

Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 13 February 2013 in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr David Anderson General Council Member, Ms Susan Ashworth Employee Representative, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Mr Peter Daniels Co-opted Member, Dr Robin Easton Co-opted Member, Professor Christine Forde Senate Member, Dr Marie Freel Senate Member, Mr James Harrison SRC President, Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP Rector, Mr Brian McBride General Council Member, Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Member, Mr Donald Mackay SRC Member on Court, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Professor William Martin Senate Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Dr Alan Owen Senate Member, Professor Miles Padgett Senate Member, Mr David Ross General Council Member (Convener of Court), Professor Michael Scott-Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Adrienne Scullion Senate Member, Dr Donald Spaeth Senate Member, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Member

In attendance:

Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Steve Beaumont (Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise), Mr Ian Black (Director of Human Resources), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate), Professor John Chapman (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), 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), 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)

Apologies:

Members: Cllr Matt Kerr Glasgow City Council Assessor, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor's Representative

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

CRT/2012/23. Announcements

Court congratulated Professor Andrea Nolan on her appointment as Principal of Edinburgh Napier University from 1 July 2013.

CRT/2012/24. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 12 December 2012

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2012/25. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2012/26. Report from the Principal

CRT/2012/26.1 Staff Investment

Several internationally eminent academic staff had been recruited to Professorships as part of the strategic investment programme in anticipation of the REF and in line with the commitment to strengthening research.

CRT/2012/26.2 Trans-national Education - Recent Activity

Court noted an update on recent Trans-national Education, focusing on current activity, including collaborative arrangements with the Singapore Institute of Technology and the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC); and potential developments with partners in China. The University was working to ensure that students involved in these developments received a 'Glasgow experience'. Additional staff were being employed to deliver courses and arrangements being made for these staff to be able to undertake research within the overseas institution.

CRT/2012/26.3 Senior Management

The Principal would be appointing a new Deputy Vice-Chancellor and reviewing the portfolios of senior management, following the appointment of Professor Nolan as Principal of Edinburgh Napier University. Court would be kept informed. The Principal would be personally involved in overseeing the internationalisation strategy following Professor Nolan's departure.

CRT/2012/26.4 Nursing and Healthcare

At the October meeting, it had been agreed that the internal consultation on Nursing and Healthcare should formally end, and Court had noted that discussions within the School and College about the possible future configuration of the subject area were at a very early stage, as outlined in the Outcome Agreement with SFC. It was also noted that any proposal for a future model of provision would be brought back to Court in due course, and that Court would receive also for information the final report of the School of Medicine's internal working group. Professor Anna Dominiczak advised that funding was being provided by the SFC for an options appraisal and collaborative discussion between the University and Glasgow Caledonian University. Court would be kept informed.

CRT/2012/26.5 Applications for University Places

UCAS had recently released figures from the 2013 applications cycle, showing that the number of people applying to university in the UK has risen by 3.5 per cent, although it had not returned to the level seen before the introduction of higher tuition fees. Court noted details of applications to Glasgow, which indicated a strong increase in applications for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught qualifications, with a marginal reduction in Postgraduate Research. Significant work was being undertaken with regard to conversions of RUK applications into firm acceptances, in particular via the Applicants' Visits days. Applications from the EU would be kept under review particularly to ensure as far as possible that entry standards were fair and consistent. Fairness would also be key in the treatment of home and RUK applications and it was not anticipated that any marginal decisions to admit applicants from one group would adversely affect the other. Court noted that the quality of overseas applications remained high despite the increase in numbers. It also noted that investment in residential and teaching accommodation, and in front-line student services, was being made in light of increasing student numbers.

CRT/2012/26.6 Widening Participation

Following the University's submissions to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) in relation to Outcome Agreements, the University had learned that additional places for up to 800 students from low-income backgrounds would be created at the University over the next four years.

CRT/2012/26.6 SFC Outcome Agreement

Court noted an update on UG and PGT places which had been awarded as a result of bids to SFC for a variety of new funded places for 2013-14 onwards. Thanks were extended by the Principal to the Colleges and Schools for their work in preparing bids.

Court had received the University's draft Outcome Agreement for the 2013-14 year, which required to be submitted to the SFC at the end of February. Professor Nolan explained that new sections had been added since last year, covering development of graduate skills and promotion of international competitiveness. Court supported the text of the draft document and noted that it would receive a further updated version by email for final approval before the end of the month.

Court noted that it was likely that targets would be required to be included in the Agreement although some caution was required in terms of their future use.

CRT/2012/26.7 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.

CRT/2012/27. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2012/27.1 Review of Court's Effectiveness

John Lauwerys's report had been circulated to Court members. Court agreed that the report's recommendations would be discussed further at a session to be held later in the spring.

CRT/2012/27.2 Review of Higher Education Governance/ Scottish Code of Governance

Following publication of the Von Prondzynski report on 1 February, the Cabinet Secretary for Education had asked the Committee of the Scottish Chairs of Higher Education Institutions to develop a new Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance. A Steering Group had been formed, of which David Ross was a member, and consultants had been appointed to support the Steering Group in developing the new Code. The University had been visited by one of the consultants on 18 December, when he had met with several members of Court, including staff, student and lay representatives. The consultants' work was ongoing. The precise timing of publication of their report was not certain. Court agreed that, if necessary, given time constraints, a sub-group of Court be convened to consider and comment on the draft Code. Court members would be kept briefed on developments.

CRT/2012/27.3 Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill

As Court had heard at its last meeting, the Scottish Government had presented its bill for legislation on Post-16 Education and, while the bill focused largely on Further Education, some

sections related to universities. The most significant of these was Section 2, which would place a requirement on universities to comply with principles of good governance and management practice, as determined by Scottish Ministers. Universities had anticipated that this legislation might make reference to the forthcoming Code of Good Higher Education Governance which was currently being developed by a Steering Group of the Scottish Chairs. The expectation had been that the legislation might require each university to comply with good governance practice as set out in the Code, or to explain their reasons for not so doing. In fact, the scope of the draft bill was much wider: it stated that 'The Scottish Ministers may ... impose a condition that the [Funding] Council must, when making a payment to a higher education institution ... require that institution to comply with any principles of governance or management which appear to the Scottish Ministers to constitute good practice in relation to higher education institutions.'

As drafted, this would give a Government Minister considerable new powers to intervene in University business. Strong representations had been made to the Parliament on this draft legislation by Universities Scotland, by the Committee of University Chairs, and by University Principals, a group of whom had recently been invited to give evidence to Parliament's Education and Culture Committee. In all these submissions, university representatives had queried the need for legislation and pointed to the unsatisfactory nature of what had been drafted. Having consulted with Court members, the Secretary of Court had made a brief submission on 17 January to the Education & Culture Committee.

Court would be kept updated at future meetings.

CRT/2012/27.4 Management of Organisational Change

At the December meeting, Court had received a draft policy on the Management of Organisational Change. This had been the subject of extensive consultation, including with the Senior Management Group, and had been considered and recommended to Court by the Human Resources Committee. Court had also been advised at its December meeting of concerns that remained on the part of the trade unions regarding the management of 'Tier 2' cases. In terms of the draft procedure, these would be considered by a Court Procedural Review Group (CPRG). The campus unions' view had been that the CPRG should not be empowered to make decisions on Tier 2 matters, but instead should make recommendations to Court.

December Court had agreed to defer consideration of this item of business, to provide an opportunity for further discussions to be held. The management and union sides to these discussions each felt that there remained merit in allowing further consultation to take place. The discussions would also cover the competency procedure. Court approved the continuation of discussions, on the understanding that a recommended policy on the Management of Organisational Change would be submitted to Court for approval in April.

Mr Newall updated Court on the outcome of a Management of Organisational Change process involving the Registry Accounts Receivable function, where the two remaining staff whose posts had potentially been at risk had now been redeployed, and the work of the relevant Structural Change and Redundancy Committees had finished.

CRT/2012/27.5 Student Representative Council Constitution

Minor amendments to the SRC Constitution had been approved by the Secretary of Court, following approval by SRC Council in January. The most significant change within the amendments was to alter the remit of the sabbatical officers. From 2013/14, the four executive posts would be: President; Vice-President (Education); Vice-President (Student Activities); Vice-President (Student Support).

CRT/2012/27.6 Vice-Principal Appointment

Court approved an extension to Professor Murray Pittock's term as Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Arts, until 31 July 2014.

CRT/2012/27.7 Media Report

The latest media report was noted. Court agreed that as part of the ongoing review of external relations functions in general, the content of the report would be reviewed and refreshed, and should show more strategic information including KPIs. Court would receive proposals later in the year following the review.

CRT/2012/27.8 Resolutions

The following Resolutions had been approved following consultation with the Senate and General Council for consultation. A copy of the Resolutions was available from the Court Office.

RESOLUTION 656 - FOUNDATION OF THE DONALD J ROBERTSON CHAIR OF ECONOMICS

RESOLUTION 657 - CHANGE OF NAME OF THE CHAIR OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES (AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE NO 329. – (GLASGOW NO 94))

CRT/2011/28. SRC Annual Report

James Harrison, SRC President, presented the SRC's annual report for 2011/12.

Highlights for the SRC's year included: changes to the representation structure; involvement with improvements to MyCampus; the PG Space & Welcome Point development; working closely with the University on the implementation of the graduate attributes agenda, and membership of the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR) Working Group, where students were now recognised for their extra-curricular activities on their university transcript. The Student Volunteer Support Service was engaged in supporting a number of projects in the community including Support for the Homeless, Classroom support, Nightline and Macmillan befriending. The SRC advice centre had dealt with a heavy load of cases relating to academic work, and also with accommodation problems and financial issues. The SRC had been involved in internal representations in several areas including Lecture recording, the Carers' policy, the Debt policy and PG parental leave; and in external representation relating to the Glasgow Student Forum, Equal Marriage and It Gets Better, and Tenancy Deposits. Other activities had covered Charity work, Student Media and Freshers Week.

Court thanked Mr Harrison for the briefing.

CRT/2012/29. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2012/29.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2012/29.1.1 MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit (SPHSU) transfer

Finance Committee had received a financial business case outlining a potential transfer of the Social and Public Health Sciences Unit (SPHSU), a Medical Research Council (MRC) Unit, to the University. Finance Committee had approved the proposal, subject to a satisfactory resolution of TUPE, pay and grading scheme and s75 pension issues. Finance

Committee had also noted that the SHPSU had sought a commitment from the University that it would at some time in the future provide suitable accommodation for the Unit on the Western Infirmary Site. It had since been agreed with MRC that documents would only make reference to accommodation on the 'University campus'.

CRT/2012/29.1.2 Scottish Universities Environmental Research Centre (SUERC) Capex application

Finance Committee had received a capital expenditure application requesting a loan of £1.2m to purchase a Thermo Fisher 253 Ultra Mass Spectrometer to be housed at the Scottish Universities Environmental Research Centre (SUERC). Finance Committee had approved the Capex application.

CRT/2012/29.1.3 Finance Key Performance Indicators

Court noted Finance Key Performance Indicators.

CRT/2012/29.1.4 Investment Managers Report as at 31 December 2012

Court noted the Investment Report.

CRT/2012/29.1.5 Overview of Performance as at 30 November 2012

Court noted an Overview of Performance as at 30 November 2012.

CRT/2012/29.2 Human Resources Committee

Court noted the report from the Human Resources Committee.

CRT/2012/29.3 Estates Committee

Court noted the report from the Estates Committee. Consultation on the Campus Estates Strategy, including the future use of the Western Infirmary site, was about to begin.

CRT/2012/29.4 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Court noted the report from the Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee.

CRT/2012/30. Report from the Rector

The Scottish Rectors' Group had requested to give oral evidence to the consultation on the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill, but this had been declined; the group would however ensure that its views were conveyed. The group was also involved in lobbying with regard to matters relating to student visas and the UK Border Agency.

CRT/2012/31. Communications from meeting of Senate 7 February 2013

Communications from the meeting of Senate held on 7 February were noted by Court. Senate had received reports on the Outcome Agreement, the draft University Knowledge Exchange and Impact Strategy and the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill. It had also received an update on the management of Teaching Space.

CRT/2012/32. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2012/33. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 10 April 2013 at the Dumfries Campus

Court – Wednesday 10 April 2013

**Report from the Meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on
Wednesday 27 March 2013**

Cover Sheet

Brief description of the paper

- HR Committee Minute – 27 March 2013.
- Management of Organisational Change / Redundancy Policy and Procedure
- Competency Procedure
- Public Sector Equality Duty

Action required

- Court is asked **to note** the HR Committee Minute - 27 March 2013.
- Court is asked **to approve** the Management of Organisational Change / Redundancy Policy and Procedure (**Annex 1**)

This is the last policy related to the 2010 change in the Employment Ordinance to be developed. A tiered approach (Appendix A) has been developed to deal with the different types of Organisational Changes, and to allow Court to adopt different approaches commensurate with the proposed change, replacing the current single procedure.

For tier 2, a new Committee of Court, the Court Procedural Review Group (Appendix C), will be established to scrutinise the University's proposals and, from the October Court to the June meeting, recommend to Court the actions Court should take in relation to the proposals – e.g. allow them to remain entirely in the management domain, or require full Court scrutiny, or whatever combination it believes appropriate. Court is therefore able to have strategic oversight of proposals, but may decide to leave them in the management sphere. During the summer months the CPRG will decide on tier 2 cases without automatic reference to Court.

It is proposed this policy be reviewed in October 2014: this review to include the effectiveness of the Tiered approach and the CPRG.

The HR committee, by majority, approved this policy at its meeting on 27th March 2013.

- Court is asked **to approve** the Competency Procedure (**Annex 2**)

This is the penultimate policy related to the 2010 change in the Employment Ordinance. This policy provides a comprehensive, fair way of dealing with performance issues for staff. It encourages early intervention and supportive action: it is triggered as circumstances arise and is not dependent on timetables and outcomes driven by other policies. It has been agreed with the campus Trade Unions after extensive consultations, as have other policies in the suite.

Key features include:

- This procedure applies to all staff
- This procedure incorporates many practical aspects raised by all parties during the consultation meetings.
- The procedure focuses on managers addressing any issues as early as possible, and not waiting until the next formal appraisal.
- Most formal stages are dealt with by line managers, but where dismissal is a possible option, a manager from within the College but not previously involved will hear the case. There are appeals at all formal stages.
- The procedure closely follows the principles of the ACAS code of practice.

The HR committee approved this policy at its meeting on 27th March 2013.

- Public Sector Equality Duty (**Annex 3**)

This paper details the University's requirements to meet the Public Sector Equality Duty and sets out how to meet these legislative requirements. Some elements of this paper relate to students, and others to staff: it has therefore been to a number of committees including the Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee, the Education Policy and Strategy Committee, and to the HR Committee. The different committees have approved the relevant sections for both staff and students, and the 6 Equality Outcomes. Action requested:

Court is asked **to note the content and action plans, and to approve** the following:

- The Equality Outcomes
- Equality and Diversity Strategy Action Plan as the University's Mainstreaming Report
- The Equal Pay statement
- The timescale for the Equal Pay Audit

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Human Resources Committee

Minute of Meeting held in the Turnbull Room on 27 March 2013

Present: Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), The Principal (AM), Mrs A Allen (AAL), Professor A Anderson (AA), Mr I Black (IHB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Mrs H Durndell (HD), Professor C Forde (CF), Mr A Macfarlane (AMcF), Dr A Owen (AO), Dr D Spaeth (DS), Mr G Scott (GS) (Clerk).

In attendance: Mrs Christine Barr (CB), Mhairi Taylor (in part), Professor Andrea Nolan (in part).

Apologies: Mr S McCafferty (SMcC), Mr D Newall (DN).

HR/12/37 **Minute of the previous meeting**

The minute of the previous meeting held on the 23 January 2013 was agreed.

HR/12/38 **Matters arising**

IHB advised that the original HR restructuring report had been provided to the Committee for information. This outlined how resources had been deployed at the time of restructure. This has subsequently been enhanced at College level to take account of demand for HR Services. IHB reported that he had received a range of views from College HR managers on his report and while they may have articulated it differently there was broad agreement on the challenges and pressures identified. AA commented from a College perspective that there was huge added value from having HR teams embedded within the Colleges and others agreed.

CB clarified that discussion was taking place on how to mainstream the review of restructure going forward and that this would incorporate reviews of services such as HR.

AMcF asked whether consideration had been given to the rotation of HR managers. IHB advised that this had not been discussed with HR Managers or VP / Heads of College.

The remaining matters arising from the previous meeting were included later in the agenda or were scheduled for future meetings.

HR/12/39 **HR Director's Report**

IHB gave an overview of his HR Director's report and provided an update in relation to a number of areas.

IHB gave an update on national pay bargaining and there was discussion on the likelihood of a shift to local bargaining in the future.

IHB advised that implementation of pension auto enrolment was on track for April 2013. He also outlined that a wider issue existed in relation to the UGPS pension scheme deficit and that consideration was being given to options going forward by the Senior Management Group and a Court working party. There is a requirement for consultation with the Unions about proposed changes. It was agreed that it would be appropriate for HR Committee to have a more detailed briefing once a proposal for the future was developed

Action IHB / DA

IHB advised that a decision was still to be taken regarding the provision on e-recruitment provider for the future and it was hoped that a decision would be made by the summer.

HR/12/40 HR Policies

Management of Organisational Change

IHB explained that although HR Committee had agreed a policy on this at a previous meeting, Court had been asked by the Senior Management Group to allow additional consultation to be undertaken with the Unions regarding both Management of Organisational Change and the Competency Procedures.

On the basis of the discussions, the Unions locally have indicated that they would sign up to section 9 of the Management of Organisational Change Procedure but will not sign up to the section covering compulsory redundancies. UNITE are to confirm this with their full time officer. (This has subsequently been confirmed).

The Unions have also agreed to the Competency Procedure. GS outlined that this was a significant shift of position for UCU. The proposals for the two procedures have been endorsed by the Senior Management Group.

AMcF outlined that he was not content with the approach of considering the two procedures together and his preference would have been to finalise the arrangements for the management of organisational change procedure first. He also indicated that he was not happy with the new Management of Organisational Change policy

There was discussion on the likelihood that Court would accept without discussion the recommendation of the CPRG or would wish to consider all cases in depth and it was agreed that it was difficult to predict how this would work out in practice.

AO was supportive of the changes and welcomed the additional level of scrutiny. AM supported the proposal as he felt it represented progress though he recognised that it would not satisfy all parties. DS supported the proposal and felt it would help address the Senate Assessors concerns regarding the definition of tier 2. AAL felt that the approach would support the development of trust with staff following restructure. AA also supported the proposal and noted that it was important that the opportunity to agree the Competency Procedure was not lost.

DA advised that the Lay Members of the HR Committee could not support the proposals as they felt that it would not achieve the original objective of devolving some decisions from Court. In effect all cases involving restructuring, including single cases, would now come automatically to Court. In addition the role of the CPRG had to be seriously questioned since cases it would consider would be reconsidered at Court and this did not seem to be effective use of a committee of Court's time. There also seemed to be a strange anomaly where the CPRG would, during summer, have the power to make decisions. This appeared to the Lay members on the committee to be an inconsistency. There had been a lot of good work done on all employment policies following the change in the ordinances and it was regrettable that this policy seemed to be born out of compromise rather than best practice.

There was further discussion regarding the procedure. It was agreed that should the procedure go to Court there should be a formal review of how it operated in practice after 18 months to ensure that it had achieved its objectives. It was also

noted that the CPRG remit and membership would be subject to an annual review as a Committee of Court.

As the majority of HR Committee members support the revised proposal and it was agreed that it would go forward to Court for approval. The convenor expressed regret that this would be the only policy to go forward without full committee support and with no Lay member support.

Competency Procedure

There was discussion regarding the proposed Competency Procedure. DA and AMcF outlined that they felt that it was a good comprehensive procedure. DS highlighted that the frequently asked questions could be further refined. There was unanimous support for the procedure and it was agreed that it would go forward to Court for approval.

Parental Leave

GS outlined legislative changes to increase unpaid parental leave entitlements from 13 to 18 weeks. These took effect from the 8th of March. GS advised that the parental leave policy would be updated accordingly to take account of this change. The HR Committee noted this change.

HR/12/41 EDSC Committee

The minute of the EDSC Committee was noted. There was discussion regarding complaints about contractors and AAL advised that complaints regarding building contractors were addressed as a priority.

HR/12/42 Public Sector Equality Duty

MT gave an overview of the proposals to meet the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty. The HR Committee approved and agreed to recommend to Court the equality outcomes for staff, the equal pay statement, the timescale for the equal pay audit and using the equality and diversity strategy action plan as the mainstreaming report. It was agreed that the full report would go to Court for approval with the HR Committee minute and that fuller discussion could be scheduled for a later Court meeting if required.

There was discussion regarding the action plan and MT agreed to incorporate the review of processes and training to support the equality outcomes into the action plan. MT also agreed that she would discuss the need for contractors to comply with the equality requirements with the Head of Procurement.

Action: M Taylor

HR/12/43 Managing Academic Performance & Career Development (MAPCD) update

AN and CB provided an update on the MAPCD project, in particular focusing on Performance and Development Review (P&DR) success measures and professorial zoning.

CB provided an overview of P&DR completion rates, distribution of performance ratings and highlighted trends from the moderation process. CB noted that overall good progress had been made, with a more robust process now in place, and acknowledged the work that had been undertaken within Colleges and University Services to facilitate this.

There was discussion and it was agreed that there was further scope to ensure praise was provided and that objectives were SMART and strategically aligned. CB

reported that in the next round of P&DR there would be no fundamental change to the process but a continued focus on setting SMART objectives and greater emphasis on personal development planning

CB gave an update on Professorial Zoning outlining the distribution within zones before and after the zoning exercise and the impact of recent recruitment for the REF she also outlined the gender profile within zones. CB outlined that regular equal pay reviews had illustrated that the gender profile for grades 1-9 was within acceptable limits. There was however gender imbalance at professorial level with only 21% of Professors being female. There was discussion about this issue and how to address it. While there was acknowledgement that this was sector wide issue it was agreed that steps could be taken through initiatives such as Athena Swan, the use of role models and effective P&DR to address this.

CB outlined future development for managing performance and career development including the move to online P&DR process in 2014, reviewing the number of performance outcomes and longer term plans for talent management and succession planning. It was agreed that a future update to Court would be beneficial and that the HR Committee would receive a further update once the plans for online P&DR system were developed.

Action AN & CB

HR/12/44 Any other business

There was no other business raised.

HR/12/45 Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the HR Committee will take place on Wednesday 29 May 2013 at 10am in the Turnbull Room.

Management of Organisational Change / Redundancy Policy and Procedure

1. Introduction

1.1 The University's staffing profile requires to change over time to ensure it is appropriate and supports the University's Strategy. In managing these changes, the University recognises the importance of security of employment for its staff and the desirability of avoiding redundancies.

1.2 This non-contractual procedure applies to all staff and provides a framework for dealing with organisational change and other circumstances that could potentially result in compulsory redundancies. The policy specifically seeks to highlight and address the measures which will be considered or taken to avoid or minimise the need for potential redundancies and to mitigate their impact should redundancies become unavoidable.

2. Principles

2.1 The University and the Trade Union(s) jointly commit to avoiding compulsory redundancies wherever possible by using this procedure.

2.2 The University will consult at an early stage with the relevant Trade Union(s) about proposals for change in staffing requirements which have the potential to give rise to redundancies (as outlined in section 10.7.2). This will aim to assist in the avoidance and / or mitigation of potential redundancies where possible.

2.3 The University commits to consider compulsory redundancy only as a last resort when all other alternatives have been fully explored and exhausted.

2.4 The University is committed to managing the processes in this policy with care and sensitivity in consideration of the impact upon all staff.

2.5 The University will act fairly and consistently when operating this procedure.

2.6 An employee has the right to be accompanied at any formal meetings and related appeals by a work colleague, a duly accredited Trade Union representative or an official employed by a Trade Union.

2.7 Training and coaching for managers operating the procedure will be available. Advice and guidance on the application of this procedure will be provided by Human Resources.

2.8 This policy reflects the University's commitment to promote equality in all its activities in line with the University's Equality & Diversity policy which can be viewed at: www.gla.ac.uk/services/equalitydiversity/equalitydiversitypolicy/ .

2.9 The arrangements for the ending of fixed term contracts and open ended contracts with a funding end date that may result in potential redundancies will be managed at a local level as outlined in section 10.5.

3. Definition of redundancy

3.1 Dismissal by reason of redundancy is defined by the Employment Rights Act 1996 as a dismissal wholly or mainly due to:

- the fact that the University has ceased, or intends to cease, to carry on the activity for the purposes of which the member of staff concerned was appointed or employed by the University, or has ceased, or intends to cease, to carry on that activity in the place in which the member of staff concerned worked; or
- the fact that the requirements of that activity for members of staff of any category to carry out work of a particular kind, or for members of staff to carry out work of a particular kind in that place, have ceased or diminished, or are expected to cease or diminish.

4. Consultation

4.1 The University undertakes to consult with the relevant recognised Trade Union(s) about proposed redundancies, potential or otherwise, as early as practicable and will keep the relevant Trade Union(s) informed of further developments as they arise throughout the period of consultation in accordance with legislative requirements.

4.2 Formal consultation will begin:*

- at least 90 days before the first dismissal is due to take effect, where it is proposed to dismiss as redundant 100 or more staff within a period of 90 days or less within a College, School/RI/Service, section or budget centre; or
- at least 30 days before the first dismissal is due to take effect, where it is proposed to dismiss as redundant between 20-99 staff within a period of 90 days or less within a College, School/RI/Service, section or budget centre; or

- as soon as is reasonably practicable before the first dismissal is due to take effect, where it is proposed to dismiss as redundant fewer than 20 staff within a College, School/RI/Service, section or budget centre.

* These match current legislative requirements (at March 2013). Should the latter change, this section will be reviewed.

The University will consult at an early stage and formal consultation will be for at least the minimum statutory period.

