers. £20.0m of cost reduction had been included in the forecasts with £17.9m due to be delivered by 2011/12.

The 2011/12 budget included £5.9m investment in new posts to support and strengthen research performance in preparation for the Research Excellence Framework . A further £5.8m was projected in 2012/13 to 2014/15. A number of these appointments would make a contribution to teaching and would ensure the University maintained the staff:student ratio with increased overseas student recruitment.

Available cash reserves were projected to decrease from £60m in 2011/12 to £39.2m in 2014/15. Estates Plan projects down to and including 'priority 3' had been included within the capital expenditure forecasts. The University was anticipating significant costs to capitalise on the opportunities provided by the procurement and development of the Western Infirmary site, which would commence after 2014/15.

Court approved the 2011/12 Budget and four year financial forecasts, and the updated capital plan which had been provided for the meeting.

CRT/2010/50. Report from the Principal

CRT/2010/50.1 Funding Environment including Tuition Fees for Rest of UK students

The Scottish Government was currently considering its policy on how to deal with Rest of UK students and what tuition fees should be charged. Court agreed that any decision on fees which had to be taken prior to the next meeting of Court in October should be considered by a sub-committee of Court, to be chaired by the Convenor of Court and advised by SMG. Court would be kept informed over the summer.

CRT/2010/50.2 Review of Restructuring

The plan for restructuring had included a commitment to review its success after the first year of operation as well as after 3 and 5 years. Progress would be reviewed against short, medium and longer terms success criteria. SMG was due to receive a report on the first year in September 2011. A report would be made to the October 2011 meetings of Court and Senate.

CRT/2010/50.4. Consultation Outcomes

In February, Court had agreed to an approach to closing the financial gap identified at the Court Strategy Day in September 2010, to bridge an estimated £35M+ funding gap through the generation of new income and the removal of £20M of costs, split £3M, £10M and £7M over financial years 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13 respectively. As part of possible cost removal, a number of areas had been subject to further scrutiny in

terms of their alignment with the University's strategic plan. The consultation exercise in respect of these areas was now complete.

Court had been provided with paperwork comprising the full reports and executive summaries from each of the consultations; responses to the reports from Schools and the SRC; a full report on the discussion at Senate, which also included report summaries under headings of Learning and Teaching, Research, Internationalisation and Stakeholder Views; and a paper from SMG incorporating its comments arising from the reports. In addition, each of the panel chairs provided an oral summary to the Court meeting.

Court noted that SMG had agreed that it was important for Court to consider the recommendations alongside the draft budget for 2011/12, which reflected good progress in meeting financial targets. SMG believed that the reports and their recommendations, subject to Court's decisions, should shape the various areas of review over the life of the current strategy. It had also stressed, however, that there would be a continuing need to review all parts of the University's performance against its strategic objectives and in response to changes in the external environment. SMG had also wished to note, and recommend to Court, that as some of the reports had implications for staffing needs, that the relevant Heads of College should consider these and report to Court in October.

Anthropology and Social Work

The chair of the panel Professor Graham Caie, summarised the proceedings and recommendations of the panel, which had also comprised Dr Robin Easton, lay member of Court and Professor Bob Davis.

The proposal that the panel had been asked to consider related to the College of Social Sciences no longer taking applications for entry into undergraduate programmes in Anthropology; and to the University having signalled its intention to withdraw from the Glasgow School of Social Work. In this context it had been proposed that there was a need to review staffing levels as the degree programmes were taught out.

With regard to Anthropology, the panel had found the area to be strongly integrated within the Sociology subject area, with the staff fully involved in teaching and research. There was strength in the PGT and PGR areas. Potential existed for interdisciplinary teaching and research across the School of Social and Political Sciences and other areas. Anthropology also provided a global perspective to many academic disciplines and enhanced recruitment of international students. The panel had concluded that Anthropology was well aligned to the University's strategy and recommended that current staffing levels should be maintained to support the interdisciplinary development of teaching and research across the School of Social and Political Sciences and the Institute for Health and Wellbeing.

With regard to Social Work, the Panel had found no evidence to rebut the proposition that the subject was not well aligned with the University's strategy. It was recommended that withdrawal from joint teaching of Social Work with the University of Strathclyde continue, with teaching out on the Masters programme being completed by the end of session 2011/12. There was one member of staff concerned, who was in dialogue with Human Resources

Senate had endorsed the recommendations relating to the two areas under review.

Court approved the recommendations relating to Anthropology, agreeing that Anthropology was well aligned to the University's strategy and that current staffing levels should be maintained in order to support the interdisciplinary development of teaching and research across the School of Social and Political Sciences and in the Institute for Health and Wellbeing. Court approved the recommendations relating to

Social Work, agreeing that the current withdrawal from joint teaching of Social Work with the University of Strathclyde should continue with teaching out on the Masters programme being completed by the end of session 2011/12. Thereafter, there would be no requirement for staffing in this Subject Area.

Archaeology and History; Classics

The chair of the panel, Professor Murray Pittock, summarised the proceedings and recommendations of the panel, which had also comprised Ken Brown, lay member of Court and Professor Simon Ball.

The proposal that the panel had been asked to consider with regard to Archaeology and History related to the possibility of merging the two areas into a single subject area, which was likely to reduce the number of staff needed. The proposal had been based on underperformance in Research in Archaeology. It had been proposed that there were significant opportunities to achieve efficiencies in the delivery of undergraduate and postgraduate teaching through the rationalisation and sharing of modules between the two areas.

Staff in both subjects (Archaeology and History) and students in Archaeology had opposed any merger of the two areas. Other stakeholders had agreed. The panel had concurred with the views of stakeholders. The panel had accepted a credible plan put forward by Archaeology to address problems associated with the RAE 2008 performance, and detailing savings in the area.

The panel had found that Archaeology had an outstanding record in teaching and strong prospects for graduates, with clear evidence of research-led teaching. Both History and Archaeology were independently streamlining undergraduate programmes as part of the normal evolution of provision.

The recommendations had included an external review of research, to which Archaeology had objected, but this had been recommended on the basis of external input and the panel viewed it as a matter that needed to be addressed. The panel had also recommended that Archaeology should be confident that it would not be singled out in any future exercise, and that the University was committed to the discipline.

The proposal that the panel had been asked to consider with regard to Classics related to the subject area's underperformance in Research, and that the area should be reviewed for research sustainability and to explore options for cross-teaching elsewhere in the School. This might be facilitated by the co-location of Classics staff with staff from Archaeology, with a consequent need for fewer staff.

Classics had volunteered to the panel a mini-REF submission that had been very positive, showing a rising trajectory of quality research. The area had engaged positively with the consultation process and its findings, and had achieved cost savings in line with what was required. A plan provided to the panel had been accepted. Classics at Glasgow was ranked best in Scotland for teaching and among the best in the UK, with graduates' prospects strong. There was clear evidence of research-led teaching, with potential opportunities for the development of inter-disciplinary teaching.

Most recommendations had concerned research. The panel had also recommended that Classics should be confident that it would not be singled out in any future exercise, and that the University was committed to the discipline.

Senate had endorsed the recommendations relating to the two areas under review.

Court approved the recommendations relating to Archaeology and History, noting the outstanding record of Archaeology in teaching and the strong prospects for graduates,

with clear evidence of research-led teaching, and noting that both History and Archaeology were independently streamlining undergraduate programmes as part of the normal evolution of provision, and no further combining of programmes was sought. The plans to remedy the problems that had affected the RAE 2008 performance were commended.

Court approved the recommendations relating to Classics, noting the subject at Glasgow was ranked best in Scotland for teaching and among the best in the UK, with graduates' prospects strong, and that there was clear evidence of research-led teaching, with potential opportunities for the development of inter-disciplinary teaching.

Centre for Drugs Misuse Research

Gordon Hay, a member of staff in the Centre for Drugs Misuse Research (CDMR), left the meeting for this item.

The chair of the panel, Professor Steve Beaumont, summarised the proceedings and recommendations of the panel, which had also comprised Alan Macfarlane, lay member of Court and Professor Catherine Schenk.

The proposal that the panel had been asked to consider with regard to the Centre for Drugs Misuse Research related to its current activity not being well aligned with the University's strategy, and to the possibility of the Centre being closed.

The panel had looked at the financial performance of CDMR and its future as stand-alone unit, and had concluded CDMR had disproportionate overhead costs for its size and performance. The panel had looked at the CDMR research portfolio and found that a number of research contracts were ending soon, with no progress in obtaining new grants and income to cover overheads. There was a small number of research students and none predicted. Teaching activity was mostly CPD training undertaken by Scottish Training on Drugs and Alcohol (STRADA), which was essentially independent of CDMR.