4.3 During formal consultation the University will provide the relevant recognised Trade Union(s) with written information relating to its proposals, including¹:

- the reasons for the proposals;
- the number and description of members of staff it is proposed to declare redundant;
- the total number of members of staff of any such description employed in the College, School/RI/Service, section or budget centre, directly affected;
- the proposed method of selecting the members of staff who may be identified as redundant;
- the proposed method of carrying out the dismissals in accordance with agreed procedures as appropriate;
- the period over which the dismissals are to take effect;
- the proposed redundancy terms, including the method of calculation, if other than that specified by employment legislation.

4.4 Consultation will be meaningful and conducted with the representatives of staff who may be affected, with a view to reaching agreement on ways to avoid, to reduce the numbers of and to mitigate the consequences of the potential redundancies. Formal consultation will take place during stage 3 of the change process (see section 10.9)

4.5 In addition to collective consultation, the University will consult with individual staff or groups of staff whose positions are at risk of redundancy. During these discussions the staff will have the right to be accompanied by a work colleague, a duly accredited Trade Union representative or an official employed by a Trade Union.

¹ Further information will be provided as part of the Equality Impact Assessment at Section 9.

4.6 The University will provide the relevant Trade Union(s) with a copy of any statutory notice supplied to the Department for Business Innovation and Skills about proposed redundancies.

5. Avoidance and mitigation

5.1 The University, in consultation with individual members of staff and the relevant recognised Trade Union(s), will seek to mitigate the effects of any potential reduction in staff numbers by fully considering all alternative courses of action to minimise or eliminate the need for compulsory redundancy. Such action may include:

- reduction in non-staffing costs;
- reduction and/or termination of the use of external staffing resources in related areas e.g. agency staff, contractors;
- non-replacement of staff following normal staff turnover;
- a restriction or freeze on external recruitment in the staff categories affected or in areas to which staff may be redeployed;
- where relevant, reducing or eliminating paid overtime;
- methods of increasing income to the College, School/RI/Service, section or budget centre affected;
- consideration of flexible working requests to reduce hours and costs;
- reduction of hours of work or pay;
- redeployment, relocation and/or retraining of members of staff to alternative types of work, or places of work within the University;
- the offer of voluntary retirement or voluntary severance; and
- facilitating requests for unpaid leave of absence where appropriate.

5.2 This list is not exhaustive and other measures may be available to be implemented to mitigate or avoid the need for reductions in staff.

5.3 Consideration of these measures will be undertaken by the appropriate management group responsible for managing the change. Consideration of mitigation and avoidance will occur throughout the change process.

6. Voluntary retirement and voluntary severance

6.1 The University will give full consideration to the scope to achieve the necessary reduction in the number of staff employed, through voluntary severance and voluntary retirement.

6.2 Requests for voluntary severance will be accepted solely at the discretion of the University. In considering such requests, the University will be guided by the institutional interest and financial considerations.

6.3 Members of staff considered for voluntary severance may be eligible to receive a severance payment and/or pension supplementation according to the rules of the members' pension scheme. In cases of voluntary severance the terms of any enhancement to the Statutory Redundancy payment will be made at the University's discretion and may vary depending upon the circumstances of each redundancy proposal, taking account of equality and value for money considerations as appropriate. In the case of early retirement any pension entitlement will be determined by the rules of the member's pension scheme.

6.4 The University will consult with the relevant recognised Trade Union(s) on the terms of each scheme. Whilst minimum terms will normally be agreed for each redundancy proposal the University retains the right to offer additional terms on a case by case basis as appropriate.

6.5 Members of staff who leave the University through voluntary severance may only be eligible for re-employment or re-engagement after a suitable break in service unless specifically agreed otherwise by the University. This break will normally be a minimum of 24 months duration.

7. Redeployment

7.1 Those whose posts have been formally identified as potentially redundant or who have received formal notice of redundancy with more than nine months continuous service with the University are eligible to be considered for redeployment.

7.2 In seeking to provide suitable alternative employment, consideration will be given to the comparability of the new position with that previously held in terms of grade, rate of pay, hours of work, location and working environment. It is acknowledged that exact matches

may not be possible; therefore flexibility and an open-minded approach will be necessary from both members of staff and management concerned.

7.3 Eligible members of staff will be provided access to the Job Seekers' Register (JSR) and they will be requested to upload a summary CV, supporting statement and redeployment preferences.

7.4 Prior to advertising vacancies, managers with vacancies will be required to consider relevant staff on the Job Seekers' Register to determine those who may satisfy the essential selection criteria for selection for interview, or those who could satisfy these criteria with reasonable retraining.

7.5 Redeployment through the JSR will normally be considered at the same grade and one grade below the individual's current grade. Redeployment to a higher graded post through the Job Seekers Register is not normally permitted.

7.6 Shortlisted staff will be notified by e-mail and given two working days to indicate an interest in a potential redeployment opportunity. Shortlisted staff notifying an interest will be interviewed to review suitability for appointment. The redeployment interview panel will normally have two members including the manager with the vacancy.

7.7 Where staff are redeployed this will normally be subject to a four week trial period in order for the University and the member of staff to assess the suitability of the post. This period can be extended prior to commencement by mutual agreement should it be considered practical and necessary for retraining purposes.

7.8 In the event of redeployment to a lower paid post, the member of staff's existing basic salary will be protected for a period of one year. This excludes overtime or other non-contractual payments. During the period of protection the protected salary will be 'frozen' and will not attract incremental progression. Where the alternative employment is for different hours of work this will be taken into account in determining the extent of salary protection.

7.9 Any member of staff who has received formal notice of redundancy, who unreasonably declines an offer of suitable alternative employment or unreasonably terminates a trial period in that employment, will normally forfeit the right to redundancy pay.

7.10 Where there is a dispute over the reasons for non-selection for interview or redeployment, or whether a trial period was terminated unreasonably, the matter will be reviewed by a senior member of staff nominated by the relevant Vice-Principal / Head of College or the Secretary of Court upon the written submission to the relevant College / University Services HR Manager.

7.11 If having applied this procedure there is no interest in a vacancy or no appointable candidate, only then will the vacancy be advertised

8. Staff support

8.1 Members of staff who are subject to the provision of this policy may seek further advice, guidance and support from their College / University Services HR Team.

8.2 Details of practical guidance and support for staff seeking alternative posts can be found at :- [\(currently under development\)](#).

8.3 Staff under formal notice of redundancy are eligible for reasonable paid time off work to attend interviews.

8.4 University staff have access to a free, independent, confidential counselling service. Further details can be found on the [staff counselling website](#).

9. Equality impact assessment

9.1 The University is required to conduct Equality Impact Assessments on significant changes to policy and practice. Those accountable for managing change should ensure that an equality impact assessment is undertaken of formal proposals for significant organisational changes to identify the potential impact on specific groups with protected characteristics. Further guidance on carrying out equality impact assessments can be found on the [Equality and Diversity Unit website](#).

10. Procedural arrangements

10.1 This procedure lays out the organisational arrangements when a potential need for change is identified that may result in a reduction in staff.

10.2 There are a number of key roles during the change process:

- 1) Initial consideration and development of proposals for change
- 2) Initial strategic sign off
- 3) Management of the change
- 4) Oversight of the process
- 5) Final approval

10.3 Those responsible and accountable for undertaking these roles are dependent on the scale of the change. Changes potentially resulting in a reduction in staffing have been categorised into five tiers. These are:

- Tier 1 – Fixed term contracts & open ended contracts with a funding end date (including individuals, teams or groups).
- Tier 2 – Core funding: a reduction in an individual post, team, group, programme, college support service or a subsection of a School, RI or University Service.
- Tier 3 – The closure of an academic subject / discipline.
- Tier 4 – The closure of a School, Research Institute or University Service.
- Tier 5 – Significant University wide changes / Closure of a College.

10.4 A summary of role responsibilities for each of the tiers is detailed in Appendix A.

10.5 Tier 1 Fixed term contracts & funding end management

10.5.1 Within tier 1 arrangements for the ending of fixed term contracts and open ended contracts with a funding end date that may result in potential redundancies are managed at a local level by the relevant Principal Investigator / line manager within the School / Research Institute / University Service with oversight from the Head of School / Service/ Director of Research Institute supported by Human Resources. Further guidance can be found in the [manager's guide to redundancy consultation and management process](#). Changes at tier 1 will be reported to College Management Groups on an annual basis.

10.5.2 The process for managing the end of fixed term contracts and open ended contracts with a funding end date has been agreed with the Trade Unions.

10.6 The following procedure applies for changes within tier 2-5.

10.7 Stage 1 - Initial consideration and development of proposals / Informal consultation

10.7.1 Where a potential change is identified an initial consideration of options for change should take place. Proposals for a change will normally be formulated by those identified as responsible for the management of the process (see Appendix A).

10.7.2 There will normally be informal consultation with staff and the relevant Trade Union(s) prior to formal proposals for change being considered. This will provide the opportunity for early discussion of ways to avoid or mitigate any potential redundancies as outlined in section 5 above.

10.7.3 Where a change is proposed and all potential redundancies can be avoided through redeployment, avoidance and/or mitigation measures these changes should be managed and implemented locally in consultation with the relevant Trade Union(s).

10.7.4 Where a change is proposed that may potentially result in compulsory redundancies this should proceed to the next stage for formal consideration of whether or not to proceed.

10.8 Stage 2 - Initial strategic sign off

10.8.1 Proposals for change will normally be considered, as appropriate, by the relevant College Management Group / University Services Management Group or the Senior Management Group in the first instance prior to initial strategic sign off.

10.8.2 Formal proposals for change must be outlined by those managing the change using the proforma at appendix B. This details the proposals for change, consideration that has taken place with regard to avoidance and mitigation and outlines the potential impact of the change.

10.8.3 Proposals within tier 2 will be considered by the Court Procedural Review Group. It will recommend on strategic and / or key reputational grounds, or for other exceptional reasons if the proposal should be discussed further by Court prior to initial strategic sign off or make a recommendation to Court that the issue should remain in the management sphere. The full remit and membership of the Court Procedural Review Group is outlined in appendix C.

10.8.4 The initial strategic sign off for proposals within tiers 3 to 5 will be made by the University Court.

10.8.5 It is the responsibility of the management / Court group making the initial decision to determine if there is a direct academic impact and therefore a need for Senate to consider the implications. Senate will be consulted for changes at tiers 3, 4a and 5 as a matter of course.

10.9 Stage 3 – Formal consultation & selection

10.9.1 Those managing the process will make decisions on the definition of pools and selection criteria and consult on these. Formal collective and individual consultation will be undertaken as outlined in section 4 above and will aim to avoid or mitigate potential redundancies where possible.

10.9.2 The University will identify the employee or groups of employees who are at risk of redundancy. They will form the selection pool(s) for redundancy.

10.9.3 The University is committed to ensuring fair treatment in the selection process for redundancy and selection criteria should be as objective as possible and capable of being applied in an independent way. Where selection for redundancy is required the university will consult with the relevant Trade Union (s) on the method of selection and any selection criteria as part of its collective consultation.

10.9.4 During this stage oversight will be undertaken by the relevant management body to ensure that due process has been followed including appropriate consultation, full consideration of mitigation and avoidance, appropriate definition of redundancy pools and selection methodology for redundancy.

10.10 Stage 4 – Final decision and notice of dismissal

10.10.1 At the end of the consultation period the relevant body will make a decision on the way forward taking into account information and comments received. The decision will be confirmed to the Trade Union(s).

10.10.2 Where a decision is taken to proceed with compulsory redundancies, notices of dismissal will be issued in writing following the final approval by the appropriate University body.

10.10.3 The University is committed to avoiding compulsory redundancies where possible and will continue to endeavour to redeploy employees who have been issued with a compulsory redundancy notice up to the date of termination.

10.10.4 The University reserves the right to pay staff in lieu of notice.

11. Reporting

11.1 Court will receive a report on the outcome of each initiative following its conclusion at the subsequent meeting of Court through the Secretary of Court's regular report.

12. Redundancy payments

12.1 Staff qualifying for redundancy pay should normally anticipate working up to the date on which their formal notice expires. Where a member of staff requests to leave prior to the end of the notice period, consideration will be given to the circumstances and permission will not be withheld without good reason. Where a revised date of leaving is agreed there will be no entitlement to payment for the remainder of the notice period. If a member of staff leaves prematurely without the University's permission, they may forfeit their entitlement to a redundancy payment.

12.2 In cases of compulsory redundancy, entitlement to redundancy payments will be calculated on the basis of statutory provisions only. The University at its discretion may offer enhanced redundancy terms and payments and such will be deemed to be inclusive of any entitlement to statutory redundancy pay under any prevailing legislation. Relevant recognised Trade Union(s) will be advised of any enhanced terms which may be available at any particular time at the University's discretion in accordance with Section 6 above.

12.3 For the purpose of calculating compensation, pay is defined as at the date of termination, and in accordance with the limits of the statutory redundancy payment schedule applicable at that time.

12.4 Holiday entitlement will accrue up to the end of the notice period and should normally be taken prior to the expiry of notice.

12.5 Members of staff dismissed through the University's Disciplinary Procedure whilst under notice of redundancy will forfeit any entitlement to a redundancy payment, regardless of whether the redundancy was to be voluntary or compulsory.

13. Appeal

13.1 If an employee selected for compulsory redundancy wishes to appeal, the appeal should be made in writing, setting out in full the grounds of appeal to the appropriate HR Manager. The employee has 5 working days to notify intention to lodge an appeal from the

date of receipt of the Notice of dismissal and a maximum of a further 5 working days to submit the full grounds of the appeal.

13.2 The employee will be invited to attend an appeal meeting which will normally take place without unreasonable delay following receipt of the appeal notification and grounds of appeal. The letter will advise the employee of their right to be accompanied at the meeting by a work colleague or a Trade Union representative.

13.3 Redundancy appeals will be heard by a panel of two. Further guidance on appeals can be found at <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/policies/a-g/appeals-guidancenote/>

13.4 The employee will be informed of the outcome of the appeal meeting in writing normally within 15 working days of the meeting.

13.5 There is no further right of appeal. This exhausts the University's procedures.

Appendix A – Summary of tiered governance arrangements for the management of organisational change & redundancy

	Level	Management of Process	Initial strategic sign off	Senate involvement	Oversight	Final sign off of redundancies
1.	Fixed term funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fixed term contracts Open ended contract with a funding end date (individuals, teams or groups) 	Principal Investigator (PI) or Line manager	Head of School / Director of RI + College HRM /HRO Head of University Service / Division + HRM / HRO	N/A	Head of School/ Director of RI + HRM Head of University Service / Division+ HRM / HRO	Head of School / Director of RI + HRM Head of University Service / Division + HRM / HRO
2a.	(Core Funding) Reduction in Individual post, team, group, programme or subsection of a School /RI or a College support service.	Head of School / RI / College Secretary + College HRM + Senior Academic/ HOSA * (*where appropriate)	Court guided by the recommendation of the Court Procedural Review Group	***	College Management Group	College Management Group ****
2b.	Reduction in individual post, team, sub section of University Service	Head of US Service +US HRM + Senior manager* (*where appropriate)	Court guided by the recommendation of the Court Procedural Review Group	N/A	University Services Management Group	University Services Management Group ****
** At level 2 a Court Procedural Review Group will undertake an assessment and make recommendations to Court regarding the initial strategic decision ***Where there is a direct academic impact the implications for Senate must be considered						
3.	Closure of an academic Subject / Discipline	Head of College + Other CMG Member + College HRM	Court (Proposal to Court from CMG/USMG/SMG)	Yes, consultation	SMG	SMG****
****For level 2 proposals referred to Court and level 3 proposals:- Court has the discretion to request additional oversight for specific cases e.g. they may decide in some cases that SMG or the Court Procedural Review Group should review the case again at final sign off.						
4a.	Closure of School /RI	Head of College + Other CMG Member + College HRM	Court (Proposal to Court from CMG/USMG/SMG)	Yes, consultation	SMG	Court
4b.	Closure of a University Service	Secretary of Court + Other Head of Service + US HRM	Court (Proposal to Court from CMG/USMG/SMG)	Report if appropriate	SMG	Court
5.	University wide change/ Closure of a College	Designated VP /Head of College + HRM	Court	Yes, consultation	SMG	Court

(The structure below schools & research institutes varies between Colleges. The definition of academic subjects / disciplines within each College will be determined by the relevant College Management Group.)
(2, 3 & 4 could include cross College closures / changes.)

APPENDIX B - ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE PROPOSAL

Outline of the Change Proposal:

Prepared by:		Date:	

Description of changes proposed e.g. Closure/ reduction/ restructure:

--

Reason for the changes:

--

Posts likely to be directly affected:

Numbers by Grade:		Job Families:	
-------------------	--	---------------	--

What part of the University is affected?

Proposed Timescale:	
Any Time Constraints:	

Impact of the proposals

What is the strategic impact of the proposed change?

--

What improvements / savings are sought?

--

What is the likely reputational impact of the change?

--

Does it have an impact on academic provision?

Direct:	Is there a plan to consult Senate?	
	What other provision is there in this area:	
Indirect:	Is there any academic impact?	
	If so is there a need for Senate Consultation:	

Is there any direct impact on

Students:	
Other Services:	

**Have alternatives options been considered?
(If yes please specify main reasons for not using them).**

--

Have there been any other proposals for reductions etc. in this area in the past 3 years?	
Who will be responsible for managing this proposal?	

Redeployment, Avoidance and Mitigation

What is the likely potential for Redeployment?

In the College or University Service:	
Elsewhere in the University:	

What is the possible desire for VSER amongst staff directly affected?

--

Are there any likely “bumping” redundancy opportunities in the College or University Service?

What other avoidance is proposed or has been considered?

What other mitigation is proposed or has been considered?

What consultation has been undertaken to date (including with the relevant Trade Union(s)) and is there a need to consult other groups?

External Issues

Are there any significant external issues

Other Comments

Appendix C - Court Procedural Review Group (CPRG)

Remit

1. To act as an independent review group for all tier 2 proposals which involve organisational change which might result in staffing reductions.
2. To recommend, on strategic and /or key reputational grounds, or for other exceptional reasons, if the matter should receive initial strategic sign off by Court, or remain entirely in the Management sphere.
3. To assess, in especially sensitive matters, if the group or Court need to review the final outcome before any change occurs.
4. The Policy requires tier 3 issues to receive the initial strategic sign off by Court. In some cases, Court may decide that it wishes the group, as per point 3 of the remit above, to review the final outcome before any change occurs.

Membership

- 1 Lay member of Court from the Human Resources Committee
- 1 Lay member of Court from outwith the Human Resources Committee
- 1 Senate Assessor

- VP / Head of College / Secretary of Court for affected area

The role of the Head of College / VP on the group is to provide organisational context and explain /amplify the rationale for a proposal. The Court members will make the decision.

To ensure a degree of continuity of experience the membership of the Court Procedural Review Group will be established at the start of each academic year in case it is required. The lay members of Court will be identified by the Nominations Committee and the Senate Assessor will be chosen by the Senior Senate Assessor. In each case a reserve will also be identified in case of lack of availability at a particular time or to avoid an individual dealing with a case in a part of the University where they are closely involved.

The Court Procedural Review Group will be provided with advice and guidance by a HR Manager.

The remit and membership of the Court Procedural Review Group will be reviewed and agreed on an annual basis by Court.

Summer Powers

As a Committee of Court the Court Procedural Review Group has the power to make decisions regarding Tier 2 cases during the summer period when Court does not meet .i.e. between the June and October meetings of Court.

During this period the CPRG will be able to decide, on strategic and /or key reputational grounds, or for other exceptional reasons, if the matter should receive initial strategic sign off by Court, or is able to remain entirely in the Management sphere. All Court representatives on the Procedural Review Group will be involved in making the decision.

Where a decision is taken that a case should remain in the management sphere, The CPRG would notify University Management accordingly, who would proceed in accordance with the policy. The CPRG would also report its decision to Court at the next meeting.

Where a decision was taken that something was of such significant importance that Court should consider it, the Secretary of Court would consult Court for its view on this decision between meetings.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
DRAFT COMPETENCY PROCEDURE

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- 1.1 The University is committed to developing and maintaining constructive relations with its employees and ensuring that concerns over the performance of a staff member are addressed. This non-contractual procedure provides a framework for dealing with incompetency or poor performance at work. “Competency” in this context will cover the University’s reasonable expectations of the employee’s level of skill, knowledge and ability and their application needed for the effective performance of his or her duties.
- 1.2 The procedure will give effect to the principle that, in their areas of academic expertise, staff engaged in teaching, the provision of learning or research will have freedom within the law to hold and express opinion, to question and test established ideas and received wisdom and to present controversial or unpopular points of view without placing in jeopardy their employment or any entitlements or privileges they enjoy.
- 1.3 The University will act fairly and consistently when dealing with cases under this Competency Procedure.
- 1.4 The University will seek to resolve employment issues at the lowest possible level and, where appropriate, on an informal basis. Appendix A provides guidance on managing competency issues informally.
- 1.5 Meetings to hear cases through this Competency Procedure will normally be convened by the immediate manager of member of staff under investigation who will decide, on seeking guidance from the appropriate HR Manager, on the appropriate outcome. Meetings at stage 3 of the formal procedure will be convened by a more senior manager not previously involved in the case.
- 1.6 An employee has the right to be accompanied at any formal meeting and related appeal by a work colleague, a duly accredited Trade Union representative or an official employed by a trade union and may also be

accompanied on request at investigatory meetings.

- 1.7 If an employee has particular requirements at any stage of the procedures because of a disability, or wishes to inform the University of any relevant medical condition, the employee should contact the appropriate Human Resources representative.
- 1.8 Different procedures apply to conduct, performance and sickness/ill health cases. The University may commence the process using one procedure but continue the process using a different procedure if it is more appropriate and reasonable to do so.
- 1.9 The University will generally follow each of the stages set out in this Competency Procedure but reserves the right in appropriate cases to commence the procedure at any of the specified stages or to omit a particular stage/s
- 1.10 Formal meetings will be minuted and copies of minutes will be given to the employee, [except where the University has to withhold some information to protect a witness]. The employee should inform the University as soon as possible after receiving the minutes if he/she wishes to comment on the minutes. The University will keep a written record of every competency case which will be treated as confidential and kept in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. Notes of informal meetings may also be taken where appropriate.
- 1.11 Training and coaching of managers operating the procedure will be available. Advice and guidance on the application of the Competency Procedure will be provided by Human Resources and a Human Resources Representative may be present at any stage in the process including Competency meetings.

2. COMPETENCY PROCEDURE

2.1 Investigation

The University, normally through the appropriate Line Manager, will gather the necessary evidence where there are concerns regarding poor work performance. This may be in the form of documents such as notes of previous informal meetings, the job description, and evidence of complaints or specific examples of unsatisfactory work. The line manager should also consider what

support may be required to facilitate a return to satisfactory performance.

2.2 **Informal Competency action**

All employees are required to participate in the ongoing performance and development review cycle. Where performance issues are identified every effort will be made to manage these informally in the first instance. Appendix A provides guidance on managing competency issues informally. Informal discussions may clarify the required standards, identify areas of concern, establish the likely causes of poor performance and identify training needs and/or appropriate support measures. The appropriate line manager will normally set targets for improvement and agree a time-scale for review. This line manager will ensure that the employee is made aware that formal action will be taken (having regard to all appropriate circumstances) if the poor performance does not improve. Examples of competency issues and case studies illustrating when an issue may be dealt through the informal and formal processes are provided in Appendix C.

2.3 **Formal Competency Procedure**

If informal action does not resolve the poor performance, or the situation is considered sufficiently serious to potentially merit formal action, the steps outlined below will be taken.

2.3.1 ***Inform the employee in writing***

The University will inform the employee in writing of the shortcomings in the employee's performance that the University is seeking to address under this Competency Procedure and will write to the employee to invite him/her to a meeting.

The letter will contain sufficient information about the alleged shortcomings and the possible consequences to enable the employee to respond to these at the meeting. The letter should enclose copies of any relevant documents that that have been gathered during any investigation process to allow for adequate preparation by the employee.

The letter will also advise the employee of their right to be accompanied by a work colleague or trade union representative.

2.3.2 **Meeting**

The case at stages 1 and 2 stage of the Formal Competency Procedure will normally be heard by an appropriate direct line manager who will have considered the evidence gathered in relation to the employee's performance shortfalls. Cases at stage 3 will be heard by a more senior manager not previously involved in the case normally from within the same College / University Services.

After the meeting, the University will notify the employee of the outcome of the meeting in writing. This will normally be done within 10 working days of the meeting. If a sanction is imposed under the formal Competency Procedure, the employee will be advised of the right of appeal.

3. **COMPETENCY OUTCOMES**

The University has discretion to choose the outcomes/sanction to apply to an employee who it believes has not met acceptable standards of performance.

These are:

3.1 **Stage 1 – First Written Warning**

A First Written Warning letter will set out:

- The areas in which the employee has not met the required performance standards;
- Targets and timescales for improvement;
- Any actions, such as additional training, supervision or other support, which will be taken with a view to improving performance;
- A time-scale for review (not normally less than a month or more than three months);
- The consequences of failing to improve within the review period, or of further unsatisfactory performance;
- Details of the employee's right of appeal; and
- The period that the Stage 1 letter will remain live on file for, normally 12 months.

3.2 **Stage 2- Final Written Warning**

The Final Written Warning letter at this stage will set out the same information

that applies at Stage 1 above, except that it will state that a failure to improve could result in dismissal and the period that the Stage 2 letter will remain live on file, normally 12 months.

3.3 **Stage 3 - Dismissal or alternative outcomes**

The University will hold a further meeting in terms of this formal Competency Procedure if the employee's performance does not improve within the further review period set out at Stage 2 or if further poor performance is evident within the period the letter is live on file.

The University has recourse to the following outcomes at this stage:

- Dismissal; or
- Consider any practical alternative to dismissal such as redeployment to another suitable job at the same or lower level which the employee would be competent to fill.

If the University decides that dismissal is the appropriate sanction, the employee will be informed of the reasons for the dismissal and the date on which employment will end.

3.4 **Gross negligence**

In exceptional circumstances an employee's performance may amount to gross negligence justifying summary dismissal without notice.

4. **APPEALS**

If the employee wishes to appeal the outcome of a decision made through the formal stages of the Competency Procedure, the appeal should be submitted in writing setting out in full the grounds of appeal to the appropriate College / University Services HR Manager. The employee has 5 working days to notify intention to lodge an appeal from the date of receipt of the decision and a maximum of a further 5 working days to submit the full grounds of the appeal.