The panel had concluded in favour of the proposal that current activity in CDMR was not well aligned with the University's strategy, and that the Centre should be closed as a self-contained unit. The University should explore how some aspects of drugs misuse research could be retained elsewhere. The general field of drugs misuse research was relevant to the University's research strategy, and there was potential for links with other areas, particularly new Institute for Health and Wellbeing. The Principal added that, given the importance of such research, the head of School and College should look at skills matches over the summer, if the recommendations were approved. Court would be updated at its October meeting in such circumstances.

The Principal stressed that the work of STRADA was a separate activity, funded by the Scottish Government, and it was not the University's intention that there would be an impact on this area.

Ms Ashworth commented that in light of two senior members of CDMR having declined to take part in the consultation process, it would be very important for the School and College to support the staff in the unit, were the recommendations to be approved. The Principal agreed that this would occur. However, a fixed timetable was not appropriate as it would be a question of matching skills to the needs of the University. It would be the intention to redeploy staff wherever possible.

Senate had endorsed the recommendations relating to this area.

Court agreed that current activity in CDMR was not well aligned with the University's strategy, and that the Centre should be closed. It noted that this would not affect STRADA.

Liberal Arts, Dumfries

The chair of the panel, Professor Anne Anderson, summarised the proceedings and recommendations of the panel, which had also comprised Kevin Sweeney, lay member of Court and Professor Mike French, with Professor David Clark, Director of the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, as an observer.

The proposal that the panel had been asked to consider with regard to the Liberal Arts programmes at Dumfries related to current activity not being well aligned with the University's strategy.

Professor Anderson explained that it had been important at the outset of the consultation to communicate what the scope of it was. This had been particularly important in light of events in 2007 when the University had concluded that it would have to withdraw from all undergraduate provision, because of a lack of funding. Additional funding had subsequently been made available from the SFC. Time had been spent with staff, students and external stakeholders to stress that the University was committed to a successful School of Interdisciplinary Studies and that the consultation would be looking only at the suite of Liberal Arts undergraduate degrees and not at the University presence at the Dumfries campus in general. External interest in the consultation exercise had been high because of the importance to the region of the presence of the School at the Dumfries campus.

The Liberal Arts programmes had been part of the original set of undergraduate offerings at Dumfries, but numbers had declined in recent years. The panel had looked at future sustainability in this context. Even with a lower tariff than the one applied at the Glasgow campus, it had not been possible to recruit sufficient numbers to the Liberal Arts courses without reliance on Clearing, which was not aligned with the University's strategy of attracting the highest quality applicants. The panel had concluded that continuing the courses in this context was not sustainable and had recommended that the programmes cease, with the last cohort entry in 2011. Current and 2011-entry students would be taught out. The interdisciplinary input of Liberal Arts to other courses, for example Primary Education and Carbon Management, was strong, and the panel was recommending that this continue.

A number of stakeholders had raised a concern about marketing. This had been looked at by the panel, which had noted the presence of a full time marketing offer, which was a significant resource. The panel had not found any apparent deficiency in this area. Other, better established, institutions offered the programmes individually and were more successful in recruiting students. The School was however attracting students to other, distinctive, courses and the panel had been encouraged to see increased numbers of applicants who wanted to study at Dumfries as a first choice in these areas. A further refreshment of offerings at the School would be part of a successful Dumfries campus. Courses that were specific to Dumfries with a 'unique selling point' were seen as key to this success.

The Principal stressed that the University was committed to the Dumfries campus, but, in order to be sustainable, it had to teach courses that applicants wished to study. Doing otherwise would put the University at risk: if funded places could not be filled, funding would be clawed back. It was therefore vital that students were recruited to sustainable courses. Liberal Arts input at Dumfries would remain in other courses,

which would be better tailored to demand. Optimum use of staff resources would be considered by the Head of College and the Head of School in this context.

Tommy Gore commented on behalf of the SRC that it was disappointed with the conclusion but understood the reasons and welcomed the University's commitment to the Dumfries campus.

Senate had endorsed the recommendations relating to this area.

Court agreed that the University should withdraw provision of the dedicated Liberal Arts programmes on the Dumfries Campus, with the last intake of students to the programmes being in 2011. Court noted that the University was committed to a strong and positive future for the Dumfries campus, which would include development of a range of courses focused on environmental studies, health and social studies, and primary education. Liberal Arts would continue to be a part of other interdisciplinary degree programmes at Dumfries Campus.

Modern Languages and Cultures

The chair of the panel, Professor Neal Juster, summarised the proceedings and recommendations of the panel, which had also comprised David Anderson, lay member of Court and Professor John Macklin, Head of the School of Modern Languages & Cultures.

The proposal that the panel had been asked to consider with regard to the School of Modern Languages and Cultures (SMLC) related to it having been identified as a potential area for reshaping. In the context of a £750k savings target for the School, SMG had asked for the implications of three options to be looked at: withdrawal from three language areas, no longer offering them to honours level; withdrawal from two language areas no longer offering them to honours level; and preservation of joint honours programmes in the majority of the main areas of activity, with single honours in the remainder, moving staff to 'teaching only' contracts as appropriate.

Professor Juster explained that it had become clear to the panel early on in the consultation process that if the suggested savings level was applied to the School, it would be reduced to providing a small number of languages courses as, effectively, a service department rather than a School. This had been seen as inappropriate for the University, given the importance of languages to the institution, and to the national and local communities.

The panel had found that there was strong student demand from well qualified applicants. With respect to research, the panel had found that output was low in some areas and that there was no cluster of high quality research. The panel had also looked at language courses provided outside the School and had found wide provision, particularly through the Open Programme and the Language Centre. The recommendations had allowed for provision of all languages to continue, but in the context of a more coherent configuration.

The panel's consultation had included looking at the Slavonic Studies programme, where the course did not require mandatory study of a language, recommending moving the programme to Social Sciences, so that resources could be freed up for investment in French and Hispanic Studies, for example, to alleviate high student:staff ratios, which had been noted by the panel, and to grow research.

The panel had also concluded that moving Celtic and Gaelic to SMLC should be given further consideration, as this was the location of these subjects in some other institutions.

Senate had broadly endorsed the recommendations, subject to some qualifications, which were against a transfer of Slavonic Studies to Social and Political Sciences and against withdrawal of Slavonic Studies. Senate recognised that investment in research leadership for the School would require savings being made elsewhere. In discussion at Senate, significant concerns were raised about moving Celtic and Gaelic to SMLC.

The Principal advised Court that in light of comments from the School of Social & Political Sciences, SMG had considered that running a Slavonic Studies programme from that School was impractical. The implication of this was that entry to the programme would be discontinued from 2012, given SMLC's imperative as expressed through the panel report, although courses and teaching input would continue to form part of the comparative literature and cultural components of other programmes. SMG had supported maintaining the full range of languages being taught at existing levels of provision in the SMLC. SMG had supported the recommendation that the Language Centre transfer to SMLC in session 2012/13, rather than 2011/12. SMG had agreed that the position of Celtic and Gaelic within the College of Arts was a matter for decision within the College.

The Principal added that SMG was in favour of the migration of resources over time to areas of high student demand and of an integrated SMLC with strong research and teaching capacity. The focus would be to move to such a situation through encouraging migration based on teaching skills, for example through provision of comparative literature courses. Reducing activity in one area, in this case Slavonic Studies, would over time allow release of resources to enhance other areas.

Court approved the recommendations of the panel, subject to the comments of SMG, agreeing that the SMLC should maintain the teaching of the full current range of modern languages at the levels currently taught; that the Language Centre (including the EFL Unit) would transfer to SMLC on 1 August 2012; that September 2011 would be the last year that student cohorts would be admitted onto the degree programme in Slavonic Studies; and that investment should be made in staff (including the Marshall and Stevenson Chairs and lectureship in Translational Studies) as resources became available.

Nursing and Health Care

The chair of the panel, Professor Andrea Nolan, summarised the proceedings and recommendations of the panel, which had also comprised Peter Daniels, lay member of Court and Professor Richard Cogdell.

The proposal that the panel had been asked to consider with regard to Nursing and Health Care related to it being a potential academic area for withdrawal on the basis of lack of strategic fit, in the context of current research activity being relatively small and not integrated with the College's Research Institutes; and of overprovision of graduate nurses in Scotland and discussions within Government to reduce the number of nurses being educated in Scottish Universities. The proposal had also referred to graduates from the undergraduate degree programme finding it very difficult to find employment as nurses. This final section had later been excluded since the panel had been advised that it was not factually correct: graduates had near 100% employability.

Professor Nolan explained that the panel had looked at the area's fit with the three main strands of the University's strategy, relating to teaching, research and global reach. Nursing and Health Care did not perform well in the latter two areas, with low research output and limited international reach. While this was in part understandable because of the unit's size, a 'teaching only' subject area did not fit with the University's stated objective of being a research-led institution. It had not been seen as appropriate to

transfer resource from other parts of the College to develop areas of weakness within Nursing.