The employee will be invited to attend an appeal meeting normally within 15 working days of receipt of the appeal notification and grounds of appeal. The letter will advise the employee of their right to be accompanied at the meeting by a work colleague or Trade Union representative.

Dismissal appeals will be heard by a panel of two: All other appeal meetings will be held by another member of staff, normally in the employee's line management structure who has not been previously involved in the case.

The employee will be informed of the outcome in writing, by Human Resources, within 15 working days of the appeal meeting and that this is the final stage of the procedure.

There is no further right of appeal.

Appendix A - Managing competency issues informally

This brief guide lays out the key steps in dealing informally with issues of under performance.

Good performance management uses a combination of formal and informal methods to allow staff to perform effectively and achieve their potential. This does not replace the need for formal ongoing performance management mechanisms such as comprehensive induction, ensuring role clarity through clear job descriptions and effective Performance and Development Reviews (P&DR). Nor does it replace the need for effective day to day management and supervision of staff.

Good two way communication is key to managing effective relationships with staff. It is important that regular feedback on performance is provided to all staff, whether this is negative or positive.

When should you address performance issues?

The competency procedure lays out a *formal* process of addressing issues of poor performance. However, it states that every effort will be made to address issues *informally* prior to initiating formal proceedings.

The informal stage is aimed at bringing concerns to the attention of the employee and resolving issues quickly and effectively where possible. Concerns about performance should be raised as soon as possible after they occur, or when they become evident, to ensure they don't become bigger issues that are more difficult to tackle. It is not necessary to wait until the next formal review or P&DR meeting before raising concerns. By making staff aware of your concerns it gives them the opportunity to address them and for you to work together to resolve any issues.

Minor problems should be addressed informally by providing feedback on a day to day basis. Where there are ongoing issues that are not addressed through regular feedback and support then a more structured approach will be required.

Considerations

When you have concerns about a member of staff's performance, it is worth considering the possible causes as this will help you to address the situation appropriately.

The following questions may help you when considering poor performance, possible causes and how to address it:

- Are the requirements of the role clear and is there an up to date job description detailing this?
- Have objectives and expectations been adequately communicated?
- Have proper facilities and equipment been provided?
- Has adequate support, supervision and training been provided?
- What other support might be required? e.g. training and development, mentoring, coaching or counselling.
- Are there personal factors that should be taken account of?
- Are there wider organisational or team issues that might be impacting on performance?

It is worth considering if the issue is due to an inability to perform the role (competency or ill health capability) or is it that the member of staff is refusing or objecting to perform an aspect of the role (conduct). In the latter case this could potentially be a disciplinary matter and you should contact your College / University Services HR team for further guidance.

Holding an informal meeting

Informal meetings will normally be held on a one to one basis with the member of staff and their manager. Where you believe there is a requirement for more than one manager to meet with the member of staff you should discuss this with Human Resources. Where this is the case it would be reasonable for the member of staff to be accompanied if they wish.

When addressing ongoing performance issues with a member of staff it is important that this is approached in a constructive manner with an aim to support the individual to resolve any issues. The meeting should be aimed at encouraging and motivating the member of staff to improve their performance to an acceptable level. You should also be able to give specific factual examples of issues that are of concern.

Adequate time should be set aside for the meeting and a venue should be selected that provides adequate privacy to discuss issues.

Key steps

- 1) Explain the purpose of the meeting and give the member of staff the opportunity to ask any questions.
- 2) Advise the member of staff that their performance has fallen short of the standard expected for their position / grade and outline the impact of this.
- 3) Demonstrate and explain the grounds and/or evidence for this view providing factual examples of under performance. The Job Description may help you to focus on objective aspects and, where appropriate, the job family grade descriptors may provide additional help.
- 4) Explore the reasons for under performance and give the individual the opportunity to explain their under performance and to raise any concerns they may have about the job.
- 5) Discuss, identify and agree if there is any appropriate support, training or development that could be provided to address the issues and facilitate improvement.
- 6) Set out clear realistic performance standards and expectations going forward, and how you will monitor them.
- 7) Jointly agree realistic timescales for improvement and how and when you will monitor and review progress.
- 8) Highlight that if there are ongoing issues that this may be addressed through the formal competency procedure.

Following the meeting the key points of discussions outlining the improvement plan should be confirmed in writing to ensure that both you and the employee have the same clear understanding of what was discussed and agreed at the meeting. You should ensure that any support that is agreed at the meeting is implemented accordingly.

Appendix B - Checklist for managing competency issues informally

This checklist outlines some key areas to consider when dealing informally with performance issues. It can be used as a tool in conjunction with the guidance notes for managing competency issues informally when managing performance issues.

It is important that concerns about performance should be raised as soon as possible after they occur and need not wait until the next formal review or P&DR meeting. Minor problems should be addressed informally by providing feedback on a day to day basis.

Where there are ongoing issues that are not being addressed by a person despite regular feedback and support then a more structured approach will be required. The checklist below outlines some of the key points to consider when managing performance issues. This should be tailored accordingly for the circumstances.

- 1) What is the performance issue that is concerning you?
- 2) Can you identify specific examples that can illustrate your concerns? What are these?
- 3) What are the standards of performance that are expected for the role being undertaken?
- 4) Is there role clarity, an up to date job description or any defined standards for the work?
- 5) What are the possible causes of the performance issues (internal and external)?
- 6) Does the individual have any specific circumstances that need consideration?
- 7) Is there training and development that could support an improvement in performance?
- 8) Is there other appropriate support that could be provided?
- 9) What performance standards do you expect going forward, over what timescale, and what would be reasonable expectations for performance going forward?
- 10) How will you monitor this?
- 11) What are appropriate timescales for targets to be achieved and a review to take place?

These areas can be explored through an informal meeting and appropriate performance standards, targets and timescales agree and confirmed in writing following the meeting. Where appropriate you should highlight that ongoing issues may be addressed through the formal competency procedure.

Appendix C - Examples of competency issues

Below are a number of general examples of competency issues that could be dealt with through an informal or formal process. It is important to take into account the context the member of staff is working in, including their overall workload, when considering how to address performance issues.

Examples of General Competency Issues

- Consistent failure to perform work to a reasonable and acceptable standard.
- Failure to carry out the duties of the post properly.
- Insufficient attention to detail or frequent mistakes.
- Ongoing failure to deliver work to agreed deadlines including a failure to meet key deadlines.
- Inability to undertake specific key duties associated with the role.
- Short-termism where long term planning is necessary for the role.
- Inability to develop to meet changing and new work demands.
- Significant failure to consult with key stake-holders in relation to key decisions or actions.
- Failure of a manager to address performance issues of their staff.

Competency Case studies

The brief case studies below illustrate when a competency issue would be dealt with through the formal competency procedure. Manager's guidance on dealing with competency issues informally is contained within Appendix A.

Case Study 1

A member of staff has failed to meet a number of key deadlines. This is brought to his attention informally at the time. Specific examples are given and the impact of failing to meet these deadlines explained. He is given the opportunity to raise any concerns regarding this and to discuss how the issues could be addressed. Support is put in place and arrangements are made for him to attend training on the management of his time. Future targets and a timescale to review these are mutually agreed.

At the review meeting it is established that the mutually agreed targets had been met and no formal action is taken.

Going forward, regular meetings are arranged to ensure that there is clarity regarding work objectives and the opportunity to raise any concerns about meeting objectives at an early stage.

Case Study 2

A member of staff has failed to meet a number of key deadlines. This is brought to his attention informally at the time. Specific examples are given and the impact of failing to meet these deadlines explained. He is given the opportunity to raise any concerns regarding this and to discuss how the issues could be addressed. Support is put in place and arrangements are made for him to attend training on the management of his time. Future targets and a timescale to review these are mutually agreed.

At the review meeting it is established that the mutually agreed targets and deadlines were not met and that this had a negative impact on his colleagues and the reputation of his team.

The member of staff is asked to attend a formal competency meeting under stage 1 of the Competency Procedure and informed of his right to be accompanied at the meeting by a colleague or trade union representative. At the meeting the ongoing issues are discussed with him and he does not give a satisfactory explanation of why the deadlines have not been met following efforts to resolve this issue informally. Discussion takes place about what support can be put in place to avoid this happening in the future. A decision is taken to issue a written warning setting out: the problem, the improvement required the timescale for improvement, ongoing support that is available and a review date. The employee is informed that a failure to improve may lead to a final written warning.

Appendix D- Managers guidance for undertaking formal competency meetings

This brief guide provides guidance for managers undertaking a formal competency meeting.

Formal competency meetings normally take place where informal action has not resolved performance issues, or the situation is considered sufficiently serious to potentially merit formal action. It is important in the first situation above to ensure that appropriate steps have been taken to address competency issues informally prior to taking formal action. If you are considering formal action through the competency procedure you should contact your Human Resources Team at the outset for advice and guidance.

The meeting should be approached in a constructive manner and aimed at encouraging and motivating the member of staff to improve their performance to an acceptable level.

Prior to the meeting

The employee should be invited to the meeting in writing outlining the performance issue, the potential consequences of the meeting and advising of their right to be accompanied to the meeting. It is good practice to share any written evidence that will be discussed at the meeting prior to the meeting. Adequate time should be set aside for the meeting and a venue should be selected that provides adequate privacy to discuss issues. Arrangements should be made for someone to attend the meeting to take a minute of the meeting.

The meeting

The following areas would normally be covered within a formal competency meeting.

- 1) Explain the purpose of the meeting, introduce those present at the meeting and give the member of staff the opportunity to ask any questions about the meeting purpose or arrangements.
- 2) If the employee is accompanied clarify the role of this person.
- 3) Outline to the member of staff how their performance has fallen short of the standard expected for their position / grade, and the impact of this.
- 4) Demonstrate and explain the grounds and/or evidence for this view, providing factual examples of underperformance. The current Job Description may help you to focus on objective aspects and, where appropriate, the job family grade descriptors, performance standards or standard operating procedures may provide additional help.
- 5) Outline what action has already been taken informally to address performance issues
- 6) Give the individual the opportunity to respond and to raise any concerns they may have about the job.
- 7) Jointly explore the possible reasons for under performance.
- 8) Discuss, identify and agree if there is any appropriate support, training or development that could be provided to address the issues and facilitate improvement.
- 9) Make the individual aware of other support mechanisms if appropriate e.g. employee counselling service.
- 10) Check if there is anything else the employee wishes to raise

- 11) Set out clear, realistic performance standards and expectations going forward, and how you will monitor them.
- 12) Jointly agree realistic timescales for improvement and how and when you will monitor and review progress.
- 13) Outline a timescale for review and the consequences of failing to improve within the review period.
- 14) If a formal warning is given state the individual's right of appeal.

Following the meeting

After the meeting the outcome of the meeting should be confirmed in line with the Competency procedure. This will normally be done within 10 working days of the meeting. If a formal warning is given under the formal Competency Procedure, the employee should be advised of the right of appeal.

Competency - Frequently Asked Questions

- 1) What is specifically meant by Competency?**
In the context of this procedure, competence is about having the ability to apply your knowledge and skills to effectively carry out your role. The competency procedure is aimed at addressing under performance within a role and where possible supporting improvement where performance is not at the required standard.
- 2) I have a health problem / disability that is impacting on my ability to undertake my role is this covered by the competency procedure?**
Issues relating to ill health are covered by the [Sickness Absence Policy](#) and the [Capability Procedure](#). Further guidance can be found in the [Disability Policy](#) if your ability to carry out your role is affected as a result of a disability.
- 3) I feel that my manager doesn't think I am performing adequately in my role what should I do?**
In the first instance you should discuss your concerns with your line manager. This will give you the opportunity to confirm if this is the case. If your manager does have just concerns, this will give an opportunity for you both to discuss how any issues could be addressed.
- 4) I don't feel that I am performing adequately in my role what should I do?**
In the first instance you should discuss your concerns with your line manager. Before speaking to them it may be worth thinking through the reasons behind your concerns and what could be done to help you cope better with your role. Explaining your concerns to your manager will give them the opportunity to discuss the issues with you and what can be done to support you to perform better in your role. If you are uncomfortable discussing this with your manager you may wish to utilise the other support outlined in question 5.
- 5) I am not coping with my role what other support is available out with my team?**
If possible you should discuss your concerns with your line manager to see if what support can be given locally. You may also want to contact your local Human Resources team who can provide advice and guidance.

The University offers all employees access to a confidential independent employee counselling service. provided by the Employee Counselling Service who operate a telephone helpline 24 hours a day seven days a week on 0800 389 7851. More information is available on the HR website under [employee counselling](#).

If a health problem is affecting your ability to do your role, your manager can refer you to the Occupational Health Unit, in order to obtain advice on how to support you in your role. Alternatively you can self refer to the Occupational health Unit for help and support. Further guidance on how to contact Occupational Health and make a referral can be found in the [Sickness absence policy](#).

6) What advice is available to help support me through the competency procedure?

Guidance on the Competency Procedure is contained within the appendices of the procedure. If you have questions about the procedure further advice and guidance on the application of the procedure is available from your local HR Team.

7) What advice is available to help guide line managers through the competency procedure?

Guidance for managers on [dealing informally with competency issues](#) (quick link) is contained within the appendices of the procedure. Advice and guidance and coaching on the application of the Competency Procedure is available from your local HR Team. Training on managing performance is provided by the [Staff Development Service](#).

8) My manager has asked me to meet with me informally to discuss concerns about my performance what can I expect?

Your manager should outline to you their concerns about your performance, explaining them and giving specific examples to you. They will give you the opportunity to discuss the reasons for this with them and give you the chance to raise any concerns. You should also discuss ways that these concerns could be addressed and what support could help you. Finally they will set out clear expectations of what is required in the future, with agreed targets and timescales where appropriate, and agree with you what support will be implemented to help you improve your performance. Depending on the discussion they may highlight that a failure to improve as discussed may result in this issue being dealt with through the formal competency procedure.

9) Should a companion always be present when I am discussing a competency issue with my line manager?

Informal meetings will normally be held on a one to one basis between you and your manager.

During the formal stages of the procedure you have the right to be accompanied by a work colleague, a duly accredited Trade Union Representative or an official employed by a Trade Union. It is your choice whether you wish to be accompanied and if you wish this you will need to make the necessary arrangements. You may also be accompanied on request at investigatory meetings.

10) What can my companion do at a formal meeting?

Your companion can speak at the meeting, help you to put your case across, sum up on your behalf and respond to views raised by others at the meeting. They can also confer with you during the meeting.

Your companion cannot answer questions on your behalf, address the meeting if you don't want them to or prevent the University from explaining its case.

11) Are there other ways to address a Competency issue in the first instance?

You should receive informal feedback on your work performance from your manager on a regular basis. Where your manager has concerns about your performance this should be dealt with informally in the first instance. Guidance on dealing informally with competency issues is contained within

[Appendix A](#) of the Competency Procedure. Managers should not await the annual performance and development review to address any important competency issues.

12) Why would a review of my development and performance culminate in any action under the Competency Policy?

Your annual performance and development review will include a review of your performance against objectives for the previous year. Ongoing underperformance within your role could lead to action being taken through the formal competency procedure. Your manager should raise any concerns about performance with you when they occur and should not wait until your annual performance and development review to raise these.

13) Are there specific parameters within which my competence will be judged?

Acceptable performance is specific to a particular role. What is expected from you in your role will be described in your job description. Specific objectives will also be set as part of your annual performance and development review and specific work will be agreed through regular discussion with your manager. The [job family descriptors](#) may also give a useful indication of what is normally expected at a particular grade.

14) What are the typical timescales for improvement?

The timescales for improvement will be dependent on the specific issue and your role. Where issues are being addressed informally an improvement would expect to be demonstrated in a reasonable time period with appropriate support. The timescales for improvement in the formal stages of the policy are normally between one and three months at each stage.

15) What could the outcome be under this procedure?

The purpose of the competency procedure is, where possible, to resolve issues regarding performance locally on an informal basis with appropriate support. Where there are ongoing issues these could be dealt with through the formal process resulting in warnings and the ongoing provision of support. If you fail to improve this could result in further warnings and ultimately result in your redeployment to another post or dismissal.

Public Sector Equality Duty

1. Introduction

The University of Glasgow's strategic vision is to enhance our position as one of the world's great, broad-based, research intensive universities. To achieve this vision, the University has set out its mission and values in a strategic plan entitled Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision¹. This core strategy is underpinned by three main strategic areas of Learning and Teaching, Research and Internationalisation, and our core values of integrity, credibility, openness and success.

Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision defines our value of openness as;

Our inclusiveness embraces diversity by valuing and respecting the perspectives and contributions of all our colleagues and students.

This value places equality at the heart of the University, which is reflected in the three strategic areas underpinning our overarching vision and mission.

The Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) provides a framework for the University to achieve this strategic aim and ensure our values are embedded within our culture. Our approach to fulfilling and enhancing the legislative duties are embedded within our existing strategies and mainstreaming approach to equality.

2. Legal context

The Scottish Government revised the draft regulations for the PSED which were laid before parliament in March 2012, and these came into force on the 27 May 2012. The PSED aim is to support public authorities in meeting the needs of the general duty of the Equality Act 2010 to;

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other prohibited conduct.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Under the new regulations each public authority is required to:

- publish equality outcomes by the 30 April 2013 and report progress every two years
- report on mainstreaming the equality duty by the 30 April 2013, and thereafter every two years
- assess and review policies and practices, ongoing

¹ http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_180610_en.pdf

- gather and use employee information, and publish in the mainstreaming report (if not published elsewhere)
- publish gender pay gap information by the 30 April 2013 and report progress every two years
- publish statements on equal pay by the 30 April 2013, and at four year intervals
- consider award criteria and conditions in relation to public procurement
- publish in a manner that is accessible.

3. Equality outcomes

To develop the University's equality outcomes, it was important to be cognisant of the context and evidence base. It has been of primary importance to ensure any equality outcomes set link with the University's strategic plans, and there is a sound evidence base for the outcome.

3.1 Strategic links

In 2010, the University developed its strategy Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision to support its vision *to enhance its position as one of the world's great, broad based, research intensive universities*. Within this strategy the University identified the following equality KPI:

We will strive to ensure that the diversity of our staff population is in line with the local working population and that minority groups are fairly represented at senior levels. In particular we will work to increase the percentage of staff who are female in professorial and level 10 roles towards equal representation.²

The lack of women in senior roles, and specifically the Professoriate is an issue that the University is keen to address, and in considering our equality outcomes, it was imperative this KPI was reflected.

The University's Learning and Teaching Strategy was developed in 2011, and has a set of guiding principles, with equality embedded within these. Two of the principles specifically address equality issues:

Inclusion, access and opportunity - *Our student community will be a diverse group of individuals from a broad geographical and socio-economic base, who are recruited to the University on the basis of ability and potential to thrive in our learning environment and capitalise on the exceptional opportunities it affords them.*

A Truly Supportive Environment - *We will provide a truly supportive learning and teaching environment, for staff and students alike, free from discrimination, harassment and unfair treatment and that promotes ethical and social awareness.*

This strategy and associated action plan aims to address specific issues relating to access, opportunity and creating a supportive environment. The equality outcomes for students have been developed to address this, and aim to reflect and support this strategy.

The University's Internationalisation strategy was developed in 2010, with the vision to grow our international reach and reputation. The strategy has six themes, the student and staff themes are outlined below.

² http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_169346_en.pdf

Student Experience: To enhance the student experience at Glasgow by offering a culturally diverse learning environment that prepares students for global employment and citizenship and an experience built upon a wide range of world class support services, from point of enquiry to post graduation

Staff: To support effective engagement of staff with the goals of internationalisation and promote a culturally diverse community

There have been significant developments on each of these themes. The equality outcomes support the development of a culturally diverse community which is treated with dignity and respect.

The University's Research Strategy is embedded within the Glasgow 2020 document and outlines our key action to *deliver excellent research*³ which is underpinned by three core activities to;

- Developing research strengths and multidisciplinary activities
- Growing our community of PhD students
- Extending our knowledge exchange activity

To support this, the University has identified we need to;

- attract and retain internationally recognised academics
- nurture the development of our talented early career researchers
- cultivate the research leaders of the future
- establish a rich research environment, and
- foster and support a diverse research student population.

These requirements ensure that embedding equality and diversity is at the heart of the University's research strategy ensuring we have a supportive and collaborative environment for researchers.

The Equality and Diversity Strategy⁴ was developed in 2012, and reflects the main strategies of the University. Many elements relating to the equality outcomes and other elements of the Public Sector Equality Duty are embedded within this document.

3.2 Evidence - Staff

For staff, the Staff Equality Monitoring Report⁵ 2011/12 provided the evidence base of our staff population at the University. This report highlighted the following;

- The staff age profile is mainly grouped in the 31-55 age range.
- 2.6% of staff have declared a disability.
- 50% of staff are married, in a civil partnership or co-habiting.
- 5.3% of staff are from a Black or Minority Ethnic background.
- 20% of staff are Christian.
- 55% of staff are female.
- 1.3 % of staff have stated they are Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual.

³ Ibid

⁴ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/equalitydiversity/equalityanddiversitystrategyandpolicy/>

⁵ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/equalitydiversity/monitoring/staffmonitoring/>

The Staff Attitude Survey for 2012⁶ allows the University to extract our staffs experience of the University based on some of the protected characteristics. It should be noted that response rate for the survey was 33% (# 1780), of which the protected characteristics have been broken down as outlined below;

Protected Characteristics	#	%	# - No response	% - No response
Female	966	54	120	7
Male	694	39		
White	1563	88	155	9
Black and Minority Ethnic	62	3		
No Disability	1520	85	151	9
Disabled	109	6		
Heterosexual	1465	82	251	14
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual	64	4		

Although the numbers for many of the minority characteristics are low (BME, Disabled and LGB); for Disabled staff and LGB staff the percentage return is higher than that of the Staff Equality Monitoring Report. This shows that many staff are happy to report these characteristics in an anonymous way.

The survey consists of two elements, staff experience based on University Court KPI's, and the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Stress Measurement Tool.

When considering the results by protected characteristic of the Court KPI's, this shows;

- Disabled staff stated they were 6% less likely to be praised for a job well done than the University average. (KPI 3)
- LGB staff stated they were 11% less likely to be given annual performance feedback. (KPI 5)
- BME staff stated they were more likely to rate the communications within their team by 7% above than the University average. (KPI 6)
- LGB staff stated they were 5% more satisfied with GU-wide communications than the University average. (KPI 8)
- BME staff stated they agreed by 7% more that the University average with the statement 'I enjoy working at the University'. (KPI 9)
- BME staff stated they agreed by 10% more that the University average with the statement 'I feel loyal and supportive to the University'. (KPI 10)

The results by sex did not show a marked difference in experience, although generally male staff were less satisfied than female staff.

The HSE Stress Indicator Tool showed the scores have deteriorated in all areas, noticeably in the indicators for management and peer support across the board, and less significantly for all the other factors, compared to the 2009 survey results. When this was considered in more detail at protected characteristic level, the minority characteristics (Disabled, BME and LGB staff) results were equal to or better than the majority counterparts.

⁶ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/policies/p-z/staffattitudesurveyresults/>

3.3 Evidence – Students

For students, the Student Equality Monitoring Report 2011/12 provided the evidence base of our student population at the University. The University does not currently collect information for the protected characteristics not listed, with the exception of ethnicity where the data will be provided at a later date. This report highlighted the following for total students.

Undergraduate students:

- 70% are aged between 18-20, 22% between 21-25 and 8% between 26-40+
- 7% have declared a disability
- 8% are Asian, Black, Chinese, Mixed or Other ethnicity
- 56% are female

Postgraduate Taught students:

- 66% are aged between 21-25, and 33% are between 26-40+
- 4% have declared a disability
- 33% are Asian, Black, Chinese, Mixed or Other ethnicity
- 64% are female

Postgraduate Research students:

- 45% are aged between 21-15, and 55% are between 26-40+
- 6% have declared a disability
- 25% are Asian, Black, Chinese, Mixed or Other ethnicity
- 48% are female

Our students participate in a number of surveys during their academic lifetime depending on their stage in the academic cycle. For the purposes of this report and gathering evidence, three national surveys have been considered – National Student Survey (NSS), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) and Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), all results relate to 2011/12 surveys. It should be noted that for PTES and PRES the survey response rate by protected characteristic can be small.

The NSS results can be considered by age, disability, ethnicity and sex. The University identified one key question and considered the results by the protected characteristics – the question was rating your overall satisfaction.

On considering the results of the survey in 2011/12, this shows:

- Younger students are more satisfied than mature students – however the difference is only 2%.
- Disabled students (including dyslexic) are 1% less satisfied than non-disabled students.
- Black students are the most satisfied (92%), then White (89%), Other (88%), Not known (85%) and Asian students are the least satisfied (84%).
- Female students are more satisfied than male (89% and 88% respectively).

There seems to be no consistent trend within the NSS data – however further investigation may be required to identify why Asian students are the least satisfied.

The PTES results can be looked at by age, disability and sex. The University identified one key question set to consider the results by these protected characteristics: the question was

Q13. *Please rate the following aspects of your postgraduate taught programme in terms of how your experience has met with your expectations (-3 it has definitely not met my expectations , 0 it has met my expectations, +3 it has definitely exceeded my expectations)*

- a. *Quality of teaching and learning*
- b. *Assessment and feedback*
- c. *Organisation and management*
- d. *Learning resources*
- e. *Skills and personal development*
- f. *Career and professional development*
- g. *Overall experience of my course*

On considering the results of the survey in 2011/12, this shows

- 31-35 years (8% of respondents) stated their experience did not meet their expectation for e and g by >4% above the average for the question. All other results show no differentiation for PGT results by age.
- Disabled students (4% of respondents) stated their experience did not meet their expectation in all questions (a-g), except learning resources (d); the difference between disabled and non-disabled students varies between 8% and 22%. However it should be noted the numbers are low.
- Female students (63% of respondents) stated their expectations were not met for questions a and e by >2% when compared to male students, and male students (37% of respondents) have stated this for f by >2%.