The Panel had discussed at length the option of withdrawing from the area and - given the consensus reached on the other (rejected) options relating to the area becoming teaching only or investing further resources - considered this to be the appropriate conclusion. However, it had been announced that the Chief Nursing Officer (CNO) was undertaking a review of nursing and midwifery education system in Scotland. In the circumstances, the panel had agreed that any decision on the future of provision at the University would need to be delayed. The panel was mindful of the need for national planning for the nursing profession and of the University's possible role in contributing to this through provision of the degree. As a result, the panel was recommending to Court that: a decision regarding the withdrawal from Nursing & Health Care should be taken after the outcome of the CNO review; the School should continue with its activities and admit students until any implications of the review were known and Court's response to these were agreed; as part of the engagement with Scottish government and the Scottish Funding Council, and if the skills mix provided by Glasgow nursing education was seen as essential within Scotland's map of provision for Higher Education, the University should pursue the possibility of obtaining commissioned places for its preregistration provision (thereby releasing the current funded places for use within MVLS) and of obtaining a strong funding line to allow for capacity building of research.

Senate had been overall more supportive of Nursing than the consultation report and the view expressed by SMG, which had supported the report's conclusions. Senate had been in favour of promoting the teaching excellence of the area, although it had agreed that the research performance was not optimal.

The Principal added that given the circumstances of the CNO review and the panel's findings on teaching excellence, and its consequent recommendations, it would be important that the area was supported by the University in the interim period. The Head of College and Head of School would work to achieve this.

Dr Olwyn Byron asked about the likelihood of research funding being made available to enhance the area's research profile, in the event that commissioned places were provided to Glasgow for nursing teaching, following the CNO review. It was her understanding that such funding was not likely to be available, therefore if the recommendations about commissioned places and research were taken together, the future of Nursing and Health Care was bound not to succeed. Professor Nolan responded that an approach would be made to the government and other relevant stakeholders for research funding, noting that the baseline would not need to be high.

It was suggested by Dr Easton that Court might consider whether it was in fact essential for there to be a research element to the area, or whether an exception could be made such that a teaching-only unit might exist. Professor Dominiczak advised Court that the College would be supportive of the School continuing its excellent teaching; it was also the case that developing the current low level of research in this area would be costly and was very difficult, given in particular the focus of the subject area on practical, professional application. Ms Ashworth commented that the area had in fact provided a plan showing how research could be expanded. Professor Nolan commented that the panel had not felt this plan was achievable and that it would have required a transfer of scarce resources from elsewhere in the College. The panel had not been in favour of making an exception to the requirement for research activity. Dr Byron suggested that the staff profile could be altered relatively quickly to boost research; in addition, the area had previously been advised that it was acceptable for it

to focus on teaching. Mr Ritchie reminded the Court of the importance that students placed on the departments delivering teaching also undertaking relevant research.

There was discussion about the wording of the recommendations and whether they should be amended. Court was not minded to do this, and agreed to accept the recommendations as listed, but that its decision was against a background of the need for strong support for the School from senior management and about clarity being given to the School about what would be required in terms of expected levels of successful research. As a consequence of Court's acceptance of the recommendations, pending the outcome of the Chief Nursing Officer's review of nursing and midwifery education system in Scotland, all programmes and activities would continue as normal, including admissions for academic year 2011-12, and 2012-13. Court would receive an update on the position in June 2012.

Open Programme

The chair of the panel, Professor Frank Coton, summarised the proceedings and recommendations of the panel, which had also comprised Margaret Morton, lay member of Court and Professor Tom Guthrie.

The proposal that the panel had been asked to consider with regard to the Open Programme had related to possible withdrawal from some or all Open Programme courses and the associated Certificate of Higher Education, on the basis that they did not fit with the University's strategy.

Professor Coton explained that the panel had undertaken a wide consultation, including open sessions being arranged for all students of Open Programme courses. About 1,700 written submissions had been received. The panel had looked at the area in the context of the three main strands of the University's strategic plan, relating to teaching, research and global reach. While the student experience connected to teaching was extremely positive, the programme was less strong in the other two areas. However, the panel had agreed that this lack of fit with strategy needed to be looked in parallel with the different funding structure for the programme, the engagement it provided with and for the local community, the large (c4,300) number of students for whom it provided courses, and its uniqueness in providing input to Lifelong Learning agenda given that many of its participants were non-traditional learners. The panel had also looked at similar provision in other Russell Group universities and had found that all offered some Lifelong Learning and community engagement. These aspects, combined with the excellent quality of the courses, were such that that panel had concluded that provision of offerings under the Open Programme should continue.