The PRES results can be considered by age, disability and sex. The University identified one key question set to consider the results by these protected characteristics; the question was

Q15. *Please rate the following broad aspects of your research degree programme in terms of how your experience of them has met with your expectations (-3 = it is much more negative, 0 = it has met my expectations, +3 = it is much more positive)*

- a. *Supervisory support and guidance*
- b. *Opportunities to develop a range of research skills*
- c. *Opportunities to develop a range of transferable skills*
- d. *Access to appropriate facilities*
- e. *The research environment*
- f. *Provision of guidance on institutional standards and expectations for your research degree programme*
- g. *Overall experience of my research programme*

On considering the results of the survey in 2011/12, this shows

- In terms of age there was no difference in whether PGR students experience had met their expectations.
- Disabled students (5.5% of respondents) were more likely to state their experience did not meet their expectations for all the questions (a-g) the smallest margin being 6%, the largest 12%. However it should be noted the numbers are low.
- Female students (54% of respondents) were more likely to state their experience did not meet their expectations for a, d and f (by a margin of >2%); whilst male students

were more likely to state their experience did not meet their expectations for c (by a margin >4%).

The evidence from the PTES and PRES surveys seem to show a trend of disabled students' experience not meeting their expectations.

4. Consultation and approval process for equality outcomes

There are three key constituents to consult with during this process – staff, students and University management. The legislation outlines the importance of including people from the protected characteristic groups, and the equality structure at the University assists with this. The EDU will consult on the equality outcomes with the following groups;

- Staff Trade Unions
- Student Representative Council
- Disability Equality Group (this includes staff and student membership)
- Athena SWAN Self Assessment Team
- Sexual Orientation Equality Group (staff and student membership)
- Religion and Belief Equality Group (staff and student membership)
- University management/committees (including EDSC, SMG, HR Committee, SSDC and Court)
- Specific relevant staff/student groups on campus (i.e. HR Managers, Disability Service, Health, Safety and Wellbeing).

Additionally an article in Campus News, inviting staff to respond to an online consultation will appear during March 2013.

5. Equality outcomes

The equality outcomes have been developed based on the strategic aims of the University (section 3.1) and the evidence base (sections 3.2 and 3.3) – these are outlined below.

*It is recognised this requires increases in percentages of female and ethnic minority staff at lower grades to impact this Equality Outcome.

	No.	Equality Outcome	Evidence	Strategic link	Protected characteristic	Lead	Success Measure
Students	1.	Ensure all learning materials for course complies with an agreed inclusion and accessibility standard.	Disabled Student Survey FY Survey	L&T Strategy E Learning Strategy	Disability International students (Race/Religion and Belief)	Disability Champion, EDU and DEG	Improved approval rating on surveys relating to access information.
	2.	Degree attainment – reduced any disparity for students from different protected characteristic groups.	Student Monitoring Report	L&T Strategy	Age, Disability, Race and Sex.	Clerk of Senate, VP L&T, EDU	Reduce disparity for protected characteristic groups in degree attainment, as monitored.
	3.	Retention – continue to address retention and progression issues based on protected characteristic groups.	Retention Working Group – annual statistics.	L&T Strategy	Age, Disability, Race and Sex.	Retention Working Group	Reduce disparity in retention between protected characteristic groups identified.
Staff	4.	Increase the diversity of the Professoriate and management positions, specifically in gender and ethnicity.*	Staff Monitoring Report	Glasgow 2020	Sex, Race	Gender & Race Champion, HR, HoC, CMG	Year on year growth in the percentage of females and BME in these roles. Engagement levels in Leadership and Management training. Increased percentage of female and ethnic minority applicants, and applicants for promotion.
	5.	Foster a supportive culture, which promotes dignity and respect and where all staff feel valued and inappropriate behaviours are challenged.	Staff Monitoring Report, Staff Attitude Survey.	Glasgow 2020, HR Strategy	All	EDU, HR	Improved satisfaction for the Staff Attitude Survey in relation to being valued. Percentage 90%+ of completion rates of E&D training by 2017. Devise a training plan to support this. Increase in the use of informal resolution process (currently HVN's – other measures will be required). Development of guidance on acceptable behaviour.
	6.	To provide seamless service provision to disabled staff.	Staff Attitude Survey	Glasgow 2020, HR Strategy	Disability	HR, Occupational Health, Disability Service	Set up a measurement process for the provision. Increase satisfaction of disabled staff in the Staff Attitude Survey. Increase disclosure rates for disabled staff. Cognisance of this for the Campus Master plan.

6. Mainstreaming report

The PSED requires the University to produce a mainstreaming report from April 2013, and then every two years. As the EDU consulted and drafted the first Equality and Diversity Strategy and Action Plan in 2012, it is proposed that the annual update for this action plan acts as the basis for the mainstreaming report, see Appendix A.

Using the action plan as an update document ensure the actions are regularly considered, updated, revised and linked to University strategies. This guarantees EDSC (and relevant reporting committees) are aware of developments relating to equality, the progress to date and can add or remove actions depending on changing priorities of the organisation and legislative framework. Additionally, other key actions, such as Athena SWAN are regularly reported to EDSC and feature in the Equality and Diversity Strategy and Action Plan.

The University published the Staff Equality Monitoring Report⁷ in June 2012, which outlines the employment data for the organisation. The University intends to continue with this cycle and the data for 2013 will be published in a similar annual timeframe.

7. Equal Pay

The PSED requires the University by April 2013 to;

- Publish information on the percentage difference between men's and women's average hourly pay (excluding overtime) and subsequently at two-year intervals.
- Publish a statement on gender pay gap information, and subsequently at four year intervals.
- Publish policies on equal pay and occupational segregation between men and women and subsequently at four year intervals (when data will be required on disabled and non-disabled staff and people of minority ethnic groups and those who are not).

To meet this requirement the University has revised the Equal Pay Statement, a draft of this is below;

The University of Glasgow is committed to the principles of equal pay for all of our employees. We operate a single job evaluation scheme to measure the relative value of all jobs in our pay and grading structures within an overall framework that is consistent, transparent and fair. The University aims to eliminate any gender bias in our pay and remuneration systems and understands that equal pay between males and females is a legal right in accordance with the Equality Act 2010, Public Sector Equality Duty and European law.

Our Policy aims to reflect equal pay with respect to remuneration, development and career progression for all staff in ensuring that the level of reward is appropriate to the relative size and content of the job. It is in the interests of the University to ensure that we have fair and just pay and remuneration systems as this assists in attracting and retaining the best employees. The University's policies and procedures associated with pay and remuneration have been developed and implemented with a view to eliminating gender bias. Further, we regularly review our processes, in partnership with the recognised trade unions, to ensure their integrity in relation to equal pay considerations.

⁷ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/equalitydiversity/monitoring/staffmonitoring/>

We believe that eliminating gender bias in pay and remuneration processes demonstrates the University's commitment to its employees and students and best practice through equitable, fair and transparent pay and reward mechanisms whilst effectively managing University finances. We believe avoiding unfair discrimination in the 'application of equitable and fair pay and performance systems that reward excellence' helps the University to realise its ambitions as outlined in Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision.

Our equal pay objectives are to:

- *eliminate any unfair, unjust or unlawful practices that impact on pay*
- *take appropriate action to address these accordingly*
- *regularly monitor and review the application of its policies and procedures and*
- *conduct an annual equal pay review in terms of gender, and within the relevant timeframe, to do so for disability and ethnicity in accordance with the Public Sector Equality Duty.*

The results of annual equal pay auditing informs future action planning in relation to potential issues identified, i.e. addressing occupational segregation. Additionally, other diversity initiatives upon which the University is embarking, may positively impact upon aspects of equal pay and occupational segregation, e.g. the Public Sector Equality Duty Equality Outcomes, the University's Equality and Diversity Strategy and Athena SWAN Charter status.

Human Resources will conduct an equal pay audit (including the percentage difference between men and women's average hourly wage) and will publish this in line with publication requirements by the April deadline. Future equal pay audits will be conducted annually from September 2013, as this fits the implementation of the University promotions rounds.

8. Procurement

Public Sector Equality Duty requires the University to ensure when relevant and proportionate to the subject matter of an agreement for goods, works or services, we have due regard to whether the award criteria and the contract conditions should include considerations to enable the University to better perform the general duty of the Equality Act 2010.

The Equality and Diversity Unit and Procurement Office are in discussion on how best to take this element of the PSED forward, and embed this within the University's procedures. It should be noted, that the Dignity at Work and Study Policy already contains a complaints procedure for Contractors.

Mhairi Taylor
Equality and Diversity Unit
April 2013

Equality and Diversity Strategy 2011-2015 Action Plan

Glasgow 2020

Strategic Objective 1: To support the University of Glasgow to achieve its vision and mission to enhance its position as one of the world's great broad-based, research intensive universities.

The EDU will achieve this by supporting the University's value of openness which identifies our commitment to inclusiveness and embraces diversity by valuing and respecting the perspective and contributions of *all* our colleagues and students.

Action		Lead and Partners	Strategic reference	Timeframe	PC(s)	2013 Update	PSED relevant
1.1	To produce an annual equality monitoring report for staff and students and use the trend data from this report to direct EDU's work in the future.	EDU (Lead), HR, Planning Office	Staff/equality section of Glasgow 2020, HR Internationalisation Action Plan	Annually, as agreed by partners	All	Ongoing	YES Equality Outcomes 2, 3 & 4
1.2	To continue the roll out of the Equality Impact Assessment policy and guidance, and support staff when conducting an EIA.	All relevant staff	HR Strategy	Ongoing	All	Ongoing	YES

Equality Outcomes

2. Degree attainment – reduced any disparity for students from different protected characteristic groups.
3. Retention – continue to address retention and progression issues based on protected characteristic groups.
4. Increase the diversity of the Professoriate and management positions, specifically in gender and ethnicity.

Learning and Teaching Strategy

Strategic Objective 2: Via a robust, transparent and fair admissions policy, to attract the best talent, from whatever background, to study at this University and to support it in achieving academic success. In doing so, to remain the leading University of choice for talented students from under-represented groups.

Action		Lead and Partners	Strategic reference	Timeframe	PC(s)	2013 Update	PSED relevant
2.1	Embed Equality & Diversity practices (<i>ELIR Reflective analysis</i>) We will increase the use of our impact assessment process to monitor progress of our equality action plans, supported by enhanced staff development and training.	EDU (Lead), EDSC, LTC	L&T Strategy Action Plan	Ongoing	All	Ongoing	YES Refer to Action 1.2
2.2	Equality & Diversity agenda <i>ELIR Report Para 67</i> Overall, substantial work has been carried out on setting the policy and management framework for student equality and diversity matters. Work remains to be done across the range of equality strands to embed practice, particularly with regards to learning, teaching and curriculum planning.	EDU (Lead), EDSC, LTC, Senate Office, SRC	L&T Strategy Action Plan	Ongoing	All	Ongoing	YES Equality Outcome 1
2.3	To attend the Retention Working Group, and identify if the EDU can assist with the work taken forward by this group.	Retention Working Group (Lead), RIO, EDU	L&T Strategy	From November 2011	Sex (male), Age	EDU provided summary of ECU report on male student engagement with student services – RWG made recommendations to SSDC on this basis	YES Equality Outcome 3

Appendix A

2.4	To ensure our admissions processes are fair, consistent and provide the University with the transparent process for recruiting the best students.	RIO (Lead), Colleges, EDU	L&T Strategy Action Plan	EdPSC paper in January 2012	All	EdPSC short working group agreed Admissions Principles for all devolved areas – report to EdPSC November 2012.	N/A
2.5	To review the statistical evidence and identify if there is an attainment gap between students of different ethnicities.	EDU (Lead), Race Champion, Planning Office	Internationalisation Strategy	See 1.1	Race	Student Monitoring Report due February 2013.	YES Equality Outcome 2
2.6	To hold a series of student focus groups for Black, Asian and Minority ethnic students to gain further understanding of their student experience.	EDU (Lead), Race Champion, SRC	Internationalisation Strategy	Complete by 2011/12	Race	TBC	N/A
2.7	To campaign/request a specific scholarship for students with refugee/asylum seeker status to study at the University.	Clerk of Senate (Lead), RIO, SRC	Internationalisation Strategy	June 2012	Race, Religion and Belief, Sexual Orientation.	CARA Working Group set up, EDU a member.	N/A

It should be noted that learning and teaching issues relating to disabled student experience are managed by the Disability Service.

Equality Outcomes

1. Ensure all learning materials for course complies with an agreed accessibility standard.
2. Degree attainment – reduced any disparity for students from different protected characteristic groups.
3. Retention – continue to address retention and progression issues based on protected characteristic groups.

Research Strategy

Strategic Objective 3: To ensure the University is fair, equitable place where research thrives. Ensure the University is fully aware of all the equality implications in the Concordat and REF2014, and that all researchers of the appropriate academic standard are able to participate in each process.

Action		Lead and Partners	Strategic reference	Timeframe	PC(s)	2013 Update	PSED relevant
3.1	To join the Athena Swan charter and support the University bronze award submission.	Gender Champion (Lead), EDU HR, Colleges	Concordat Implementation Plan, HR Strategy, Glasgow 2020	Submit November 2012	Gender	University Bronze, and School of Physics Silver submission made November 2012. S&E (two Schools) and MVLS (five Schools/RI's) looking to make Departmental Bronze submissions – dates TBC.	YES Equality Outcome 4
3.2	To ensure the University's REF2014 Code of Practice takes into account all the equality implications in the REF.	R&E (lead), EDU, HR, Colleges	Glasgow 2020, HR Strategy	July 2012	All	Complete – Code of Practice approved.	N/A
3.3	To ensure all University staff involved in the REF selection process are trained in equality.	R&E (Lead), EDU, HR, Colleges	HR Strategy, E&D Training	From July 2012	All	Complete – summer 2012.	N/A
3.4	To ensure the University is meeting the requirements set out in the RCUK Equality and Diversity statement.	R&E (Lead), EDU	Glasgow 2020	From February 2013	All	Gap analysis completed for SMG/EDSC in February 2013	N/A

Equality Outcomes

4. Increase the diversity of the Professoriate and management positions, specifically in gender and ethnicity.

Internationalisation Strategy

Strategic Objective 4: To support the University's Internationalisation Strategy, specifically on the three key themes of student experience, staff and local engagement.

	Action	Lead and Partners	Strategic reference	Timeframe	PC(s)	2013 Update	PSED relevant
4.1	To identify ways to support internationalisation through the provision of learning and development opportunities.	SDS (Lead), EDU, HR, Colleges	HR Strategy	By January 2011 & ongoing	Cultural diversity, race, Religion and Belief.	People Development Plan – mainstreamed by SDS.	N/A
4.2	To assist with the implementation of the HR Internationalisation Action Plan and associated activity.	HR (Lead), EDU, SDS, Colleges	HR Strategy and Internationalisation Action Plan.	By January 2011 & ongoing	Cultural diversity.	Ongoing	N/A

Human Resource Strategy

Strategic Objective 5: Mainstream equality and diversity in all staff related practices.

Strategic Objective 5: Mainstream equality and diversity in all staff related practices.							
	Action and its origins	Lead and Partners	Strategic reference	Timeframe	PC(s)	2013 Update	PSED relevant
5.1	To develop a Single Equality Policy encompassing all the protected characteristics.	EDU (Lead), EDSC, HR, Senate Office, SRC	HR Strategy	Complete by April 2012	All	Policy not completed.	N/A
5.2	To develop a Dignity at Work policy	EDU (Lead), HR	HR Strategy	April 2012	All	Approved by Court June 2012.	YES Equality Outcome 5
5.3	To develop and implement mentoring scheme following pilot study.	HR (Lead), SDS, EDU	HR Strategy	Complete pilot by June 2012	Gender (initially)	Framework drafted.	N/A
5.4	To conduct annual equal pay audit and review and implement revised action plan accordingly.	HR (Lead), EDU	HR Strategy	Annual	Gender, other PC's may be considered.	Gender Audit published 2012, and annually from September 2013.	YES Disability and Ethnicity audits required by 2017
5.5	To undertake legislative horizon scanning and respond to changing equality legislation and case law.	EDU (Lead), HR	HR Strategy	Ongoing	All	Ongoing.	N/A
5.6	To develop a Single Equality Scheme as required by the Public Sector Duty.	EDU (Lead), EDSC, HR, SRC, University community		TBC	All	PSED has superseded this – paper submitted to EDSC in June 2012.	N/A

Appendix A

5.7	To support the development and delivery of STELLAR Scotland, a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic leadership programme.	Prof. Shireen Davies (Lead), EDU, HR, Imperial College London	Staff objectives building leadership capacity and ensure capability development in Glasgow 2020, HR Strategy, Internationalisation Strategy, Equality and Diversity Training.	August 2011, anticipated programme to commence in March 2012	Race	Programme planned and then dissolved due to lack of interest from other Scottish HEI's.	YES Equality Outcome 4
-----	---	---	---	--	------	---	--------------------------------------

Equality Outcomes

4. Increase the diversity of the Professoriate and management positions, specifically in gender and ethnicity.
5. Foster a supportive culture, which promotes dignity and respect and where all staff feel valued and inappropriate behaviours are challenged.

Equality and Diversity Training

Strategic Objective 6: To ensure all staff understand their responsibility in relation to equality and diversity legislation. To develop bespoke equality training as required by the client group. To develop value-added equality training for relevant staff groups.

	Action	Lead and Partners	Strategic reference	Timeframe	PC(s)	2013 Update	PSED relevant
6.1	To roll out the two online equality training modules across the University.	EDU (Lead), SDS, HR, Colleges/US	HR Strategy, HR Internationalisation People Development Plan	From October 2011	All	As at 13.12.12 929 staff had completed Essentials; 122 Managing Diversity	YES Equality Outcome 5
6.2	To provide equality training to staff who cannot access IT facilities.	EDU (Lead), SDS, US		From October 2011	All	210 Cleaning Services staff have completed training.	YES Equality Outcome 5
6.3	To provide bespoke equality and diversity training as requested, and to suit the client's requirements.	EDU (Lead), SDS, University Managers		As requested	All	Ongoing	N/A
6.4	To ensure recruitment and selection training reflects current legislative requirements, and promotes best practice in relation to equality.	SDS (Lead), EDU, HR Recruitment	HR Strategy	Ongoing	All	Ongoing	N/A

Equality Outcomes

5. Foster a supportive culture, which promotes dignity and respect and where all staff feel valued and inappropriate behaviours are challenged.

Equality and Diversity Projects

Strategic Objective 7: To manage the development of bespoke equality projects in line with the desired requirements.

	Action	Lead and Partners	Strategic reference	Timeframe	PC(s)	2013 Update	PSED relevant
7.1	To finalise the Disability Library Audit and present the final report to the Library Management Team.	EDU (Lead), Library, DS		Complete November 2011	Disability	Report completed and sent to Library and E&B in March 2012.	N/A
7.2	To support the reporting of the Mental Health Working Group, and any subsequent actions agreed by the Disability Equality Group.	EDU (Lead), Mental Health Working Group, DEG		Complete in 2011	Disability/ Mental Health	Report provided to DEG October 2012. Recommendations being taken forward by SRC, HS&Wellbeing, EDU and HR.	N/A
7.3	To support the student-led Disabled Students careers survey, and reporting to the Disability Equality Group.	EDU (Lead), DEG, Careers Service, SRC		March 2012	Disability	Survey completed and report provided to DEG June 2012, recommendation taken forward by EDU.	N/A
7.4	To gain approval and roll out the voluntary work placement scheme for refugees and asylum seekers, and disabled ex-military personnel.	EDU (Lead), HR, GRAMNET		A Seekers/ Refugees asap; Ex-Military personnel December 2011	Race, Disability	Approved by EDSC October 2011. Taken forward by CARA Working Group.	N/A
7.5	To implement actions from the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index as agreed by Sexual Orientation Equality Group.	EDU (Lead), SOEG		Ongoing	Sexual orientation	Partially complete – ongoing work with some actions.	N/A

Appendix A

7.6	To devise and host a Faith Mini-Conference in the form of a Global Café, as agreed by the Religion and Belief Equality Group.	EDU (Lead), R&BEG, SRC	Internationalisation Strategy	April 2012	Religion and Belief	Completed on 7 November 2012.	N/A
7.7	To manage the Disabled Go contract, and decide in consultation with Estates and Buildings how best to continue this service.	EDU (Lead), E&B, Disability Champion		Contract expires August 2012	Disability	Ongoing – agreed three year contract August 2012.	N/A
7.8	To ensure the University's car parking policy is fair for all users, in particular disabled users.	EDU (Lead), Central Services		March 2012	Disability	Revised February 2012.	N/A

Appendix A

Glossary of Terms

CARA	Council for Assisting Refugee Academics
DEG	Disability Equality Group
DS	Disability Service
E&B	Estates and Buildings
ECU	Equality Challenge Unit
EdPSC	Education Policy and Strategy Committee
EDSC	Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee
EDU	Equality and Diversity Unit
GRAMNET	Glasgow Refugee, Asylum and Migrant Network
HR	Human Resources
HRC	Human Resources Committee
LTC	Learning and Teaching Centre
MVLS	College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences
PSED	Public Sector Equality Duty
R&BEG	Religion and Belief Equality Group
R&E	Research and Enterprise
RIO	Recruitment and International Office
RWG	Retention Working Group
S&E	College of Science and Engineering
SDS	Staff Development Service
SOEG	Sexual Orientation Equality Group
SRC	Student Representative Council
US	University Services



Court – Wednesday 10 April 2013

Report from the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on

27 March 2013

Cover Sheet

Brief description of the paper

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

Action Requested

A Items – for action

CA/2012/56. MRC Unit Transfer

Finance Committee received an updated report on the proposed transfer of the Medical Research Council (MRC) Social and Public Health Sciences Unit and the MRC – University of Glasgow Centre for Virus Research (CVR) to sole ownership of the University. The Committee was invited to approve the transfer of the Units in principle.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend to Court that the transfer of the Units was approved subject to satisfactory resolution of the key issues identified in relation to: pay and grading, pensions and the s75 pension liability, suitable accommodation being identified, data protection requirements and redundancy provision for externally funded staff. In order to meet the planned timetable for completion, Finance Committee recommended that Court approve delegated authority to the Principal, the Secretary of Court and the Convenor of Court.

B Items – for noting

CA/2012/49. South Glasgow Hospital Learning and Teaching Facility

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting £4.975m to develop a learning and teaching facility at the new South Glasgow Hospital.

Finance Committee approved the application subject to satisfactory resolution of the outstanding issues in relation to ownership and running costs and funding for the Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre.

CA/2012/50. South Glasgow Clinical Research Facility (paper 5.1.2)

The Committee was presented with a capital expenditure application to develop a Clinical Research Facility at the South Glasgow Hospital.

Finance Committee approved the development of the Clinical Research Facility.

CA/2012/51. James Watt South Mezzanine (paper 5.1.3)

The College of Science and Engineering proposed the development of additional research facilities within James Watt South. The application proposed the development of a mezzanine level in room 455 of the James Watt South, facilitating the redevelopment of an existing double-height laboratory and adjacent rooms into two 500m² research facilities.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2012/52. Chemistry Laboratory Development (paper 5.1.4)

The Committee considered an application for £2.955m to develop 500m² laboratory space to enhance the world class research opportunities offered by Professor Robert Liskamp and associated research contracts.

Finance Committee approved the application.

University of Glasgow
Finance Committee
Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday, 27 March 2013
in Melville Room, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:

Mr Ken Brown (Convener), Mr Peter Daniels, Mr Robert Fraser, Mr James Harrison, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Prof Miles Padgett, Mr David Ross, Prof Adrienne Scullion, Mr Iain Stewart.

In attendance:

Mrs Ann Allen, Prof Neal Juster, Mr Gavin Lee, Dr Dorothy Welch.

In attendance for Item CA/2012/48.3:

Professor Ewan Cameron, Miss Paula Sharp.

Apologies:

Mr David Newall, Mr Kevin Sweeney, Ms Carolyn Timar.

CA/2012/47. Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were noted.

CA/2012/48. Matters Arising

CA/2012/48.1 Glasgow Student Village

The Director of Finance provided an update to the Committee in relation the role of the Pension Regulator in the potential developments with Glasgow Student Village. The Committee noted that, as the University would be swapping assets within the institution, the Pension Regulator would not have authority to intervene.

CA/2012/49. South Glasgow Hospital Learning and Teaching Facility (paper 5.1.1)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting £4.975m to develop a learning and teaching facility at the new South Glasgow Hospital. The application noted the major reorganisation of the NHS estate in Glasgow leading to the closure of the Queen Mother Hospital and, in 2015 of the Western Infirmary and Yorkhill Hospitals. The Teaching Facility at South Glasgow Hospital will replace the embedded teaching rooms and facilities currently utilised by the School of Medicine in the hospitals marked for closure. The application identified a number of opportunities to increase income through the development of the new teaching facility including increased recruitment from North America, increased international PGT numbers and utilisation of the space for conferences.

Following completion of the Capex application, the Scottish Funding Council had agreed to fund the development of a Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre which would be housed in the Learning and Teaching Facility. The overall additional cost of £6.5m would be funded through SFC (£5m) and Glasgow City Council. The original Capex application identified requirement for a three storey building to house the learning and teaching facility. Following the request from the Scottish Funding Council to co-locate the Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre the plans would be amended to develop a four storey building.

It was clarified that the projected growth in international (North American) students and associated income was not in addition to previous targets but reflected an amendment of existing targets across the College.

Finance Committee approved the application subject to satisfactory resolution of the outstanding issues in relation to ownership and running costs and funding for the Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre.

CA/2012/50. South Glasgow Clinical Research Facility (paper 5.1.2)

The Committee was presented with a capital expenditure application to develop a Clinical Research Facility at the South Glasgow Hospital, to replace the facilities the University utilises at the Western Infirmary and Yorkhill Hospitals which are both scheduled for closure in 2015. The application did not request funding from the University Capital Programme. The Clinical Research Facility is intended to bring together clinician scientists across a wider range of disciplines and be a major clinical research hub in Scotland.

The Committee noted that the Development and Alumni Office were responsible for raising £2.2m to support the development of the project. It was reported that the College and the DAO had already raised significant funds from the charities above to support the development. It was agreed that, should the amount raised by the DAO be less than required for completion of the project, that funding would be available from the capital fund.