There were however some aspects that were less satisfactory at present and required addressing, including the strategic fit with the College and the visibility of the courses on offer. It had been felt that the programme could integrate better with the University's strengths. There was a lack of clarity in the financial model applied to the courses, many classes ran with low numbers, and the SFC Teaching Grant 'funded places' associated with the programme were not optimally used. These factors had led to a series of recommendations that Court was now being asked to approve.

Senate had endorsed the recommendations relating to this area, although concerns had been expressed regarding the assured viability of provision following the recommended phasing out of Teaching Grant support.

A question was asked about whether a move to a revised model, based around the Open Programme being self financing, would in reality mean that provision and therefore choice would reduce, since only fully self-financing courses would continue to run. Professor Coton explained that the panel's view was that a revised model would not

result in this outcome: the current model could be improved and a while a reconfiguration of it would not lead to a reduction in choice, it would lead to more efficiency. It was however necessary for the Open Programme as a whole to be financially self-sustaining. It was agreed that an update would be provided to Court in June 2012 and that David Newall would provide an interim report to Court in December 2011 when the business model for the programme had been reviewed.

Cllr Mackechnie stressed that the courses provided by the Open Programme were of huge importance in the context of the interface between the University and the community, and might also be of added significance at a time of economic downturn when participants in the programmes could be seeking new workplace skills. He was supportive of progressive pricing to increase participation. Professor Coton confirmed that a progressive pricing policy model could be built into the business plan.

Court endorsed the recommendation that the University should continue to provide courses through the Open Programme, but that a robust business model and accompanying business plan should be established. The business would address the need to operate in future without support from the SFC teaching grant, and it might incorporate: the development of an integrated marketing strategy; a programme of Summer School activities; and application of appropriate threshold numbers for courses. The programme would be supported by an independent, self-supporting unit within University Services.

Closing remarks

The Principal restated what he had indicated at Senate, namely that there remained considerable uncertainty regarding the future, and identified savings had to be achieved, but the prospect in general of compulsory redundancy was no longer a current concern. The University was now in a position to move forward positively. It required to be remembered, however, that this did not preclude the possibility of redundancies in specific instances where there was a mismatch between staff deployment and the University's needs.

The Principal added that decisions relating to any staffing matters connected to the consultations, where relevant, should not be taken in a rushed manner. Court agreed that the relevant Heads of College and School should consider these matters and that a report should be submitted to Court in October.

Court thanked all those involved in the extensive and exhaustive consultation process, including students, staff and external stakeholders, and commended the consultation panels for their thorough approach.

CRT/2010/50.5. University Communications

The Principal had instituted *From the Principal's Notebook*, which was intended to be a weekly/fortnightly update or reflection on a particular issue of note or interest, and which was shared on the website with all staff and students in the University.

CRT/2010/50.5. Key Activities

Court noted a summary of some of the main activities in which the Principal had been involved since the last meeting of Court, covering internal and external activities beyond daily operational management and strategy meetings. The activities were under

the broad headings of: Lobbying and profile-raising; Internal consultation and events; Academic Development; and Alumni Events. Court noted in particular the engagement with the Scottish Parliament and key alumni events. Tommy Gore welcomed the involvement of the SRC in a number of the areas listed.

CRT/2010/51. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2010/51.1 Voluntary Severance Scheme

As at 6 June, 217 members of staff had confirmed their acceptance of an offer, with a net recurrent payroll saving of £8.8M. Savings had increased to over 9M since then.

In April, Court had confirmed that the scheme should run until at least 2 weeks after the Court meeting on 22 June. The budget paper presented at the meeting had referred to the possibility of the scheme being further extended to aid budget holders in reshaping. Court approved the scheme being kept open until at least 26 October.

CRT/2010/51.2 Bribery Act 2010

A summary of the Bribery Act 2010 had been provided, together with a series of proposals on how the University should respond to its requirements. The proposals had been reviewed by the Audit Committee and approved by SMG on 21 June. They included drawing the attention of all members of staff to the Compliance section of the University's Financial Regulations; requiring all Heads of School / Heads of Service / Directors of Research Institutes in future to maintain a register of gifts; undertaking a comprehensive review of the use of overseas agents; and introducing new contractual terms that address specifically their responsibilities in terms of the Bribery Act.

Court approved the proposals.

CRT/2010/51.3 Structural Change: Hunterian Museum & Art Gallery

Court had received details of an organisation change proposal from the Hunterian Museum & Art Gallery. Its aim was to align resources with the Hunterian's newly-articulated strategic direction, and to address the need to reduce staff costs by £205,000 as part of University Services' cost-reduction commitment.