Finance Committee approved the development of the Clinical Research Facility.

CA/2012/51. James Watt South Mezzanine (paper 5.1.3)

The College of Science and Engineering proposed the development of additional research facilities within James Watt South. The application proposed the development of a mezzanine level in room 455 of the James Watt South, facilitating the redevelopment of an existing double-height laboratory and adjacent rooms into two 500m² research facilities. The application requested £2.95m of capital investment and noted a discounted cashflow of £0.455m over ten years. It was noted that the development of the space would further support applications for Doctoral Training Centres and would allow staff currently located in townhouses on Oakfield Avenue and Southpark to be relocated the James Watt South.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2012/52. Chemistry Laboratory Development (paper 5.1.4)

The Committee considered an application for £2.955m to develop 500m² laboratory space to enhance the world class research opportunities offered by Professor Robert Liskamp and associated research contracts. It was noted that the dowry for Professor Liskamp included the commitment to providing refurbished laboratory space to house the size of research group anticipated through his research activities. The development would require the reconfiguration of existing space within the Joseph Black Building and would partly be facilitated by the relocation of other research groups to new, improved facilities.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2012/53. Gilmorehill Halls (updated application) (paper 5.1.5)

The Committee received an updated application in relation to Gilmorehill Halls. Finance Committee previously approved £2.15m for the emergency structural works to address issues of water ingress and structural instability. During the initial works, additional unforeseen work has been identified. Finance Committee was invited to approve an additional £0.2m to allow all required structural repairs to be undertaken.

Finance Committee noted the essential nature of the works and approved the application.

CA/2012/54. Queen Elizabeth Building Glasgow Royal Infirmary (update) (paper 5.1.6)

Finance Committee approved £6.866m in August 2009 to refurbish two floors of the University Tower Block at Glasgow Royal Infirmary. The project was delayed by a number of factors. In order to progress with the redevelopment in 2013, Finance Committee had been invited to approve an increased budget to take account of increased VAT charges, inflation and elements of redesign. The increase in construction costs was £1.715m which had been offset by saving of £0.84m leaving a budget increase request of £0.874m. The College of MVLS had secured a contribution from the Medical Research Council (MRC) of £0.876m making the Capex application revenue neutral.

The Director of Estates noted that this application had been approved by members of Finance Committee by email due to time pressures on omitting to this.

CA/2012/56. MRC Unit Transfer (paper 5.3)

Finance Committee received an updated report on the proposed transfer of the Medical Research Council (MRC) Social and Public Health Sciences Unit and the MRC – University of Glasgow Centre for Virus Research (CVR) to sole ownership of the University. Finance Committee requested that, in future, the Committee was not provided with full draft legal agreements for review and instead all salient points were highlighted in a short overview papers. The Committee was invited to approve the transfer of the Units in principle.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend to Court that the transfer of the Units was approved subject to satisfactory resolution of the key issues identified in relation to: pay and grading, pensions and the s75 pension liability, suitable accommodation being identified, data protection requirements and redundancy provision for externally funded staff. In order to meet the planned timetable for completion, Finance Committee recommended that Court approve delegated authority to the Principal, the Secretary of Court and the Convenor of Court.

CA/2012/57. Endowment Investment Reports (paper 6.1)

Finance Committee noted the endowment investment reports.

CA/2012/58. Finance KPIs (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee received expanded key performance indicators benchmarking the University against Russell Group competitors. Finance Committee noted that the University had suffered a larger drop in income in 2011-12 than any other Russell Group competitor largely due to a reduction in Home and EU tuition income. It was also noted that the average income across the Russell Group was distorted by the inclusion of very high levels of income at Oxford and Cambridge, which included commercial income through the publishing wings. It was agreed that a further analysis would be provided reflecting Russell Group institutions with similar size, shape and resources to Glasgow.

CA/2012/59. Updated Capex Report (paper 6.3)

Finance Committee noted the updated Capex report. The Deputy Secretary clarified that projects with no capital funding were being funded through revenue streams.

CA/2012/60. Overview of Performance at 28 February 2013 (paper 7.1)

Finance Committee received the overview of performance for Period 7. The Period 7 actuals were £15.7m; ahead of the year to date budget of £11m. The main year to date variances were in relation to salaries with a £4.2m positive variance caused by the timing of vacancies being filled across the Colleges and Services. Residential Services income was £0.8m ahead of

budget due to deferral of 2011/12 income and higher than budgeted summer income. Research income was lower than budget across three Colleges: Science and Engineering £1.8m, Arts £0.2m, Social Sciences £0.1m but £0.8m higher than budget in the College of MVLS.

The full year outlook of £3.7m is £1.8m lower than full year budgeted surplus. Similarly to Period 7, the full year outlook for Research income is £2.6m adverse to budget and approved overspends in Residential Services, Overseas Agents and in Estates and Buildings are expected to result in consumable spending £3.7m above budget. The full year outlook calculations also included increased strategic investment funds of £2.7m in 2012/13 (taking total to £22.97m).

It was noted that the overspend on overseas agents appeared to be in contradiction with the reduction in international student numbers and tuition fee income. The Deputy Secretary confirmed that forecasting of overseas agents expenses was being revised and these two figures would come into line in future.

CA/2012/61. Debtors Report at 28 February 2013 (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received an analysis of the University debt position. Finance Committee noted a significant year-on-year improvement in the level of student debt from £18.2m in February 2012 to £11.7m in February 2013. This had been achieved by putting greater financial controls in place and beginning the collection process earlier. Of the outstanding £11.7m, £6.7m was covered by Direct Debits and Payment Plans, £4m was being pursued by the University Credit Control section and the remaining £0.974m had been passed to external debt collectors. The increase in Sponsor Debt (£3.4m to £5.3m year on year) was due to more prompt transfers of contracts from students to the sponsor. The Senate Assessor for Court (Science and Engineering) noted that anecdotal evidence and evidence presented in the debtor analysis suggested that MyCampus was performing significantly better in 2012-13 than in 2011-12.

It was noted that the current policy requiring self-funding students to pay 50% of their tuition fee up-front was not rigorously enforced and a review of the process was being carried out to ensure less debt fell into collection processes.

Commercial debt analysis showed a slight increase in average debtor days (from 41 in February 2012 to 45 in February 2013) but the top five balances of debt aged over 90 days were with secure third parties and full recovery of the debt was expected.

CA/2012/62. Kelvin Hall

The Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources) indicated that an update on the Kelvin Hall development would be presented to the next Finance Committee. At the next meeting, the Committee would also be asked to approve delegated authority to allow the University to meet Heritage Lottery Fund deadlines.

CA/2012/63. Scottish Council for Research in Education (SCRE)

The Director of Finance Reported that the Court of Appeal had upheld the original decision, in favour of the University, in the dispute between the University and City of Edinburgh Council in relation to pension liability for SCRE. City of Edinburgh Council may decide to appeal the decision to the Supreme Court.

CA/2012/64. Date of next meeting

Please note changed date: Monday, 3 June 2013, 3pm, Melville Room



Court – Wednesday 10 April 2013

Report from the Meeting of the Estates Committee held on 18 March 2013

Cover Sheet

Brief Description of Paper

Minute of the Estates Committee meeting of 18 March 2013

Action Requested

Court is asked to:

Note the University's underwriting risk in respect of the South Glasgow Hospital (Teaching and Learning and CRF Facilities) (EC/2012/21.1 and EC/2012/21.2 refer);

Note Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications:

Gilmorehill Halls in the sum of £200k (EC/2012/21.5.1 refers);

Chemistry Laboratories, Joseph Black Building in the sum of £2.955m (EC/2012/21.5.2 refers);

Queen Elizabeth Building, Glasgow Royal Infirmary in the sum of £1,714,640 (EC/2012/21.5.3 refers);

James Watt South Mezzanine (Room 455) in the sum of £2.95m (EC/2012/21.5.4 refers)

Note the remainder of the minute.

Originator of the Paper

Lynn Duncan
Clerk to Estates Committee
25 March 2013

UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW
Estates Committee

**Minute of the meeting held in the Meeting Room, Translational Research Centre, Garscube Estate
on Monday 18 March 2013**

Present:

Mrs A Allen (part), Mr P Daniels (Convener), Mr R Fraser, Ms M Freel, Dr S Inch, Professor N Juster, Ms J McGrellis, Professor W Martin, Mr D Milloy, Ms M Morton, Mr D Newall

In Attendance:

Mr N Campbell (part), Mrs L Duncan, Mr R Kilpatrick, Mr D Page (part), Mr S Sutton, Mr P Stasiuk (part)

Apologies:

Mr J Harrison, Professor A Muscatelli (Principal)

EC/2012/17 Minute of the meeting held on 7 January 2013

The minutes were approved.

EC/2012/18 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

EC/2012/19 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2012/20 Strategies and Performance

EC/2012/20.1 Gilmorehill Campus Estates Strategy Update, Vision Statement and Gateway Review

Item deferred.

EC/2012/20.1.1 – Campus Development Framework (CDF) (Planning Status)

The Committee noted the CDF would become the principal document linking the future Estates Strategy to the local authority planning system. It noted an approved CDF would provide some certainty for the University as it would be recognised as the key document to facilitate and expedite further approvals of area master plans and building projects and would provide flexibility to make amendments to approved plans.

The Committee agreed that Glasgow City Council approval should be sought for the CDF in early 2014.

EC/2012/20.2 – Student Residential Accommodation Strategy 2013–2023

The Committee noted the strategy paper and the presentation by the Head of Residential Services. It recognised that student accommodation and residential life represented important strands in the delivery of Glasgow 2020. The Committee approved the Student Residential Accommodation Strategy. In so doing, it agreed that the University should retain its purpose-built residential accommodation, dispose of its poorest residential accommodation, continuously review demand for specialist accommodation, and undertake a review of the on-going requirement for Wolfson Hall.

EC/2012/20.3 Minute of Carbon Management Committee

The Committee noted the minute of 5 March 2013.

EC/2012/21 Projects

EC/2012/21.1 South Glasgow Hospital (Teaching and Learning Facility)

The Committee noted the funding award of £5M from SFC for development of an innovation centre for stratified medicine and the proposal that this be accommodated within an additional floor of the teaching and learning building. It also noted that the additional floor was fully funded with no significant financial risk to the University.

The Committee noted the total development cost for the four-floor building in the sum of £20m and that agreement had been reached with the NHS on the extent of its capital contribution. The NHS would fund £10m of the building cost and had agreed to contribute an additional £4.025m in lieu of the loss of the University's existing embedded NHS space. With the commitment of an additional £1M of bequest income, the capital investment required by the University was just under £5M, which fell within the sum included in the capital plan. The Committee noted business plan projections for the facility, as approved by CapEx Committee.

Estates Committee approved the proposal to construct an additional floor on this basis.

EC/2012/21.2 Southern General Hospital (Clinical Research Facility - CRF)

The Committee noted that following a strategic review and restructure of its estate, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde would close both Yorkhill and Western Infirmary hospitals in 2015. The University's existing Clinical Research Facility was based at the Western Infirmary, with some facilities also at Yorkhill. Alternative facilities were therefore required and it was proposed that these would be provided by refurbishing level 5 of the existing Neuroscience Building, South Glasgow Hospital site.

The Committee noted that there was no anticipated requirement for funds from the capital programme to finance the project and that it was expected that the funding required (£5M) could be raised in full from external sources. It noted and approved that the University underwrite the funding pending completion of the fund raising activities.

EC/2012/21.4 CHP Proposal Update

The Committee noted that a second stage bid had been submitted on 28 February 2013. The stage 2 proposal reflected progress made since the original submission in November 2012. The Committee noted that it was unclear when the outcome of the Stage 2 bid would be notified by SFC but that irrespective of a positive or negative outcome, the life-expired steam main requires replacement. Given the significance of this project in meeting the University's carbon reduction targets it was agreed that Estates and Buildings should continue with the feasibility and development of the CHP proposal. If the bid was unsuccessful it was agreed that an options paper would be provided to a future Estates Committee meeting.

EC/2012/21.5 CapEx Applications

EC/2012/21.5.1 Gilmorehill Halls (CP11/443)

The Committee approved a request for additional funding in the sum of £200k to enable progress of additional unforeseen essential works on the project.

EC/2012/21.5.2 Chemistry Laboratories, Joseph Black Building (Liskamp)

The Committee noted the project would create approximately 500sqm of landmark laboratory space for Professor Robert Liskamp and three newly appointed career researchers and would facilitate the

consolidation of MVLS research group spaces within the building. The project was proposed as the most cost-effective means of rationalising space in the building and meeting the needs of stakeholder groups, delivering the new laboratory, significantly improving the quality of remaining MVLS space, and resolving underutilisation and Health and Safety matters.

The Committee approved the project in the sum of £2.955m. It requested a report be provided to the meeting scheduled in May 2013 outlining the broader plans for the Joseph Black Building.

(Action: AA)

EC/2012/21.5.3 Queen Elizabeth Building, Glasgow Royal Infirmary (Additional Funding)

The Committee was asked to approve increased funding from the sum previously approved by CapEx in August 2009. It noted that costs had increased from £6,866,004 to £7,742,004. The increase in construction cost was noted as £1,714,640 but was offset by savings. The net additional spend was noted as £874,402.

The Committee noted that whilst the project cost was now £874,402 over the original CapEx approval MVLS had secured additional funding in the sum of £876,000 for the Institute of Hearing Research redevelopment resulting in no additional cost to the University.

The Committee approved the increased total cost of the project from £6,866,004 to £ 7,742,004.

EC/2012/21.5.4 James Watt South Mezzanine (Room 455) (CP08/159)

The Committee noted and approved the proposal in the sum of £2.95m to develop a mezzanine level in room 455, James Watt South to provide flexible research accommodation.

EC/2012/21.6 Lease Approvals

EC/2012/21.6.1 University Tower Block, GRI

The Committee noted the report and approved the lease. It also approved the sub-lease of accommodation at in favour of the Medical Research Council.

EC/2012/21.6.2 JISC RSC Scotland

The Committee noted the report and authorised the Secretary of Court, after consultation with the Convenor over final detailed terms, to conclude a lease on behalf of the University.

EC/2012/21.6.3 The Innovation Centre – Sensors and Imaging Systems

To Committee noted the report and authorised the Secretary of Court, after consultation with the Convenor over final detailed terms, to conclude a lease on behalf of the University.

EC/2012/21.7 Library Tower External Signage

The Committee noted the concerns raised by Friends of Glasgow West regarding the proposed signage.

As part of the cladding works, Estates and Buildings had been asked by the Project Board to explore the potential to erect signage to assist staff, students and visitors with way-finding to the University Library, specifically as a result of a previous audit highlighting the inadequacies of existing signage.

The Employers Agent (Architect) was made aware of this and developed a proposal for a single illuminated external sign to be located on the south facing elevation of Tower 6 facing down towards University Avenue. This proposal was reviewed by the Project Board and a decision was agreed to take this forward and to obtain the necessary permission from Glasgow City Council (GCC) Planning. An

application was lodged with GCC for Express Consent to Display Advertisements (Application number 12/02518/DC) as required at the beginning of December 2012 and permission was granted on the 13 February 2013.

EC/2012/21.8 Approved Projects Status (RAG)

The Committee noted the current status of approved projects:

EC/2012/21.8.1 CP08/162 – Queen Elizabeth Building, Glasgow Royal Infirmary (Levels 1, 2 & 3)

The Committee noted that it was anticipated that all outstanding matters would be resolved by mid March 2013. It noted that Medical Research Council funding had been agreed and offsets the increased project cost.

EC/2012/21.8.2 LM09/334 Library Cladding

The Committee noted that whilst works were generally on programme there was potential for delay and additional cost due to issues around the existing telecoms equipment located on Tower 5. Discussions were ongoing to facilitate relocation of the telecoms antennae and Dundas and Wilson were acting on behalf of the University to resolve the matter.

EC/2012/21.8.3 CP09/324 – Carbon Reduction Programme

The Committee noted that the Carbon Management Plan remains in draft form whilst work continues to identify ways to deliver on its commitment. The RAG status has moved from red to amber due to the possible CHP scheme.

EC/2012/21.8.4 CP10/412 - Garscube Learning and Social Space

The Committee noted that following the Receivership of RMJM Design Ltd the University had provisionally appointed Archial Architects as design team leaders for the project. Archial were undertaking due diligence on RMJM's design prior to entering into a formal contract with the University. The forecast cost for this appraisal was anticipated to be approximately £20k. Estates and Buildings would aim to absorb this additional cost within the project budget however, if this was not achievable, a report would be submitted to CapEx Committee for consideration. A revised project programme would be reported at the next Committee meeting.

EC/2012/21.8.5 CP11/433 & CP09/305 – GUU Refurbishment & Stevenson Building Extension

The Committee noted the building proposal had reached RIBA Stage D in design development. The Project Board had approved an extended completion date of 31 January 2015. City Planning officers had advised they had approved the proposal and subsequently forwarded the application to Historic Scotland for Listed Building Consent which was expected by end of March 2013. The Committee noted the impact of statutory approvals was at risk until this is achieved.

EC/2012/22 Estates Committee Operating Matters

EC/2011/22.1 Critical Path

The Committee noted the Critical Path.

EC/2012/23 Any Other Business

There was no other business.

EC/2012/24 Schedule of Meetings for 2012/2013

The Committee noted the remaining scheduled meetings in session 2012/2013: Monday 20 May 2013.



University
of Glasgow

Court – Wednesday 10 April 2013

**Report from Meeting of the Audit Committee held on
26 February 2013**

Cover Sheet

Brief description of the paper

The paper contains Audit Committee minutes from a meeting held on 26 February 2013, for information.

Prepared by Deborah Maddern

2.4.13

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Audit Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Monday 26 February 2013 in the Melville Room

Present:

Dr Paul Brady, Mr Jo Elliot, Mr Hamish Guthrie, Mr Neil Menzies, Mr Kevin Sweeney (Convener)

In attendance:

Mr Jim Bishop (Ernst & Young), Ms Gillian Connal (Deloitte LLP), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Mr Colin Gibson (Deloitte LLP), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Mrs Carolyn Timar (Financial Accountant)

Apologies: Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young), Mr Paul McGinty (Deloitte LLP), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal)

AUDIT/2012/17. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2012

The Minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2012/18. Matters Arising

.2 Misconduct Cases - update (Audit 2011/4, 16, 26.4, 37.3; 2012/3.4)

Two members of staff had been dismissed following disciplinary cases relating to expenses. A further member of staff had received a final written warning. The University's internal procedures were now at an end.

.3 General Ledger Adjustments (Audit 2011/39, 2012/2.7, 2012/9.3)

The £25k level, whereby a report was produced by the central finance office every month for each College highlighting any manual general ledger journals which had an I&E impact of more than £25k, had been implemented and its operation had been reviewed. Of a sample of 200 there had only been one issue. The £25k level would be maintained.

.4 Campus Solutions Development/MyCampus (Audit 2011/38, 2012/2.10, 9.4)

An update had been requested for the present meeting on testing of the MyCampus system ahead of next year's Registration, and the adequacy of resources available for this. Mr Newall explained that hardware Load Balancers had now been installed. These had been recommended by external experts as the solution to the IT infrastructure problems experienced in August 2012. The Load Balancers were currently being put through a more sophisticated load testing system than had been available in 2012.

The Committee had expressed an opinion at an earlier meeting that the College IT managers should have a reporting line to the Director of IT Services, as well as to the College; the Committee also wished to know about the level of central direction over College IT matters. Mr Newall advised that IT Services was currently undergoing a cyclical service review exercise, chaired by the VP (Learning & Teaching) and involving two external experts. The review panel would report later in the session, and the reporting lines would be discussed with SMG at that time.

.5 Higher Education Governance Review - update (Audit 32 and 37.5, 2012/3.6)

A Scottish HE Code of Practice was being developed following the 2012 review of HE governance. There was also a Post 16 Education draft bill which was out for consultation nationally; it included reference to ministerial involvement in decisions about good practice in a number of areas. HE representative bodies had made submissions objecting to the wording of this as it currently stood. The situation would be monitored and the Committee would be kept updated at a future meeting.

.6 Internal Audit Annual Report 2011/12 - reviews from 2009/10 and before

Mr Newall explained that earlier reviews relating to Business Continuity and to Data Handling had contained some recommendations that were still in the process of being implemented. The University wished these to remain within the audit reporting framework. The Committee agreed that it was important for realistic deadlines to be included with management responses to recommendations.

.7 Financial Statements 2011/12 - Pension Fund (Audit 2012/11.1)

Mr Fraser advised that the SMG was being kept informed by a sub-group that had been approved by Court to look at options relating to addressing the deficit in the University pension fund. The options would be presented to the April 2013 meeting of Court. A further update would be provided at the Committee's next meeting.

AUDIT/2012/19. Internal Audit Update

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

Review of IT Security

Although the University had documented policies governing IT security and its practical implementation across systems, the review had identified that these policies required updating (currently underway) and adherence to these policies was not consistent across all systems and Colleges. Several recommendations had been made regarding the configuration of systems, including instances of default accounts present on systems, and the maintenance of administrator accounts, which provided highly-privileged access to systems. There were two Priority 1, four Priority 2 and three Priority 3 findings. The Committee noted that the SMG would be receiving details of the report at its next meeting, for discussion and action.

The Committee received a video presentation outlining an IT security scenario, highlighting the risks to businesses.

Review of Audio Visual Procurement

Following receipt of anonymous allegations, a review had been undertaken of AV procurement, including compliance with the APUC procurement framework. Areas

requiring improvement had been identified and these were being addressed by management.

Other areas

The auditors were in the process of completing reviews of Freedom of Information Act Compliance, Ethical Approval, College Management (Social Sciences), UK Bribery Act 2010, Remuneration Committee, Estates Procurement and Transport Services Management.

It was noted that the executive summaries of audits, which it had been agreed would be supplied in the regular audit update to the Committee, would be provided from the next meeting onwards.

ACTION CG/GC

Risk Management

Risk workshops had been completed with three Colleges, with a workshop for the College of MVLS to be conducted in late February. It was agreed that the risk register format and the way it was approached by Colleges should be revisited and simplified, with a view to greater focus on key risks and better engagement by Colleges with risks that were managed locally; and clear identification of those responsible for progressing matters within Colleges. It was important that College Management Groups engaged with the issue regularly. There needed to be greater clarity to College management about what the University was responsible for in terms of risk, and what the Colleges themselves were responsible for. The risks at College level also needed to be allied where possible to strategy.

It was agreed that Deloitte would seek to effect the changes at the next University-level risk workshop (March) and that a remodelled system should be in place for 2014.

ACTION CG/GC

AUDIT/2012/20. Implementation of Outstanding Priority 1 and 2 Recommendations

Finance Office

Since the September 2012 meeting, 10 actions against audit reports had been completed, 11 had been partially implemented and 22 were being progressed, 14 of which would be addressed by the new Research Management System. 3 of the points would be addressed by the introduction of the new Core expenses system. The Core expense system was being rolled out, although work on amending it to allow proxies had caused a delay. In terms of staff being reminded about the expenses regulations, there were checkpoints within the system. In addition, all staff had received an email from the relevant head of College or University Services relating to the University's financial regulations about expenses claims. The Committee agreed that it was important for regular awareness-raising to occur in this area.

The majority of all recommendations relating to audits within the Finance Office report would be addressed in the next 4 to 6 months, with the exception of those associated with the new Research Management System, which were longer term.

The Committee asked that a summary update also be provided, to accompany the next report.

ACTION CT

Departments other than the Finance Office

The key points were as follows:

Audit reports: 2005 - 10

Business Continuity

Five outstanding recommendations were on Business Continuity Management, and were all linked to the establishment of business continuity plans, within a standard framework, throughout Schools, Institutes and University Services. A standard template had been agreed and was being piloted in the School of Medicine before being rolled out to Schools, Institutes and Service Departments. This would be followed by a regular testing of BCPs coordinated through the University's Emergencies Planning Group. These actions would address all five audit recommendations.

Other outstanding recommendations

Two recommendations appeared in the Staff Development audit, and related to the staff training record. These would be addressed by exploiting the functionality that would be offered by the new HR/Payroll System. Two recommendations on Data Handling remained to be fully implemented, with the steady rollout of a programme to introduce data handling training and a specific data handling policy for each University Service department. One recommendation on Heritage Asset records awaited the implementation of the INCA cataloguing system in 2013/14. One recommendation on Estates Maintenance awaited the development of an interface between the Estates Management Information System and Agresso.

Audit reports 2010 - 11

There were no outstanding Priority 1 recommendations. Of the five recommendations still to be fully implemented, two, from the Portfolio Management Audit would be addressed by March 2013; two, from the Student Retention audit, would be addressed by June 2013; one recommendation from the Estates Acquisitions & Disposals, relating to a review of leases, was still being addressed by the Commercial Property Surveyor.

Audit reports 2011 - 12

Audits with Priority 2 recommendations not yet fully implemented included:

Virtual Learning (6 recommendations)

Work was ongoing on each of the 6 recommendations, led by the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) and the Head of the Learning & Teaching Centre.

College of MVLS (3 recommendations)

Areas still requiring to be fully addressed were: Review of finance duties currently performed by administrative staff (ongoing); Review of University Consultancy Policy (planned for March 2014); School/Institute Fixed Asset Registers (to be completed by July 2013).

With regard to the timeframe for the review of the Consultancy Policy, it was noted that this took account of the need for the REF to be completed, and that it was a University action rather than MVLS. DN would send further details to the Committee.

ACTION DN

College of Science & Engineering (3 recommendations)

Outstanding areas were: Introduction of new Procurement processes and responsibilities (March 2013); Review of structure of support staff in the College (ongoing); Review of methodology for allocating income to Institute of Neurosciences (ongoing).

Value for Money (3 recommendations)

Remaining areas were: Development of a report to identify spend on suppliers outwith contracts / framework agreements; Revised commercial pricing policy; and Development of a College Workload Model. There had been a delay in addressing the

first two of these because of staffing changes. Work had begun on the College Workload Model, but with no agreed end-date at present.

Audit reports 2012 - 13

Full implementation of the outstanding actions on audits of HR/Payroll System Implementation Intellectual Property, and Spin-Out Management, was planned for April 2013.