The proposal had been considered and approved by the Hunterian's Strategic Development Board and by the University's Senior Management Group. It included the proposed cessation of the Digital Media Unit, involving the loss of two posts. Court approved the establishment of a Structural Change Committee and a Redundancy Committee to oversee the management of this staff reduction, if required, noting that mitigation via voluntary severance or redeployment was a possibility.

CRT/2010/51.4 Redundancy Committee Glasgow University Archaeological Research Division (GUARD)

At its December meeting, Court had agreed that Structural Change and Redundancy Committees should be established in respect of posts in GUARD. As reported at the last meeting, steps in mitigation had occurred with respect to the 2 x 1 FTE Research & Teaching (R&T) posts, with redeployment of both staff. The Redundancy Committee had since agreed as follows:-

To note the decision of the member of Management Professional & Administrative staff regarding acceptance of a fixed term contract for 4 months and that this member of staff would now be supported, at the end of the fixed term contract, via the management of fixed term funding arrangements.

To note that in relation to the Zero-Hours member of R&T staff, following negotiations and discussions with the individual and the relevant Trade Union, it had not been possible to avoid or mitigate the position for this member of staff. The member of staff has worked on one project, is based outside Glasgow and does not wish to relocate to the city. Court approved the Committee's recommendation relating to compulsory redundancy of the Zero-Hours member of R&T staff.

To note that, with regard to the Technical and Related post where the member of staff was continuing to be assigned to archive and treasure trove activities for 6 months, that during this period the member of staff would continue to be consulted with a view to avoidance of redundancy when this activity had been completed, and that the individual would still be able access to the Jobseekers Register in order to seek suitable redeployment. Court approved the Committee's recommendation relating to compulsory redundancy of the Technical and Related member of staff if, at the end of the 6 month period, it had not been possible to redeploy her. Matters in further mitigation and avoidance would continue during this period. Court would be updated at its October meeting.

CRT/2010/51.5 University of Glasgow Pension Scheme

In recent months, in overseeing the 3-yearly actuarial valuation of the scheme, members of the Board of the Pension Scheme had been conscious of the conflict of interest that could exist between their duties as trustees and their other responsibilities to the University community. This was particularly the case for the Chair of the Board, and it had led the current Chair to the view that it would be preferable if the University were now to appoint an independent Chair of the Trustees Board, following a practice that was common for occupational pension schemes.

Court approved the Trustees taking forward the recruitment of a suitably qualified independent Chair. David Anderson would continue to serve as Chair until the conclusion of the recruitment process.

CRT/2010/51.6 Ordinance on Composition of Court

Court noted that the Ordinance on the composition of Court was now with the Privy Council for consideration. David Ross had attended Senate on 28 April to discuss with Senate members the reasons for Court's decision to make a new ordinance. The meeting had concluded with a request, reflected in the Communications from Senate, that Court should not progress with the Ordinance at this time. This question had been raised at the April meeting of Court, when Court's decision was that it did not wish to delay the approval process and this remained Court's position. In the meantime the Scottish Government had announced a review of Higher Education governance and it was possible that, as a result, the Ordinance process would be put in abeyance by the Privy Council.

Court noted that Senate has agreed to establish a short-life Working Group to make recommendations on communications between Senate and Court. The remit also included the terms of the draft Ordinances concerning Senate's own composition, which Court had considered and approved for consultation at its February 2011 meeting. The

Group was to report its recommendations to Senate at its October meeting and details would be provided to Court thereafter.

CRT/2010/51.7 Glasgow International College

Court noted that the Secretary of Court had approved an extension to and a refreshment of the terms of the agreement between the Kaplan Corporation and the University in respect of Glasgow International College (GIC). The agreement would run to September 2027. The main changes included the establishment of a Joint Strategic Management Board, which de facto had operated since 2008, and provision for GIC to be subject to the University's system of periodic review of subjects. Court would receive an annual update on the College from the Senior Vice-Principal.

CRT/2010/51.8 Court Committee appointment

Court approved a recommendation made on behalf of the Nominations Committee that Mr Iain Stewart be appointed to the Finance Committee as a co-opted member for the four-year period ending 31 July 2015.

CRT/2010/51.9 Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT)

In December 2010, Court had approved in principle the establishment of a subsidiary company to facilitate a partnership with SIT to deliver two Undergraduate programmes in Engineering, to be taught in Singapore. Court noted that a Limited Company has now been set up in Singapore to take forward this collaborative arrangement.