AUDIT/2012/21. Risk Management – including College Risk Register

The register was noted. The matter had also been discussed under item 19.

AUDIT/2012/22. Any Other Business

22.1 Committee membership

The Committee's thanks and best wishes to Ms Elizabeth Simpson, whose term on the Committee had ended, were recorded.

22.2 Capital Expenditure

It was agreed that the chairs of the Estates and Finance Committees and the Director of Estates and Buildings would be invited to attend a future pre-meeting to discuss the approach to capital expenditure and major projects, in particular the development of the Western Infirmary site which would form a major part of the campus estates strategy.

ACTION DN/DM

AUDIT/2012/23. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 22 May 2013 at 2pm in the Melville Room (12.30pm pre-meeting for Committee members only).

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



University
of Glasgow

Court – Wednesday 10 April 2013

**Report from the Meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee
held on Wednesday 13 March 2013**

Cover Sheet

Brief description of the papers

Agenda and draft Minute

Action required

For information purposes only

*Author's Name: Debbie Beales
Title: Clerk to HSW Committee
Date 18.03.2013*

University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 13 March 2013 at 10:00 AM in the Melville Room

Present:

Mrs Ann Allen, Mr Robert Arthurs, Mr Ian Black, Ms Mae Boyd, Mr James Gray, Mr David Mclean, Dr Robin Easton, Mr John F Malcolm, Dr Catherine Martin, Mr David Newall, Dr John O'Dowd, Mr Paul Phillips, Mrs Elizabeth Richardson, Mr Deric Robinson, Mr David Somerville, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Selina Woolcott, Dr Gordon Duckett, Ms Jessica McGrellis, Ms Frances Bell

In Attendance:

Ms Debbie Beales, Dr Nick Elliott, Dr Phil Walsh, Mr Gordon Mackenzie

Apologies:

Ms Joanne Mcfadden, Ms Julie Ommer

HSWC/2012/27 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 13 December 2012

The Minute of the meeting of 13 December 2012 was approved.

HSWC/2012/28 Matters arising

HSWC/2012/28.1 Assisted Evacuation (verbal update DN)

David Newall **informed** the Committee that there was now a Policy in place that would be launched in April. Many people had been involved in this process, but he wanted to thank three in particular: Gordon Mackenzie for creating an emergency response team, Andy Mackay who was tasked with identifying refuge points which would be badged during the forthcoming weeks, and David Mclean for preparing the Policy itself.

HSWC/2012/28.2 Safety Auditing (verbal update DMcL)

David McLean **informed** the Committee that there were 6-8 internal safety audits planned within areas of University Services not previously audited by Marsh. The audit in Transport Services was complete and a draft report had been prepared and would be sent to the Head of Service. Initial reports were that the audit went very well. Cleaning Services were due to be audited next week and Hospitality Services shortly thereafter. The Convenor asked that Mr McLean continue to advise the Committee of progress.

HSWC/2012/28.3 Fire Safety E-Learning (verbal update DMcL)

David McLean **informed** the Committee that an email had been sent to HoS, DirRI, HoC and HoUS about the fire safety e-learning and had received good feedback especially from SRS.

HSWC/2012/28.4 Fire Safety Policy - Amendment to Section 3 Training (Paper extract)

The Committee **noted** the Paper extract that was circulated. David Newall **informed** the Committee that, along with the known amendments, the Policy had been changed informing staff that they were required to complete the fire safety e-learning course every 3 years. The Committee **approved** these changes.

HSWC/2012/28.5 Gas Cylinder Maintenance (verbal update DMcL)

David McLean **informed** the Committee that unfortunately no company had tendered for a national contract that included a maintenance contract. There was an alternative option to approach the suppliers of cylinders but this would be costly. Contractors normally wished to supply a full maintenance contract rather than just statutory inspection.

HSWC/2012/28.6 Management of Stress in the Workplace draft Policy (Paper 1)

Selina Woolcott **informed** the Committee that, due to the high volume of constructive comments on the draft Policy, she had decided the best way forward was to consider all comments and carry this item to the next HSWC meeting in May. An amended draft would be circulated to members in April. She thanked members for their input as well as that from their operational areas.

HSWC/2012/29 Student Safety on and around Campus (Paper 2)

The Committee **noted** that an update email had been sent to the Committee via the Clerk in lieu of a Paper. Gordon Mackenzie **informed** the Committee that the University of Glasgow Campus had very little crime compared to other universities, with the Garscube Campus making up 10% of those figures. The sex of a student was a factor, with females most likely to be the victim of theft and men most likely to be victims of assault. Outwith campus however students made up 50% of crime victims in the Hillhead area. The Personal Safety Co-ordination Group had identified that assaults on students and bike thefts were the most common crimes and small working groups had been formed to find ways to increase safety and reduce crime. Mr Mackenzie **thanked** the SRC for their help in getting important information on crime to students. The "shut it" campaign pilot, delivered in conjunction with Strathclyde Police to improve security awareness, had resulted in a 50% reduction in break-ins at student residences. However, these had started to increase again so another campaign would run after the start of the next semester. He also **informed** the Committee that only 3% of stolen items (mainly laptops and small electrical items) were recovered and it was felt that using tracking systems such as security markers could help assist in the recovery of stolen property. Another current focus was pedestrian safety around the Garscube Campus where there was increased construction traffic due to ongoing development work. The Committee **thanked** Mr Mackenzie for taking time to update them.

HSWC/2012/30 OH Report (Paper 3)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Aileen Stewart **informed** the Committee that external clients had risen from previous quarters. However this would fall once the MRC merged with the University as they were currently considered external clients. Management and self referrals were down slightly from the same quarter last year. She stated that she would like future OH reports to include absence stats and was working with HR on this to ensure that absence categories matched those of UCEA. This would enable the stats to be benchmarked against other universities. During this discussion the Committee **noted** that there was still under reporting of staff absence in academic areas which was problematic. The Committee **agreed** that the inclusion of % in the stats was useful and **thanked** Ms Stewart for the report.

HSWC/2012/31 Accident Statistics (Paper 4)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. David McLean **informed** the Committee that the stats were consistent year to year with no trends emerging. Future reports would include electricity as a cause of injury. He also **informed** the Committee that

an angler had drowned on the stretch of the River Kelvin that ran through the Garscube Campus. This incident was not work related and would therefore not feature in the accident stats. Although the river ran through the Campus it was not in the ownership of the University. That aside he felt that the Committee should be made aware of the event. The local Angling Club had stated that they would like to erect warning signs detailing the specific conditions prevalent at this section of the river. Although the University did not have ownership of the river it felt that it was right to allow the Angling Club access to the river bank to erect signs which would be on University land at Garscube.

HSWC/2012/32 Employee Assistance Programme statistics (Paper 5)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Selina Woolcott **informed** the Committee that the first year had now passed with 1 year to go and an optional 3rd year. Uptake of the service had remained comparable with that of the previous provider with employees receiving personal counselling at an average of 9 per month. The Committee **agreed** that uptake of the service was still disappointingly low and more publicity was required, especially for the management information services that were available. Ms Woolcott **agreed** to liaise with the new Internal Communications Manager at Corporate Communications to find the best way to do so. Of the 64 on-line activities approx 16% related to work issues, 48% to health/wellbeing and 34% to personal issues. Over the 12 month period the breakdown was: 24% related to work life, 38% to wellbeing, 34% to personal life issues and 3% accessed information on people management. Ms Woolcott was to meet with PPC in the coming weeks and would discuss the possibility of getting customer feedback. There were forms available but she felt, with such a low uptake, the value of this information may be limited. Ms Woolcott **agreed** to begin a review of the contract in September.

HSWC/2012/33 Estates & Buildings H&S Committee (verbal report AA)

Ann Allen **informed** the Committee that Estates and Buildings had set up their own Health & Safety Committee 6 months ago. This included 2 members of the HSWC and a member of SEPS as well as reps for each of the Colleges and US. Standing items were Policy, asbestos management, accident statistics and PPE. All the members had recently completed the 4 day IOSH Managing Safely course and knowledge gained from this would be shared with Schools etc. The Committee were looking to embed health & safety within Estates & Buildings as well as providing best practise for external contractors. The Committee **thanked** Mrs Allen for her update.

HSWC/2012/34 Asbestos Management (verbal update NE)

Nick Elliott **informed** the Committee that he had 3 items that he wanted to bring to the Committee's attention:

- Waiver requests to HSE. There was a requirement where high risk work involving asbestos was planned to provide a 14 day notification to HSE. There was the option of a waiver in extreme circumstances however the University of Glasgow had applied for 9 waivers in the last 3 years, much more than any other University. This now meant that HSE were monitoring the University closely. Robert Kilpatrick from E&B was working with HSE on this and a report had been submitted. One of the main reasons for the waiver requests was the steam main which heated the Main Building. This was made in the 1950's and broke down frequently. Waiver requests were being made so that heating could be restored quickly rather than having to wait 14 days. E&B had applied to the Scottish Funding Council for £10M to help fund a replacement Combine Heat & Power (CHP) heating system and hoped to hear back

within a month. Dr Elliott stated that all future waiver requests must go through him initially for appraisal. Contractors had been advised that the University would not support waivers for contracted work.

- Asbestos Compliance Officers - 2 FTE posts were being recruited and interviews would take place next week. Duties would include in-house re-inspections which would provide more control and achieve considerable cost savings. They would also do internal auditing and monitoring of asbestos.
- Colleagues were asked to remember that there was a strict requirement to submit a works request for any work, no matter how minor, that caused any disturbance to the fabric of the building. Examples of this would be cable routing for communication systems and the fitting of window features, such as blinds, that required drilling into walls etc.

Current work included the ongoing maintenance of risers in various buildings which involved the removal of some asbestos as well as work scheduled in the Boyd Orr. The Committee **thanked** Dr Elliott for his update and recognised that asbestos management was in a much better place than it had been prior to his appointment last year.

HSWC/2012/35 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Annual Report (Paper 6)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Selina Woolcott **informed** the Committee that the past year had been an extremely challenging one due to the departure, particularly in SEPS, of some long serving and extremely experienced staff. New staff in place were: Portia Lamb, General Safety Adviser; Phil Walsh, Biological Safety Adviser; Andy Mackay, Fire Safety Manager and Morag Marshall, OH admin assistant. In the interim period between the departures of staff and the arrival of new staff SEPS was down by 1.5FTE (nearly 23% of the professional team). This had placed tremendous demands on the remaining team members who still managed to deliver training to over 1,500 employees, an increase of more than 25% on the previous year. This excluded the online health & safety e-induction training. Occupational Health achieved Safe Effective Quality Occupational Health Service (SEQOHS) accreditation this year, only the 2nd university in the UK (and the 1st in Scotland) to achieve this. The University's Radiation Protection Adviser co-authored a paper entitled "Measurement of the radioactivity in the excreta of cats treated with iodine-131 for hyperthyroidism". This paper demonstrated that the radiation levels were sufficiently low to be disposed of through household waste streams within 2 weeks of treatment ceasing. In the coming year the Service planned to conduct an in-house audit programme and the launch of various policies such as the Fire Safety Policy and guidance on biological safety. The Committee **thanked** the 3 teams within HSW for their hard work and **acknowledged** the fact that the past 12 months had been especially trying due to staffing issues. E&B gave special thanks to the hard work and support provided by SEPS.

HSWC/2012/36 Health & Safety Risk Register Progress Report Review (Paper 7)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Selina Woolcott **informed** the Committee that the main changes to the risk register were:

- The addition of stress management to CoSE risks - risk rating moderate
- Rewording within the Arts section to reflect common issues
- Genetic modification (MVLS) went from a 3 (low) to a 6 (moderate)

In the final table Ms Woolcott had amended the risk rating for asbestos management (from 12 high to 8 moderate) and electrical safety (from 15 high to 10 high) to reflect the implementation of actions proposed previously. She apologised to E&B for omitting them from previous communications on the report and advised that she was happy to amend any

risk rating that E&B felt was incorrect. Updates from University Services were still to be added to the report and Ms Woolcott would bring the amended register to the next meeting in May. The Committee **noted** that a lot of work had gone into reducing the risks for electrical safety and asbestos. It was hoped that the fire safety rating would come down in the future due to the new e-learning system that had just gone live and the Committee would revisit this in September.

HSWC/2012/37 Registration of Pathogens & Toxins (Paper 8)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Phil Walsh **informed** the Committee that following a visit from the Police regarding counter terrorism and a requirement for a "permissioning regime", a form had been created to help log pathogens and toxins. Due to the restructure SEPS were unsure where all high hazard materials were kept. The form, along with guidance notes, would allow SEPS to create and maintain a list of all high hazard materials within the University. The form would be completed by whoever had the pathogen/toxin, passed to the School Safety Co-ordinator with a copy going to SEPS. Dr Walsh confirmed that he had liaised with the Police, HSE and relevant Schools who were all happy with the proposed system. He would discuss the new procedure with School Safety Co-ordinators who would in turn educate the relevant Units. The Committee **thanked** Dr Walsh for his work in producing the document and **agreed** that they were happy for him to proceed.

HSWC/2012/38 Any Other Business

HSWC/2012/38.1 Management Training

Selina Woolcott **informed** the Committee that she and 4-5 others had attended a training for trainers course held by Robertson Cooper on Personal Resilience and Leadership Impact. They were now looking at ways to incorporate stress management into existing leadership development courses as well as delivering resilience training to managers. Bespoke training could also be delivered on request. She stated that the Stress Management Policy needed to be finalised first to give managers clear guidance on stress in the workplace. The Committee **agreed** it was a good policy and needed to be widely broadcast once completed and approved.

HSWC/2012/38.2 Zurich Municipal (ZM) Insurers

David McLean **informed** the Committee that ZM insurers had offered additional courses which would be free to attend. These were: 5x1 day courses on risk assessment, 4x1/2 day courses on investigation and 4x1/2 day courses on inspection. These would be held between May and November and details would be emailed to Schools, RI's and Services on a targeted basis. The Committee **discussed** the fact that there wasn't much training for HoS level and above. Mr McLean stated that there was a one day session on 22 October that would last 6 hours. This was an IOSH course entitled "Safety for Senior Executives" and there were 15 places which could potentially be 2-3 places per College/US. The Committee **agreed** that the College reps would take this information to CMG (Selina Woolcott to SMG for information) to nominate attendees for the course. Mr McLean would send an email about this after the next SMG meeting.

HSWC/2012/39 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee will be held on Wednesday 22 May 2013 at 10am in the Senate Room.

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales

Court - Wednesday 10 April 2013

Principal's Report

Items A : For Discussion

1. SFC Grant Award letter

At the time of issue of the Court papers, the SFC had not issued its announcement of the annual grant to HEIs. A verbal report will be provided at the Court meeting if the SFC announcement has been made.

2. Trans-national Education Strategy

The draft TNE strategy is now nearing the conclusion of a long consultation process, and is due to go to Senate later this month for final comment and input. I wanted Court to have sight of the document now as this will be the last opportunity Professor Andrea Nolan will have to speak to Court and answer any questions Court members may have concerning the strategy before she takes up her new post of Principal, Edinburgh Napier University.

3. Nursing and Health Care

Following the end of the internal consultation on Nursing and Healthcare in October 2012, and further to discussions within the School and College about the possible future configuration of the subject area, Court heard at the February 2013 meeting that funding was being provided by the SFC for an options appraisal and collaborative discussion between the University and Glasgow Caledonian University. Court has also been advised that any proposal for a future model of provision will be brought back to Court, and that it would receive the final report of the internal working group convened by Professor Nolan.

4. Senior Management changes

I will provide a verbal update and a recommendation to Court on the appointment of a replacement for Professor Andrea Nolan as Senior Vice-Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

Items B: For Information

5. Key activities

Below is a summary of some of the main activities I have been involved in since the last meeting of Court (February), divided into 4 themes: Academic Development and Strategy; Internationalisation activities; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; Internal activities and Communications.

5.1 Academic Development and Strategy

On the 18 February I attended the official launch of the IBIS project based at SCENE by Nicola Sturgeon, Deputy First Minister of Scotland, Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities. IBIS, part of the ERDF INTERREG IVA programme is a partnership between the Loughs Agency (Lead Partner), the University of Glasgow and Queen's University Belfast. It is an £8m cross-border project to help protect aquatic resources across Northern Ireland, the Border Region of Ireland and Western Scotland. Funded from August 2011, IBIS will deliver 70 years of applied research in doctoral and masters projects, 16 CPD courses and 12 Knowledge Transfer workshops by June 2015, leaving a legacy of expertise in sustainable aquatic resources management in the three jurisdictions. The project includes the development of the new teaching building at SCENE (scheduled for completion in late 2013) which will be the base for the IBIS research studentships being appointed by the University of Glasgow: 7 PhDs and 14 Masters Students.

On 13 March, we officially launched our Gaelic Plan. The 5 year plan was formally approved by the Bord na Gaidhlig on 10 December 2012 and represents the culmination of some 2 years work, careful planning and consultation by our Gaelic Language Committee and dedicated Gaelic Language Officer, Fiona Dunn. It emerges from a strong tradition of Gaelic and Celtic studies at Glasgow, and demonstrates the University's support for the Gaelic language and culture. It underlines our commitment to the plan's aspirations to increase the profile and use of Gaelic within the University, across the city, nationally and internationally. It is also aligned with our academic interests in Gaelic and Celtic. Gaelic and Celtic, along with the multidisciplinary Centre for Scottish & Celtic Studies, which brings together academics from across the university - History, Scottish Literature, Music, Film and TV Studies and Archaeology, will continue to create a world class focus for research and teaching in the history, literature and culture of Scotland and the Celtic world.

I, along with Andrew Roberston, Chairman of the NHSGGC & Anna Dominiczak, hosted a visit of John Swinney to the New South Glasgow Hospitals Project Offices Site. The new South Glasgow Hospitals Campus is an £842m development which aims to bring together on one campus maternity, children's and adult acute hospitals and state of the art laboratory services. It will also accommodate the biggest Critical care complex and one of the biggest Emergency Departments in Scotland. The visit provided an opportunity to present to Mr Swinney not just the development of New South Glasgow Hospital but the academic developments and the Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre at South Glasgow in particular. As per the recommendations to be considered by Court through the Estates and Finance Committees, the University will be making some major investments on this site. The site in addition to incorporating a new Learning and Teaching Facility will also accommodate a Clinical Research Facility which will focus on experimental medicine, phase I and II clinical trials and biomarker development. The new hospital campus will be the hub for the Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre which will provide new insights into disease to revolutionise diagnosis, treatment, and prevention strategies and in addition will attract and encourage pharmaceutical companies and other health science firms to make Scotland a prime site for clinical trials. The visit also included a tour of the New Southern General Laboratory.

As noted in previous reports I continue to be involved in Chair appointments and since the last meeting of Court have interviewed for the Chair in Biomedical Engineering (25 Feb); Chair in Mathematics (27 Feb); the Head of Business School (28 Feb); Chair in Medical Genomics (4 March) and the Director MRC Social & Public Health Sciences Unit (9 April).

5.2 International Activities

I visited China from 17-23 March.

On Sunday 17th March, we enjoyed a very large and lively Alumni event in Beijing. Around 280 alumni attended along with some prospective students and staff from DAO, RIO and College of Social Sciences. It was an immensely encouraging event and bodes well for the future.

The following day, while Professor Anne Anderson, Head of College Social Sciences, and colleagues from the College travelled on to Tianjin for meetings at Nankai University regarding the TNE programme and the proposed joint graduate school, I went to Hong Kong where I was able to host a dinner for a small group of key alumni/donors.

On Wednesday, I then went to Guangzhou to visit Sun Yat-sen University (SYSU). Our University delegation involved Professor Anna F Dominiczak, Professor Jon Cooper, Dean of Graduate Studies, College of Science & Engineering and International Dean for China and East Asia and Professor Matthew Walters, Professor of Clinical Pharmacology. This was a follow-up visit to the visit of a delegation from Sun Yat-Sen to the University in September 2012 and gave us the opportunity to meet Professor Guangmei Yan, the Vice President and colleagues from SYSU. The main focus for discussion was potential research and post graduate collaborations around the medical sciences, and discussions on two way student exchanges at UG and PG level, collaborative Masters Programs in Public Health and Primary Care, and the potential shape of future cerebrovascular collaborations including the proposed stroke symposium planned for May 2013. There may also be strong potential for developing research training in many research areas covered by MVLS. We also had the opportunity to visit the Cancer Centre and Guanghua Hospital of Stomatology both at SYSU. We concluded our visit by signing an MoU. The links with SYSU may provide an opportunity for additional TNE in China, primarily in MVLS, but possibly with some input from our Business School in the area of Health Care Management.

In addition to this trip I welcomed the Saudia Arabian Cultural Attache to the University (1 March) and a delegation of Indonesian Vice Rectors for a meeting and dinner (28 March).

5.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

We have been pleased to host a series of public lectures/events over the last two months.

Sir Stephen Gomersall, KCMG delivered the latest Europe-Japan Dialogue Series lecture (18 Feb). Sir Stephen is former Ambassador to Japan (1999-2004) and took up the post of Hitachi's Chief Executive for Europe in October 2004, before being appointed Group Chairman for Europe in April 2011. His subject was *Japan, an Ambassador's and Hitachi Group Chairman's view*. The Europe-Japan Dialogue public lectures were started 10 years ago, in June 2003, and since then some 35 public lectures have been organized. This year's Europe-Japan Dialogue lecture series has been organized by the Japan Desk Scotland on behalf of the University of Glasgow Adam Smith Business School. It has arranged four lectures under the common theme of 'Opportunities in Japan'. Sir Stephen's talk was the third in the series.

On the 27 February Murdoch MacLennan Chief Executive of the Telegraph Media Group, a member of Court and Chancellor's Assessor gave a lecture (27 Feb) on the Leveson inquiry its outcomes and implications, with a focus on both the UK implications and the potential reforms in Scotland.

On the 28 February we celebrated the David Livingstone Bicentenary with a reception, lecture and dinner. Livingstone attended the University for two years (1835-7) and later received an honorary degree in 1854. The Lecture was delivered by the Rt Hon Lord McConnell of Glenscorrodale who has been so closely associated with Africa, Malawi in particular and the Deputy High Commissioner of Malawi and Dr Peter & Mrs Margaret West from the Consulate of Malawi attended the lecture. As a prelude to the lecture we were delighted to watch a specially commissioned message from Desmond Tutu celebrating Dr Livingstone's legacy.

The evening continued the University's celebrations of Dr Livingstone which began on Monday 25th with our Welcome Trust Centre for Molecular Parasitology and Institute of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation, hosting a Symposium which captured the international relevance, impact and interest in, David Livingstone. The symposium drew international experts from the World Health Organisation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, St George's University of London, Makerere University in Uganda and of course our own University. It was an opportunity to focus particularly on historical and contemporary issues surrounding health and infectious diseases in Africa within the context of the remarkable life of Dr Livingstone.

On the 4 March Andrew Neil, journalist, broadcaster and business man hosted a panel discussion in the Bute Hall on the *Future of Printed Media*. It was tremendous to see such a great response, perhaps indicative of the interest the topic arouses in people's minds in these current times. The expert panel included external representatives from the media and our own Professor Philip Schlesinger.

Finally Mike Russell, Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning, visited the University (27 March) and gave a speech to an invited audience entitled *From Good to Great: Building Equity and Success in Scottish Education*.

On 23 February I, along with friends of the University attended the annual Snell Dinner at Balliol College. This was a particularly special dinner as Balliol college was celebrating its 750th Anniversary. I was therefore invited to say a few words celebrating Glasgow's links with Balliol particularly through the Snell Scholarships which of course have such a distinguished history – Adam Smith being perhaps the most famous of all Snell exhibitioners.

I continue to be involved in the Glasgow City Marketing Bureau and attended a Board meeting on 26 March. GCMB is leading on a new project to develop an overarching brand strategy for the city. This arises out of a key recommendation of the Glasgow Economic Commission (and Leadership) and is also identified in Glasgow City Council's Strategic Plan 2012-2017. The aim is to develop and implement a compelling brand to communicate Glasgow's key sectors, assets and ambitions to the world. It is about aiming to promote Glasgow as a dynamic and successful city for those who live, work, invest - and who may invest - in the city as well as those who visit, study and come to live and work in Glasgow. Tayburn Ltd. has been appointed to conduct consultations with key stakeholders, partners and public to develop, share, test and refine the brand architecture model, report findings and recommendations to inform the next phase of the project, the creative strategy development. I met with Simon Farrell of Tayburn Ltd (5 April) to share my views on this initiative and the strengths of the city. It is anticipated that this consultative phase will conclude by early April 2013. The following stages of the project – the development of brand identity, implementation plan and communications strategy – will commence thereafter to conclude in June.

I chaired the meeting of National Centre for Universities and Business Steering Board (NCUB), the UK's new Centre for Business-University interactions (28 March) where the Board approved the business plan, governance and membership plans for the new Centre. As Court will recall NCUB was launched in 28 January, and will begin its operations officially in April-May.

In addition I attended the UUK Projects on Student Funding (19 February) the UUK Funding Policy Network (21 February) and the UUK Members Meeting on 22 February. I also attended the annual Russell Group strategy meetings on 6-7 March.

I also attended the SFC business meetings (15 March, 2 April) and the NHS/GU Joint Strategy Group meeting (9 April).

Apart from the diet of formal meetings, I have over the period since the last Court meeting had the pleasure of meeting various people of influence including Stuart Patrick (CEO City Chamber of Commerce) (1 March); Magnus Llewellyn the new Editor of the Glasgow Herald and Lord Patten, Chairman of BBC Trust (6 March).

On the 11 March I travelled to London to undertake various visits to high profile supporters and donors.

Finally I was pleased to attend the Cairncross Dinner in Perth (8 April), hosted by the Scottish Economics Society, speak after dinner on the topic of 'HEIs and the Economy' and present the Cairncross prize.

5.4. Internal activities and Communications

I've hosted various receptions in the Lodging to meet and greet specific groups of colleagues. These have included a reception for new academics in MVLS & Science Engineering (20 February), a reception for the General Council Business Committee (25 Feb), a reception for new staff in University Services (12 March) and a reception for International Leadership Scholars (9 April).

I was delighted to meet and speak to DAO telephone campaign student volunteers who were attending a training session (26 Feb). This is always a very worthwhile initiative, and the students provide an extremely effective interface with our alumni and potential donors for the future.

On 14 March we enjoyed an excellent Senate Guest Night where we were able to confer on John Lumsden and Clark McGinn honorary fellowships of the University in recognition of their outstanding service to Glasgow over many years.

I agreed to give an interview for the Student Guardian focusing on the Gilmorehill Campus Vision and Estate Strategy (27 February), continued my podcast interviews (13 March) and undertook a 'Principal's Surgery' on 14 March, with another scheduled for 17 April.

6. Senior Management Group business

In addition to standing and regular items (which include, Recruitment & Admissions update, Risk List, Management Accounts, Audit reports) the following issues were discussed.

SMG Meeting of 20 February

- Widening Participation – Strategic Direction for 2013 and beyond
- Organisational Development

SMG Meeting of 20 March

- Health, Safety and Wellbeing Update Report
- Early Career Development – Final Agreement
- Ordinance
- Update on Action Plan Arising from Year 1 Review of Implementation of New University Structure
- Public Sector Equality Duty
- MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit
- Policy for External Partners and IP & Commercialisation Policy
- Update on REF
- Update on KE strategy
- Commonwealth Games Group



Court - Wednesday 10 April 2013

Report from the Secretary of Court

SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Review of Higher Education Governance/ Scottish Code of Governance

Following publication of the Von Prondzynski report on 1 February 2012, the Cabinet Secretary for Education asked the Committee of the Scottish Chairs of Higher Education Institutions to develop a new Scottish Code of Good Governance for Higher Education. A Steering Group was formed and consultants were appointed to support the Steering Group in developing the new Code.

At the time of writing, it is anticipated that the Steering Group will publish a draft Code in the second week of April. Court has agreed that a sub-group of Court might be convened, if required, to consider and comment on the draft Code. The Convener and I will update Court orally on 10 April and will continue to keep Court members briefed on developments.

A.2 Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill

Court has been briefed on the contents of the Post-16 Education Bill, and has submitted comments on it to the Education & Culture Committee. The Committee concluded its Stage 1 consideration of the Bill on 20 March, and on 27 March the Scottish Parliament approved the Bill's progress to Stage 2. With regard to University Governance, Section 3 of the draft bill places a requirement on universities to comply with principles of good governance and management practice, as determined by Scottish Ministers. The University has supported a suggested amendment to that part of the Bill, as proposed by Universities Scotland, having the impact that the Minister would expect universities to comply with a Code of Good Governance practice, as developed by the HE sector. The Education & Culture Committee has encouraged the Minister to consider this suggested amendment, which may be adopted when Stage 2 is presented. Much will depend on whether the Minister and the Committee are satisfied with the contents of the Code of Good Governance Practice.

A.3 Review of Court Effectiveness

A special meeting of Court is being arranged in June, at which members of Court will have the opportunity to discuss the recommendations contained in the review of Court Effectiveness, and with reference to the draft Scottish Code of Good Governance Practice (A.1. above).

A.4 *Glasgow University Union*

The Principal contacted all members of Court on 13 March following widespread media coverage of events at this year's Glasgow University Union (GUU) Ancients Debating Championship, at which two visiting women speakers complained they were subjected to unacceptable sexist abuse.

Senate Office has initiated an investigation into the complaints and, if University students are found to have breached the University's code of conduct, disciplinary measures will be taken.

In addition, GUU's officers have committed to an independent review of the culture within the GUU to ensure that it provides a welcoming and safe environment for all. The Principal and I are in discussion with the GUU President with a view to ensuring that this review exercise is robust and that its recommendations are implemented.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 *Pensions Liability – University of Glasgow Pension Scheme UGPS*

In October 2012, Court received correspondence from the chair of the Trustees of the UGPS, advising that the UK's Pensions Regulator had raised concerns regarding the UGPS deficit recovery plan, as submitted by the University in 2011. The UGPS deficit had increased significantly since 2011, largely because of the low rate of return applying to Government bonds. The Trustees advised that they had commissioned an independent review of the strength of the University's financial covenant and a review of arrangements for funding the deficit. They communicated again with Court in December, asking that the University increase substantially its financial commitment to the pension scheme.

Court has established an expert working group to provide advice on this matter, given its significance and the technical nature of the analysis required. The working group is chaired by Ken Brown, and includes David Anderson, Iain Stewart (lay member of Finance Committee) and Tom Whiteley (a professional actuary, co-opted by the working group). The Group's role is to review proposals for addressing the current UGPS deficit, and to consider the future benefit structure of UGPS, given the need for future pension arrangements to be financially sustainable.

In recent weeks, there have been several discussions of this business, involving the Senior Management Group, the Pension Trustees and the Court working group. In addition, SMG members have briefed the relevant campus trade unions. Discussions are ongoing and, at this point, it is anticipated that the working group will receive a proposal from SMG in time to consider it and report with recommendations to the meeting of Court on 19 June.

B.2 *Nominations Committee*

Nominations Committee recommended to Court that Dr Paul Brady and Neil Menzies serve a further 4 years as members of the Audit Committee, until April 2017. Court members approved this via email following the February meeting.

B.3 *Staff Engagement Development Plan*

The Year 1 Review of the University Restructure identified the need for managers to engage more effectively with staff throughout the University. The Staff Engagement Development Plan (**Annex 1**) sets out how this is being taken forward.

B.4 *Heads of School*

The following appointment has been made:

College of Social Sciences

Business School

Professor Jim Love, former Deputy Principal at the University of Strathclyde, has been appointed as Head of the Business School for a period of four years from 1 May 2013, in succession to Professor Farhad Noorbakhsh

The following Senate Assessors will serve on appointing Committees for Heads of Schools where vacancies are occurring in December 2013:

College of Arts

School of Modern Languages and Cultures (current Head Professor John Macklin)

Dr Alan Owen will be the Senate Assessor on the appointing committee

School of Critical Studies (current Head Professor Nigel Leask)

Professor Christine Forde will be the Senate Assessor on the appointing committee

B.5 *Draft Resolutions*

The following draft Resolutions have been approved. They relate to academic matters including degree regulations, and were drafted in the Senate Office, incorporating comments from the General Council:

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 382-2 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 382 -
DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN DENTAL SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 507-4 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 507 -
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 552-7 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 552 -
GENERIC REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTERS DEGREES
GAINED BY THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF TAUGHT
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 557-6 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 557 -
DEGREE OF MASTER OF RESEARCH

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 558-3 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 558 -
DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 564-9 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 564 –
CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 565-1 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 565 –
FITNESS TO PRACTISE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 570-2 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. 570 – APPEALS CODE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 582-2 – GENERIC REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF DEGREES GAINED BY THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 583-1 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 583-2 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 583-3 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 585-1 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 586-1 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DIVINITY (MINISTRY)

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 597-1 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS (SOCIAL SCIENCES)

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 603-2 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 603 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DENTAL SURGERY

DRAFT RESOLUTION 605-4 – AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION 605 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE AND DEGREE OF MASTER IN SCIENCE

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 606-2 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 606 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF VETERINARY MEDICINE & SURGERY

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 607-1 – AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION 607 - DEGREES OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN VETERINARY BIOSCIENCES AND MASTER IN SCIENCE IN VETERINARY BIOSCIENCES

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 609-3 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 609 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS (SCOTTISH AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE) AND BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (SCOTTISH AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE)

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 620-1 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 620 - DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE (DENTAL SCIENCE)

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 628-1 – AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 628 - DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF NURSING

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 637 – DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MEDICAL SCIENCE (MEDICAL HUMANITIES)

DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 645 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF RESEARCH

DN/DM

University of Glasgow

Staff Engagement

Progress on work that arose from Year 1 restructuring review

STAFF ENGAGEMENT: DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The plan is based on incremental improvements with emphasis on clarifying roles and remits of staff; improving staff engagement in decision-making and internal communications, and improving systems and processes.

Action	Timescale	Measurable outcomes	Progress at 21 March 2013
1. Improve internal communications, in particular face to face communication practice			
1.1. develop a comprehensive internal communications strategy drawing on best practice and the experience of other institutions/industries.	July 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver an audit of current practice. • Provide a document that summarises best practice in comparable institutions/ and sectors as appropriate • Provide a flexible framework to be implemented throughout the University to affect an inclusive approach, engaging all employees in efforts to improve communication and internal communication networks, both formal and informal e.g. introduction of e-mail protocol policy 	Benchmarking exercise undertaken on the ways in which other Universities and large organisations use internal communications to foster greater employee engagement. Completed March 2012. Internal Communications (IC) Manager appointed February 2013. Meetings underway between IC Manager and Heads of Colleges (2 complete, 2 in hand) to discuss internal communications networks and the creation of IC champions. Timescale for completion of process April 2013.
1.2. develop a toolkit and provide training in effective methods of communication Responsibility: Director of Corp Comms Lead: Peter Aitchison /Wendy McAnerney	April 2012 – June 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver a toolkit for managers • Conduct focus group work following the implementation of the action plan to identify recent progress and trends in staff perceptions around decision-making and inclusiveness, publishing 'best practice' and progressive illustrations introduced within the University that have positively impacted on staff perceptions around inclusiveness and improved opportunities for staff to engage in decision making. 	Internal communications toolkit prepared and being reviewed by IC Manager (agreement on toolkit, May 2013). Pilot of team briefing and middle management training being developed by University Services, under Ian Black/Peter Aitchison/Phil Taylor. Timescale for completion of pilot July 2013 . Review in communications input of IT platforms, specifically intranet/portal/enterprise social networks. IC Manager member of Information Architecture Review. See section 7. Plans to introduce a major staff briefing and feedback event – the Glasgow Gathering – being developed; details to be confirmed by May 2013. Staff Development Service launching a range of communication training courses for line managers including online web resources.
2. Develop and deliver mechanisms/strategies to improve and strengthen staff engagement and transparency in decision making processes			
2.1. live and practise the University values of integrity, credibility, openness and success in conducting our work at all levels within the University to improve levels of trust and collegiality, thus fostering a culture in which all members of staff are respected and display	Ongoing	Measure progress via 2014 Staff Attitude Survey	Top line report on 2012 Staff Attitude survey delivered to SMG, EDSC, Senate, Court, JUCC, HS&W committee and Human Resources Committee; CMGs/USMG. Local action plans developed, linked to OD plan. SMG adopted PDR outcomes/objectives related to

Action	Timescale	Measurable outcomes	Progress at 21 March 2013
<p>respect in working with others</p> <p>Responsibility: SMG</p> <p>Lead: SMG, CMGs and USMG</p>			<p>leadership /staff engagement / communication. Roll out to HoS/DRIs/HoUS in 2013/14</p>
<p>2.2. Identify and communicate which University procedures and practices are common to all Colleges and University Services, and are to be applied consistently across the University (e.g. P&DR)</p> <p>Responsibility: Senior VP</p> <p>Lead: HoCs /Sec of Court</p>	October 2012	Identify key University priorities and KPIs over next 12 months and ensure consistent communication and understanding to University community.	<p>Discussion identified key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P&DR (Process improvement review occurring annually with web guidance revised accordingly) • Academic Promotion • Budget process and general finance (see Senate paper related to action 2.5) • Academic regulations
<p>2.3. Replicate HoS/DRI forum as meaningful way to engage with particular groups of postholders across the University e.g. Introduce such a forum for HoSA/HoRIAs.</p> <p>Responsibility: Deputy Secretary</p> <p>Lead: Deputy Secretary with College Secretaries</p>	Commence April 2012	Forum established and meeting regularly; feedback from forum members (June 2013)	Forum established and first meeting held June 2012. The forum meets bimonthly, timed shortly after meetings of the HoS/DoRI; its effectiveness will be reviewed in June 2013.
<p>2.4. Increase the visibility of leaders and managers through systematic direct contact with staff and 'walking the job', focusing primarily on supporting and encouraging employees.</p> <p>Responsibility: SVP</p> <p>Lead: HoC/Secretary of Court/HoS/DRIs/ Deans / Heads of Services/ divisions</p>	Immediate	Measure progress via focus groups /survey with HoS/DRI/HoSA/HoRIA; initially in late Autumn 2012.	Informal meetings held with SMG members July / August to discuss approaches. A range of approaches and initiatives are in place. All SMG members engaged with this action.
<p>2.5. Foster an inclusive, structured and transparent approach to decision making through the adoption of a range of formal and informal mechanisms, maximizing the opportunity for staff to engage in decision making wherever possible (see also 5.1)</p> <p>Responsibility: SMG</p> <p>Lead: HoC/Secretary of Court/HoS/DRIs / Heads of Services/ divisions</p>	Review summer 2013	<p>Measure progress via focus groups /survey with HoS/DRI/HoSA/HoRIA</p> <p>(Clarity about i) locus of decision making and ii) consultation process and staff involved in key areas to include strategy development, research, programme / course development and approval, staffing finance)</p>	<p>Report discussed by SMG in March, and will be presented to Senate on 18 April, together with a narrative document covering academic governance, budgeting processes, and the involvement of staff in strategy development. The document contains a number of recommendations intended to enhance academic governance arrangements.</p> <p>Further action includes the production of an expanded version of the Guide to Governance at the University, to reflect the outcome of the discussions at Senate and aspects of the 'Roles and Responsibilities...' document. Information on academic governance at comparator universities is being collated; completion – June 2013.</p>
<p>2.6 Ensure people are supported in performing roles in which they are employed, and are encouraged to fulfil role expectations</p>	Review July 2012	Use 2012 Survey as baseline and measure progress via 2014 Staff Attitude Survey	Full process review and feedback on implementation and effectiveness of PDR occurring annually across Campus which to date has resulted in meaningful PDR

Action	Timescale	Measurable outcomes	Progress at 21 March 2013
Responsibility: SMG Lead: HoC/Secretary of Court/HoS/DRI/ Deans/ College Secretaries		Annual focus upon improving fitness for purpose and effectiveness of PDR	discussions aligned with strategic objectives. Report on PDR process and outcomes for 2-11/12 presented to HR committee (March 2013) Focus upon maintaining QA mechanisms, extending moderation practice, improving SMART objective setting and development planning aspects for 2012/13 PDR. Further, College/US specific launch events scheduled and targeted learning & development opportunities e.g. Challenging Conversations & Constructive Feedback, etc. These will be actioned accordingly.
3. Deliver and implement an organisational development programme to ensure staff and managers are fully developed, supported and equipped to undertake the challenges of new or evolving roles. (Includes a basic competency framework approach)			
3.1 Support and build management and leadership capacity/capability to ensure relevant skills base to maximize and improve opportunities to engage and involve all staff in delivering the University strategy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heads of School/Director of RI • Heads of Service • College Deans • HoSA/ RI Admin and other admin leadership roles (eg College HoASAs, School team leaders) Responsibility: Director of HR Lead: Christine Barr /Wendy McAnerney informed by HoCs, College Secretaries & HRMs Resources: SDS resource (2fte)	June 2012	P&DR outcomes from 2013 onwards; Staff Attitude Surveys Internal coaching to support staff including a internal coaching pool Cross-campus mentoring support mechanisms in place. Increased awareness and understanding of organisational benefits of actively providing opportunities for staff engagement among University managers and leaders	OD Framework outlines key priorities including mentoring, executive coaching and leadership and management development for key target groups. Heads of School Admin / RI Admin – programme launched / Colleges & US at various stages of completion through 2012/13. Leadership & Management Programme agreed (SMG 20/02/13) following consultation with key stakeholders. Academic Leadership Programme launch schedule commencing late summer/early autumn 2013. University Services Leadership Programme launch schedule commencing autumn 2013.
3.2 Ensure clarity and consistency of the role of Head of Subject, where extant, and their responsibilities Responsibility: Senior VP Lead: HoS (as appropriate)	June 2012	Agreed job description	Discussions held with stakeholders; the role of the Head of Subject is a key role within the School structure for many schools, and the role varies depending on the discipline 'size'; equally significant is the role of the School convenors of L&T / R&KT committees. The role of Head of Subject and other roles in line management was noted. A key concern for the future is the appointment of staff into these roles. Consequently it is recommended that incentivisation and recognition be considered further for key roles in Schools/ RIs; through workload models and promotion procedures. It should be noted that

Action	Timescale	Measurable outcomes	Progress at 21 March 2013
			practice in terms of recognition in workload models varies across Schools. <i>Action:</i> College HRMs and CMGs. Job description for Head of Subject to remain as currently agreed
3.3 Further build College based teams to achieve effective and efficient team working and enhance cross functional working Responsibility: Heads of College Lead: HoCs supported by HRM / SDS Resources: SDS OD resource as above	Ongoing	P&DR outcomes from 2013 onwards, Staff Attitude Survey and measurable efficiency gains	Joint College Office/School/RI administrative staff meetings underway in all Colleges.
3.4 Further develop effective training support in relation to performance management processes including opportunities for staff engagement in career management dialogue & skills development Responsibility: Deputy HR Director Lead: Christine Barr/Wendy McAnerney, supported by College HRMs Resources: SDS OD resource as above	May 2012	P&DR outcomes from 2013 onwards, Staff Attitude Survey	Staff Development Service implementing Leadership & Management Framework Programme following extensive consultation with senior stakeholders. This will cover a range of topics including effective communication and staff engagement. See Action 2.6 for progress update on PDR.
4. Deliver a reduction in 'bureaucracy' around core processes			
4.1 Develop and implement streamlined research project approval process including fast track for low risk applications and replacement for PAF and ensure more efficient research project set up (including recruitment of staff – see below) Responsibility: Director of Finance Lead: Joanne Hulley Resources: Research Management Review project	October 2012 (system available for phased implementation)	Reduced lead time for project approval Reduced lead time from award receipt to project start-up Client satisfaction survey data	The processes for grants, contracts and EU have been completed and validated with a range of stakeholders. It was agreed that implementation would be delayed until after REF, resulting in a revised target date of March 2014. The detailed system design is in progress based on the requirements captured as part of the redesign of the processes. The high level principles for the Organisation Design have been agreed by the Project Board and detailed design work has started. The organisation structure required to support EU / International has been prioritised and a proposal has been agreed by the Project Board and will be considered by SMG in April.
4.2 Review staff recruitment processes and implement simplified, speedier arrangements Responsibility: Director of HR Lead: Christine Barr / Tracey Stirling	August 2012	Reduced recruitment time – minimum time scales to be determined following trend analysis and review conducted jointly with Colleges.	Recruitment team fully staffed from May 2012. Further to the implementation of a number of procedures to reduce the time to hire the Recruitment Team continue to monitor these timescales across the University on an ongoing basis.

Action	Timescale	Measurable outcomes	Progress at 21 March 2013
			Phase 2 of the HR/Payroll system will introduce a new recruitment system and assess the capability of the current jobseekers register and any revisions required. Implementation currently planned for early 2014. Initial UKBA audit of Tier 2 & 5 successfully completed (03/12). Successful renewal of Sponsorship licence for staff and students valid until November 2016.
<p>4.3 Automated calculation of progression status through use of plan rules built in Campus Solutions</p> <p>Responsibility: Christine Lowther Lead: Michael Arthur/ College Deans L&T Resources: Time and resources for Colleges to test & validate plan rules</p>	September 2012	Removes the need for manual processes currently carried out by staff; automatically assigns an academic standing status for failing students which can be reported out for progress committees	This has been completed and the automatic calculation of progression for full time undergraduate students was run for the first time on 9 July 2012. The process worked well for the majority of F/T UG students. The process is being refined/ errors in records resolved to ensure that all UG F/T students are included and are assigned an academic standing. Plan rules have been improved to support both enrolment and the progression process.
<p>4.4 Implement new ways of working utilising Campus Solutions functionality to support award and management of scholarships and other financial aid awards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improved visibility of the range of financial aid; • improved management and reporting of all financial aid funds; • automated awarding and disbursement of funds to student accounts • deliver single source of data to improve the accuracy, consistency and completeness of information. • electronic communications to students <p>Responsibility: Director of Student Services Lead: Michael Arthur /Colleges Resources: SLP resource and time in Colleges for training/any restructuring of roles/teams</p>	September 2012	Enhanced student satisfaction Reduced volume of transactions and associated resource costs Reduced admin burden on Schools/RIs fund managers / administrators	<p>All Financial Aid awards to students are now handled through MyCampus, providing one single source of data of Financial Aid for reporting and management purposes. Additional support has been provided centrally in 2012/13 which has improved processes for payment of stipends. This central financial aid function will continue; it will be expanded to include production of a suite of management & transactional reports and knowledge transfer/training for FA users in colleges. An online Financial Aid application form will enable students to search for all awards to which they may be entitled. This will include electronic communications automated awarding and, for some funds, disbursement of certain funds. The initial development of the on-line application is completed. It has been configured for use by Registry for hardship funds, but has not yet been implemented. RIO is considering using the on-line application for awards it administers; discussions will take place on roll out to colleges.</p> <p>The priority during 2012/13 has been to embed the processes for award and disbursement of payments and establish the central financial aid function. Future focus will be on implementation of on-line application.</p>

Action	Timescale	Measurable outcomes	Progress at 21 March 2013
5. Review administrative resource (staffing levels & skills) and its deployment in Colleges and ensure visibility and clarity of support structures and key roles and responsibilities of these units			
5.1 Clarify support staff reporting lines and improve information on College/School/RI websites on support structures and support teams to deliver good understanding of roles & responsibilities, and contact points for decision outcomes. Responsibility: College Secretaries Lead: College Secretaries with HoSA/HoRIA	End of December 2012	Staff feedback	A recommendation is being taken forward to clarify line management reporting of the HoSA/HoRIA through College Secretaries with indirect (dotted line) reporting to HoS/DoRIs. Information on College websites (Information for Staff) is now comprehensive with detail provided of contact individuals and structures including committees and procedures. School and Research Institute websites are in the process of being updated with some having comprehensive information available; at least minimal individual contact information is provided for all.
5.2 Review the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • profile (grade and number), balance and deployment of administrative support staff within Colleges • staff skill base to identify short-, medium- and long-term improvements to service delivery, meeting College staff needs. Responsibility: College Secretaries Lead: College Secretaries with HoSA/HoRIA Resources: Resource to assist with data collection	September 2013	Report for all colleges	Report on the profile of administrative support staff within Colleges was considered and discussions held within the College Secretaries forum, involving Deputy Secretary, Deputy Director of HR and University's OD Consultant, focussing on the role and skills base of HoSA/HoRIAs. Bespoke development training, with a focus on leadership attributes and all-round management skills in these crucial roles, has been organised for this group. Discussions are currently ongoing within Colleges to address skills development more broadly.
5.3 Consider any cross-College or pan-University initiatives which might contribute to more efficient / effective service provision. Responsibility: Deputy Secretary Lead: College Secretaries	March 2013		A new post of Process Improvement Manager is being recruited: the initial priorities are around student administration and the associated financial processes.
6. Further develop the website, particularly in preparation for REF and ELIR			
6.1 Develop the research profiles of research units/groups, centres and institutes. Responsibility: Director of Corp Comms/ College Deans (Research) Lead: Depute Director Corp. Comms (Digital Media, Campaigns & Marketing) with College web publishers; Craig Easton Resources: 5 FTE: 4 college specific, 1 central support	March 2012- March 2014	Availability of comprehensive information on Colleges' research offering	Web strategy group established and web content officers appointed. They are working with nominated leads from Colleges/Schools/Institutes and Centres to implement an agreed plan to enhance the website (as agreed by web strategy group and RPSC). The PGR Web Journey Working Group is progressing the development of a PGR opportunities database and improved user experience (by September 2013) with reporting updates to the DOGS meeting.

Action	Timescale	Measurable outcomes	Progress at 21 March 2013
<p>6.2 Develop the means to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> list this information within the research section of the website, within appropriate academic units: such as schools and research institutes, as well as identifying disciplines search for research information <p>Responsibility: Director of Corp Comms Lead: Craig Easton</p>	<p>July 2012</p> <p>December 2012</p>	<p>Availability of listing.</p> <p>Availability of search tool.</p>	<p>Funnelback have provided the beta version of the search facility. This is currently being tested and will be rolled out shortly.</p>
<p>6.3 Ensure that website meets QAA and SFC requirements in relation to the provision of public information (accessible, accurate, up-to-date, etc)</p> <p>Responsibility: DD Corp Comms/ Heads of College Lead: College HoASAs / Senate Office; IT Services</p>	<p>By June 2013</p>	<p>Website consistent with QAA and SFC requirements 'Student Voice' live and used (student feedback)</p>	<p>Ongoing website development consistent with QAA and SFC requirements. Senate Office is managing redevelopment of Student Voice website, working in conjunction with the SRC and IT Services regarding a Sharepoint solution.</p>
<p>6.4 Enhancement of PGT programme listings.</p> <p>Responsibility: College HoASAs Lead: Web officers</p>	<p>April 2012</p>	<p>Ability to sort degree programmes by designation; group by themes.</p>	<p>Update re: Funnelback as in 6.2 above. Note also: additional SFC funding information has been added to relevant programmes.</p>
<p>7. Reflect on the impact of developments and initiatives on staff across the full range of our activities (seeking and listening to their views) with a view to delivering future projects and developments at a pace that is congruent with the key research and teaching aims of Colleges, Schools and Research Institutes</p>			
<p>7.1. Develop and maintain 'change map' at headline level that captures key change projects across the full range of activity; prioritise 2-3 areas of strategic significance over next three years. Focus on priority areas.</p> <p>Responsibility: SVP Lead: VP (S&R)</p>	<p>As defined by individual project plans</p>	<p>Conduct specific audits at implementation and 6/12 months later at SMG/HoS/DRI/Deans/ Service Heads away days to review progress and staff perceptions</p>	<p>VP (S&R) to create annual operational plan for the University including the key change projects across our strategic themes including major IT and staffing projects; Plan to be used for communication across the University community</p>
<p>7.2 Communicate plans arising from 'change map' on an annual basis (see 7.1) at university wide committees / forums; adopt inclusive approach to 'new' project implementation, including honest articulation of progress and effective early interventions when issues affect plans</p> <p>Responsibility: SVP/ VP (Strategy & Resources) Lead: Project leads</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Conduct specific audits at implementation and 6/12 months later to review progress and staff perceptions</p>	<p>Plan to have initial change map (short headline paper) ready for SMG/HoS/DRI away day – work with VP Strategy and Resources.</p>
<p>7.3 Establish, maintain and communicate rolling 3-year plan for IT developments, explicitly indicating the impact of the project work on staff (including which staff groups are most likely to be affected)</p>	<p>June 2012</p>	<p>Updated 3 year plan published annually</p>	<p>The Information Policy & Strategy Committee (IPSC) was refreshed in November 2012 and is now a larger grouping that includes four SMG members plus a representative of each College. Each IT systems Project Board is accountable to IPSC (the relevant</p>

Action	Timescale	Measurable outcomes	Progress at 21 March 2013
<p>Responsibility: Chair, Information Planning & Strategy Committee (IPSC) Lead: Director of IT Services</p>			<p>Boards being: MyCampus, HR/Payroll, VOIP Telephony, IT Infrastructure, CMIS Room Bookings, Workload Modelling). IPSC now submits half-yearly reports to SMG, including the annual update of the 3-year IT development plan.</p> <p>IPSC is also addressing the systems aspects which are potentially contributing to issues about openness of decision making and accessibility of information (e.g. use of Sharepoint vs EDRMS). It will develop a university policy on publication of and access to committee papers.</p>
<p>7.4 Communicate 'headline' rolling 5-year capital plan to staff. Responsibility: VP (Strategy & Resources) Lead: Director of Estates</p>	Commence by June 2012	Measure progress via focus groups /survey with HoS/DRI/HoSA/HoRIA Staff attitude survey (2014). Reports accessible.	A summary paper on 'headline' rolling 5-year capital plan in preparation

Court – Wednesday 10 April 2013

Knowledge Exchange and Impact Strategy

Cover Sheet

Brief Description of Paper

The Vice Principal (Research and Enterprise) has been leading on the development of a new Knowledge Exchange and Impact Strategy for the University, which is a formal requirement of the Scottish Funding Council. In addition to this, many other key research funders and stakeholders expect universities to have robust strategies in place for knowledge exchange and for delivering impact from research excellence. The paper consists of two parts;

- i. Background and context document – This paper highlights the requirements for the new KE and Impact Strategy
- ii. KE and Impact Strategy – This draft document provides an overview of the strategy including the high-level aim, objectives and key actions for implementation.