CRT/2010/51.10 Grievances Stage 2

Court noted the outcomes of two Stage 2 grievances.

CRT/2010/51.11 Hunterian Art Gallery: Security Arrangements

Court noted an update relating to revised security arrangements at the Art Gallery.

CRT/2010/51.12 Appointment of Heads of Research Institutes and Schools

Court noted the following headship appointments which had been made following its approval.

College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences

Institute for Health & Wellbeing

Professor Sally Macintyre from 1 May 2011 until 30 April 2014

School of Veterinary Medicine

Professor Ewan Cameron had been Acting Head in recent months, and had now formally taken up the Headship of the School from 6 May 2011 to 31 July 2015.

College of Science and Engineering

School of Geographical & Earth Sciences

Professor Maggie Cusack from 1 August 2011 until 31 July 2015.

Court approved the following appointment which had been proposed following consultation within the School and an interview conducted by the Head of College, Head of the Medical School, a Senate Assessor and a representative of the Dental School.

College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences

Dental School

Professor Jeremy Bagg to be reappointed from 1 August 2011 to 31 July 2013.

Court approved the method of approving appointment of Heads of School and Research Institutes reverting to such appointments being approved by the Secretary of Court on Court's behalf, and reported as such to the next meeting of Court.

CRT/2010/52. Research Excellence Framework: Mini REF Outcome

Court noted a report on the broad outcomes of the mini-REF exercise. The aims of the exercise had been to maintain the momentum of REF preparations, help gauge the University's likely performance in time for corrective action and provide the University with an opportunity to review and optimise the use of centrally-held data for this purpose. Feedback had been, or was in the process of being given, to colleagues, and that Colleges and Senate were being made aware of any matters which needed addressing in the run-up to REF2014. SMG had agreed the actions emerging from the exercise.

Court would receive further details via the Principal's report and from the Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise at future meetings, as the REF2014 approached.

CRT/2010/53. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2010/53.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2010/53.1.1 Budget 2011/12 and four year forecast

Court had approved the 2011/12 Budget and four year financial forecasts, under item CRT/2010/49. *Strategic Plan Update/Key Performance Indicators and Budget 2011/12.*

CRT/2010/53.1.2 US Federal Loan Funding and US GAAP

There was a new requirement for US GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles) Reporting for any foreign institution in receipt of US Federal Student Loans in excess of \$3m per annum. US GAAP compliant accounts were essential criteria to being eligible to participate in the US Federal Student Loans Scheme. Due to timelines it was not anticipated that restated financial statements and accompanying audit would be complete in time for the Court meeting in December 2011. Court approved a proposal from the Finance Committee that the Finance Committee approve the financial statements in January 2012 on behalf of Court.

CRT/2010/53.1.3 Investment in UGlasgow Singapore Pte Ltd

Court noted that the Finance Committee had approved a request for initial share holder investment of up to Sing \$100,000 with additional funding of Sing \$50,000

to \$150,000 in short term shareholder advance repayable within three to four months depending on initial capital injection in UGlasgow Singapore Pte Ltd, which had been established following the Partnership Agreement with Singapore Institute of Technology.

CRT/2010/53.1.4 Overview of Performance as at 30 April 2011

Court noted Period 9 2010/11 Financial Information.

CRT/2010/53.2 Audit Committee

The report was noted.

CRT/2010/53.3 Human Resources Committee

Court noted the report of the Human Resources Committee and updates relating to HR/Payroll implementation and to organisational development. David Anderson thanked Human Resources for their work in these areas.

CRT/2010/53.4 Estates Committee

Court noted the revised priorities within the updated Capital Plan 2011-2021 and endorsed Estates Committee's recommendation to escalate 08/157 Development of John McIntyre Building from Priority 5 to Priority 4. Court noted and endorsed Estates Committee's approval of the proposed approach for the strategic development of the recently acquired Western Infirmary site.

Court noted the University's 2009/2010 performance against its identified Key Performance Indicators.

CRT/2010/53.5 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee

The report was noted.

CRT/2010/54. Report from the Rector

The Rector referred to the earlier reference to the independent investigation relating to the student occupation, which he was chairing and which was ongoing.

CRT/2010/55. Communications from meetings of Senate 28 April and 2 June 2011

Communications from Senate were noted. Professor Caie thanked lay members of Court who had attended the Senate meeting on 2 June when the consultation reports had been discussed.

CRT/2010/56. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2010/57. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 12 October 2011 in the Senate Room