Development of the strategy has taken place over the period September 2012 - March 2013 with on-going discussion and input from across the university including a formal consultation period throughout February-March 2013.

The latest version of the strategy was presented to SMG and RPSC on 20th and 21st March respectively and both committees approved the strategy for submission to University Court.

Action Requested

Court is asked to approve the Knowledge Exchange and Impact Strategy.

Originator of the Paper

Prof. Steven Beaumont, Vice Principal for Research and Enterprise
Dr Neil Bowering, Head of Knowledge Exchange

Draft Impact and Knowledge Exchange Strategy 2013-2016

Background and Context

1 Introduction

The University of Glasgow aims to enhance its position as one of the world's great broad-based, research intensive universities. Our mission outlined in Glasgow 2020 - A Global Vision is to undertake world leading research and to provide an intellectually stimulating learning environment, thus delivering benefit and impact to culture, society and the economy (www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_180610_en.pdf). Success depends on mutually supportive core strategies in Research, Knowledge Exchange, Internationalisation and Learning and Teaching, and adherence to our core values of Integrity, Credibility, Openness and Success.

It is well recognised that universities make significant contributions to the economy, culture and society on regional, national and global levels as a result of core research, teaching and knowledge exchange (KE) activities. Increasingly, our diverse range of research funders expect the work they sponsor to have impact beyond the academic community. For the first time in 2014, UK universities will be assessed not only on their research excellence, but also on the impacts derived from that research. It is expected that the weighting placed on impact by the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) for the Research Excellence Grant allocation will increase in future assessments.

The SFC is also increasing its emphasis on KE as they seek to develop a 'step-change' in the engagement of public policy and service providers, business and industry with Scotland's universities by removing any barriers to the exploitation of research for economic and wider societal benefit at the University level. As part of this process the University has now signed an outcome agreement with SFC demonstrating our commitment to increasing KE activities by 7.5%, creating 2-3 high growth spin-out companies and expanding our Easy Access IP portfolio by 10 each year. <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/planning/information>

Increasing KE and impact creation from our research base will yield significant reputational benefits to the University. For example, industry collaborations feature as one of the measures in international league tables. These reputational yardsticks are used widely in the higher education sector and inform student decisions about choice of institution.

This KE and Impact Strategy outline's our vision, goals and approach to KE and impact. Mindful that strategy is ineffective without a clear view of how it will be implemented, the strategy is designed to guide the development of action plans at all levels within the University. The strategy and its implementation should raise awareness of KE and its benefits and provide a toolkit to support researchers, schools, and colleges in identifying, developing and delivering impact from their research.

2 Impact and Knowledge Exchange

Impact is the demonstrable contribution that **excellent research** (basic, user-inspired and applied) makes to society and the economy. It embraces the diverse ways in which **research-related knowledge** and skills benefit individuals, organisations and nations by;

- fostering global economic performance and specifically the economic competitiveness of the United Kingdom;
- increasing the effectiveness of public services and policy;
- enhancing quality of life, health and creative output.¹

Research Councils UK defines KE as the *"The two-way flow of people and ideas between the research environment and wider economy, thereby contributing to national prosperity, the quality of life of citizens, and cultural enrichment of our society. Knowledge transfer encompasses the systems and processes by which knowledge, expertise and skilled people transfer between the research environment and its user communities in industry, commerce, public and service sectors"*.²

¹ <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/kei/Pages/home.aspx>

² RCUK and DUIS definition of knowledge exchange

Maximising impact from our world leading research requires efficient and effective KE across many fronts using a variety of pathways, with and to our key stakeholders including industry, third sector organisations, the public sector and individuals at a regional, national and global level.

However excellent research and KE in itself is not enough and in developing this strategy, we recognise that we must move beyond traditional responsive KE activities and proactively shape the pathways from research to impact. For KE to lead to impact requires closer collaboration and understanding of users needs and embedding KE in our research programmes from the start. This is recognised by RCUK's Pathways to Impact policy which is now a core requirement for any research application to their grants.

Whilst the Impact Agenda has primarily been driven by Government funders, there are significant benefits for the University and our academics from engaging in KE. Experience shows that research, KE, and impact should not be treated as a linear process; rather it forms a virtuous circle of activity, where KE and impact often leads to other forms of external relationships and the identification of new research and funding opportunities.

The implementation of the KE and Impact Strategy is focussed on more successfully identifying and converting impact opportunities and realising the significant potential of our world leading research by embedding KE in our research programmes.

4 A Strong Tradition of Knowledge Exchange

We have a long tradition of producing world-leading research, engaging with national and international researchers and working alongside non-academic institutions. Our experience shows that the most successful KE and Impact generating activities occur when there is strong collaboration (internal and external) with research users; the engagement is built around excellent research aligned to strong external demand; all parties are open to flexible and often creative forms of engagement and when the individuals involved are fully committed to the process and outcomes. Below we highlight some of our significant KE achievements over the past few years.

4.1 Overview

We have regularly received the 2nd highest percentage of the SFC KTG allocation each year. On an FTE basis, we are the most successful of the Scottish research intensive universities as measured by KTG.

The college structure has enabled the development of:

- inter-disciplinary initiatives that focus on research and KE activities;
- institutes, centres and networks encompassing KE;
- specialist business development and KE teams at college level

KE activity is embedded in academic job descriptions and it is measured on a personal level through the University's annual performance review process and assessed on application for promotion or change in professorial zoning. Training in enterprise is offered to all post graduate research (PGR) students, early career researchers (ECR) and undergraduate students through the Enterprise Club.

We have recognised the need to provide resources and funding to pump prime impact generating activities and, building on the success of the EPSRC KTA, we have established a £1M KE fund to add to institutional KE and Impact Acceleration grants awarded by the research councils and SFC.

4.2 Industry Engagement

We have led on a number of flagship SME engagement projects (Dialogues, the Innovation Network, and currently the Encompass programme) which have resulted in:

- 100 Innovation Vouchers completed between 2010-2012
- 40% have led to follow on activities
- 56 new products or services launched by the companies,
- 22 new companies
- 82 new jobs created

EPSRC KTA supported over 30 industry collaborations in 24 months, leading to significant follow-on activities and impacts.

Our KTP portfolio has grown from 1 to 8 projects in the last 4 years.

We are leading on two Innovation Centres (in Stratified Medicine and Sensors and Imaging Systems) that will help structure Scottish HEI-industrial engagements on a sector-by-sector basis, using the breadth of our research base to provide solutions to industrial problems.

Kelvin Nanotechnology is now a sustainable and viable service company, supporting the implementation of our research and expertise in nanofabrication, in products developed for companies on a regional, national and international scale. KNT has worked with 200 companies worldwide and is anticipated to generate £1M turnover this year with substantial returns to the University.

4.3 Venturing / Spin-outs

In the area of new venture creation the University has a long-term partnership with the UK's leading early-stage technology investor – IP Group plc. This partnership provides the University with access to expertise in company creation and importantly a dedicated £5m seed fund. Examples of recent high growth ventures launched include:

- Clyde Biosciences - expected to save the pharmaceutical industry millions of pounds through more effective testing for cardiotoxicity
- Anacail Ltd – developing a new process to extend fresh food shelf-life within the supply chain from source to supermarket
- Gold Standard Simulations Ltd – developing semiconductor design software critical for enabling the next generations of smaller, more functional silicon chips for devices such as smartphones and tablet computing
- Mode Dx – developing a range of home-use diagnostic products for the early detection of diseases such as bowel cancer

In addition there is an evolving pipeline of new ventures coming through in areas such as new therapeutics for cancer and heart disease, new materials creation and instrumentation for more effective deployment of diagnostic tests e.g. in infectious disease management. Importantly these opportunities are all being made possible by the leading edge research we undertake.

4.4 Easy Access IP

In November 2010, the University took the bold move to launch Easy Access IP – where we offer free licenses to our technologies using quick and simple 1 page agreements. We recognise that only a small proportion of our IP has significant commercial value and can be commercialised through traditional licensing and spin-out creation, however, we believe most of our IP has much more value to a company and in the economy than it has to the University and we want to remove the barriers to achieving that value.

EAIP has raised much interest in technology transfer offices across the world and has started to change the way many institutions manage their IP portfolio. Not only have all the Scottish universities now adopted EAIP, but another 18 institutions across the world have now done so. This includes North America, UK, Europe, and Australasia. More organisations are currently considering taking the same approach.

We have completed 8 licenses in the last 12 months, 6 of which have been with SMEs.

4.5 Glasgow Biomedicine

In 2012, the Glasgow Biomedicine partners (principally Glasgow University and NHS) conducted an estimated 60% of all the clinical trials carried out in Scotland. The partnership has access to a patient population of over 1.31M.

Glasgow Biomedicine is the largest biomedical partnership in Scotland, with a world class reputation in early to late phase clinical trials. This partnership, comprising of world renowned scientists and clinicians, is at the forefront of clinical and translational research in the UK. With access to a large and diverse patient population, a fully operational bio repository and dedicated clinical research facilities,

Glasgow Biomedicine offers a unique integrated platform for the conduct and management of clinical research to both the academic and business community.

4.6 Institutes, Centres and Networks

The Institute for Health & Wellbeing aims to improve population health through evidence-based research that will inform policies and practices e.g. through Scottish Government and NHS, which in the longer term will positively affect the health of the Scottish workforce and thereby the economy of Scotland. IHW has created 9 KE champions for different areas of activity.

The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research is a multi-university collaboration that aims to produce excellent research and to develop excellent researchers so as to better the development of policy, practice and public debate about crime and justice. The centre has developed excellent collaborations with policymakers, practitioners and others involved with justice all over the world, where engagement is fully embedded within daily activities. This has resulted in significant contributions to public debate and policy and practice development in the field.

CREATE is a major new Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) funded Centre for Creativity, Regulation, Enterprise & Technology and is led by and based at Glasgow. Practical and engaged input by SMEs to the Centre's research programme from day one will be vital and already over 45 content creators and SMEs are committed to specific projects in the work programme.

Glasgow Refugee, Asylum and Migration Network (GRAMNet) is working across Scotland, the UK and internationally to build on the extensive expertise relating to migration, refugees and asylum within the university and its partners. GRAMNET offers extensive opportunities for KE through:

- regular eBulletins, training and workshops, Refugee Week Research Programme, conferences and events,
- artists and performers in residence,
- funded projects and partnership initiatives.

The College of Arts has signed the Glasgow Life MoU to exchange knowledge between the University and the museums, galleries, libraries, concert halls and sporting venues of the city of Glasgow. This multifaceted partnership involves collaborative research, collaborative PhDs studentships, early career researcher training and internships, staff exchanges, and development of new postgraduate programmes.

The College of Social Sciences has established a Public Policy Forum which will create a single point of contact to all our public policy related research expertise in the University.

Many Research Centres have also implemented their own KE and impact secondment and fellowship schemes with their KE partners, which have proven to be very successful models for Impact producing KE.

4.7 Public Engagement

Glasgow hosts the Scotland STEM Ambassador Network which plays an important role in local events ranging from the West End Festival (which featured a giant model of a parasite as part of its street parade) and 'Aye Write' (Glasgow's literary festival) to Scottish Refugee week.

The Hunterian Museum has recently appointed a Student Engagement Officer to work with undergraduate and postgraduate research students to facilitate short term public engagement training projects.

The Glasgow Science Festival which began in 2007 has now extended to include the entire city and involves 59 partners, 28 venues around the city. It attracted 38,000 visitors in 2011.

Café Scientifique, which is held in the Tron Theatre Glasgow, is one of few such initiatives that take science into a public place away from any academic environment. Café Sci, which was established in Glasgow in 2003, attracts audiences of up to 100 from of all ages and is hosted monthly, in an informal setting to encourage public dialogue.

The Wellcome Trust Centre for Molecular Parasitology's comic '*Parasites*' was launched during Glasgow's West End Festival and distributed in a local park (alongside a sculpture of a giant parasite)

John Butt and the Dunedin Consort bring research-led interpretation of classical music to the public through concerts and award-winning recordings by the local company Linn Records Ltd.

5 Benefits of a Knowledge Exchange Strategy

KE metrics are used to determine the level of the knowledge transfer grant from SFC and will also drive the impact component of the Research Excellence Grant. Whilst we have regularly received the 2nd highest percentage of the SFC KT Grant each year, traditionally our drivers for engaging in KE revolve around the potential income this generates and opportunities for new research; not necessarily with an eye to the potential impact from the activity.

Formalising an approach to KE will raise awareness of the importance of it and of the impact generation across the institution and if properly implemented, will enable the appropriate allocation of resources required for enhanced delivery. In addition, the formation of deeper and more structured relationships with external organisations in the public and private sectors will open up new research funding opportunities through a process of co-creation. Engagement in KE offers a route to career development for our students, early career researchers and academics.

Additionally, KE activities and close engagement with research users open up wider benefits for academics through increased profile which can support larger grant applications and increased numbers of high quality PhD and research associate applications,

6 Fit for the Future – A Strategic approach to delivering impact from research excellence

Whilst the above examples show that the University has made significant progress, largely since restructuring, in the development of KE and impact related initiatives, there are still barriers to more wide spread KE and impact development across the University.

Academics and researchers have cited a number of specific challenges and difficulties they face in undertaking KE activities. These include

- It is not always easy to measure or monitor impact and it is difficult to develop long term plans when there is no immediate or visible benefit for the time spent on KE.
- KE networks and relationships take a long time to establish and nurture.
- Most funding has been short term/project specific and it is therefore difficult to recruit & retain staff in KE roles
- Individuals need to be given the time to focus on developing and implementing KE and Impact strategies related to their own work
- There is lack of widespread knowledge or awareness of the opportunities available and individuals and groups find it difficult to start KE activities.
- There is insufficient support, guidance and topic specific information available to individual researchers or groups.

The KE and Impact Strategy should create a framework to build on our pockets of excellence and formalise some of our best practice in order to fully embed KE across the University, so that we open up more channels through which we engage and shape the pathways from research to impact. We have identified 2 overarching themes and 4 specific areas for development which, if acted on, will help embed KE across the University and also shape the way people engage with greater focus on impact rather than the process.

6 Alignment to Scottish Government Priority Industries

The University and this strategy are well aligned with the Scottish Government and Scottish Enterprise Key Industries.

The college structure has now enabled the University to break away from the traditional academic thematic areas, and develop new inter-disciplinary initiatives that focus on developing research and KE activities to meet the needs of business and industry. Many of these developments align with key economic sectors in Scotland and the priority industries. These include the formation of new institutes and networks across the University with research and knowledge exchange embedded within their own strategic plans. Examples include:

- We are working with SE and others to develop the West of Scotland Science Park as a focus for life sciences, the South Glasgow Hospital site for clinical research and knowledge exchange, and the Biocity complex for drug discovery.
- Enhancing the Glasgow Biomedicine concept to combine strengths and to market the Glasgow-wide capability of clinical research, including clinical trials, more effectively.
- Leading new pan-Scottish Innovation Centres for Sensors and Stratified Medicine in partnership with other HEIs, public organisations, large multinational companies and SMEs.
- Developing the Kelvin Hall as a focus for collections research and knowledge exchange in partnership with Glasgow Life.
- CREATE - Major new AHRC-funded Centre for Creativity, Regulation, Enterprise & Technology (CREATE) will be based at Glasgow. The Centre's vision is based on the perspective of SMEs and individual creators and it is a joint research and knowledge exchange centre.

In addition to the thematic activities, the University provides wider support for business engagements, with a specific focus on supporting Scottish SMEs to access the knowledge and expertise of the University. Our Knowledge Exchange team, working with the various networks, clusters and institutes, provides an outward facing approach to SME engagement, including the provision of First Step Awards to develop and pump prime new engagements.

The KE Strategy must continue to support the development of these key priority areas and enhance our contributions to the Scottish Economy and Society.

7 Alignment to our Internationalisation Strategy

There are many synergies and therefore opportunities for joined up thinking between the KE, Impact and Internationalisation activities. The Internationalisation strategy focuses on 6 themes and below we highlight the alignment with the KE and Impact Strategy.

7.1 The Student Experience

The Internationalisation Strategy focuses on preparing students for global employment and citizenship. Student experience is entrenched in the KE and Impact Strategy, through the development of more formal support for student enterprise activities with a focus on Enterprise Education and Business Start-ups and through the more general inclusion of undergraduate and postgraduate students in our knowledge exchange activities. These activities will be jointly developed and delivered through collaboration between Colleges, Careers and the Research Strategy and Innovation Office.

7.2 Research and Knowledge Transfer

There is obviously an overlap in this priority area, as growing research and KE business internationally, to achieve a position of one of the world's top research intensive universities is core to the Glasgow 2020 vision. Both the KE and Internationalisation strategies recognise the importance of developing strategic international alliances in areas where we have shared research and KE interest. For example, research, KE and impact form a significant element of the TNE collaboration with the Singapore Institute of Technology.

7.3 Staff

The objective of the Internationalisation Strategy focuses on effectively supporting staff engagement with the goals of internationalisation, which is similar to increasing staff engagement in KE. There are clearly opportunities for cross over between KE and Internationalisation where activities can effectively contribute to both our KE and International agendas. Examples include the promotion of international staff exchanges, development of mechanisms to harness regional and culture knowledge which can support KE and research activities and in the development of international partnerships.

7.4 Alumni

There is a strong overlap and opportunity for more collaborative working in this area. More effectively engaging with international alumni is of key importance for the commercialisation of University IP, where they can offer significant input and insights into commercialising our knowledge and expertise in international markets. For example, there is a joint programme being developed between RSIO and the alumni and development office to University spin out companies in their international development activities.

7.5 Partnerships

The development of mutually beneficial partnerships with appropriate organisations such as education institutions, governments and industry is at the heart of our KE and Internationalisation activities. We need to share development across the boundaries and work collectively in the development of such international partnership which often embrace research, teaching and KE.

7.6 Local Engagement

The University plays an important role as a strategic partner with the city and West of Scotland and is committed to the region's economic, social and cultural prosperity. Our research and KE networks and SME outreach programmes are a key component of our KE and Impact activities and we build on our international research capability and partners to support our engagements. The University is also fully engaged with the Sustainable Glasgow programme and supporting the legacy planning around the Commonwealth games. The University also plays an important role in Scotland's cultural life through the Glasgow Life collaboration. These cultural engagements have extensive international interests and our aim is to develop the cultural offerings for the benefit of local communities and to use our expertise to lead national and international thinking in these areas.

Draft Impact and Knowledge Exchange Strategy 2013-2016

Delivering Impact from Research Excellence

1. Background

Impact is the demonstrable contribution that **excellent research** (basic, user-inspired and applied) makes to society and the economy. It embraces the diverse ways in which **research-related knowledge** and skills benefit individuals, organisations and nations by:

- fostering global economic performance and specifically the economic competitiveness of the United Kingdom;
- increasing the effectiveness of public services and policy;
- enhancing quality of life, health and creative output.¹

Knowledge Exchange is the *“The two-way flow of people and ideas between the research environment and wider economy, thereby contributing to national prosperity, the quality of life of citizens, and cultural enrichment of our society. Knowledge transfer encompasses the systems and processes by which knowledge, expertise and skilled people transfer between the research environment and its user communities in industry, commerce, public and service sectors”*.²

Research related impacts are derived through many different mechanisms across the university including consultancy, collaborative or contract research, staff exchanges, licensing and spin out company formation, public engagement, CPD and training and student enterprise. All of the different forms of knowledge exchange are embraced and included within this strategy.

Knowledge exchange (KE) and research derived impact is integral to the vision and mission of the University of Glasgow as demonstrated in the University's strategic plan [Glasgow 2020: a global vision](#) – which sets out our aspiration to enhance our position as one of the world's great, broad-based, research intensive universities that meets the strategic needs of our stakeholders.

The University now wants to formalise its approach to KE to demonstrate the value and the importance it places on embedding KE across the breadth of research, teaching and training activities to maximise the value we create for our partners, society, the public and the economy.

Maximising impact from research requires efficient and effective KE with external stakeholders including industry, third-sector organisations, the public sector and individuals at a regional, national and global level. In developing this strategy, we recognise that we are already engaged in KE and in creating a variety of positive external impacts. However, we must move beyond traditional responsive KE activities and proactively shape the pathways from research to impact by embedding KE across our entire portfolio and in our strategic decision making processes. By changing how researchers plan for and undertake KE activities, the institution will also challenge our external partners to be part of our culture of research.

Increasingly, our diverse range of research funders expect the work they sponsor to have impact beyond the academic community. For the first time in 2014, UK universities will be assessed not only on their research excellence, but also on the impacts derived from that research. It is expected that the weighting placed on impact to determine both quality rating and funding will increase in future assessments.

¹ <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/kei/Pages/home.aspx>

² RCUK and DUIS definition of knowledge exchange

The SFC is also increasing its emphasis on KE, as they seek to develop a 'step-change' in the engagement of public policy and service providers, business and industry with Scotland's universities by removing any barriers to the exploitation of research for economic and wider societal benefit at the University level. As part of this process the University has now signed an outcome agreement with SFC demonstrating our commitment to increasing KE activities by 7.5% year on year, creating 2-3 high growth spin-out companies and expanding our Easy Access IP portfolio by 10 each year. <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/planning/information>

This strategy outlines our vision, goals and approach to KE and impact. Mindful that strategy is ineffective without a clear view of how it will be implemented, this document is designed to guide the development of action plans at all levels within the university. It will provide toolkit to support researchers, schools, and colleges in identifying, developing and delivering impact from their research

Our philosophy is built around the following goals where we want to;

- Build longer term, mutually beneficial relationships with external partners
- Support our partners to achieve success through contributions to the development of products and processes leading to economic, cultural and societal benefits;
- Inform legislation, policy and governmental guidelines for local, national and international agendas;
- Promote cultural exchange within and between communities at local, national and international levels;
- Improve the health and wellbeing of our communities and environment;
- Create career development opportunities for our students and academics.

2. Strategy

Aim

Capitalising on the strength of our research portfolio we aim to accelerate generation of economic and societal impacts in the UK and internationally through proactive KE activities and relationships.

We will focus on 2 overarching themes and 4 specific areas for development that, when implemented across the University, will help us achieve our defined aim. By implementing a holistic strategy, we will establish a university-wide framework for directing resource and activity, leading to KE and external impacts with greater reach and significance.

Overarching themes

- A. **Environment and Infrastructure** - Create an environment where innovation, creativity, and enterprise flourish and increase the number of staff and students engaging in KE, commercialisation and public engagement.
- B. **Internationalisation** - To utilise our strong UK based KE track record (for example in developing and leading Innovation Centres) in the strategic development of our international partnerships and to attract business and other stakeholders to Scotland.

Specific areas

- C. **Partnerships** - Establish distinctive and user-focussed approaches to university-research user relationships that position us as a partner of choice for industry, cultural organisations and public service providers.
- D. **Leadership** - Position the University to proactively lead more collaborative, large-scale, multi-disciplinary research and KE programmes.
- E. **Public Engagement** - Stimulate a wider understanding of academic research by enthusing the public about current issues, the creative process and the aspirations and outcomes of our endeavours.
- F. **Enterprise and Commercialisation** - Commercialise our intellectual assets, knowledge and expertise through innovative, flexible and pragmatic management practices that deliver value to all parties.

3. Strategic themes and objectives

A. Environment and Infrastructure

Successful knowledge exchange and impact creation is dependent on the skills, knowledge and creativity of our academic researchers and students. It is therefore essential that the university provides an appropriate environment and infrastructure that enables KE activities to thrive and where academics and researchers feel supported in pursuing these activities.

Current position: Barriers have been identified by academics and researchers undertaking KE related to their work, where it is often viewed as an additional, unsupported activity or process beyond research and teaching.

Objectives

Create an environment where innovation, creativity, and enterprise flourish and increase the number of staff and students engaging in knowledge exchange, commercialisation and public engagement.

- A1.** Encourage and support the development of college, school, institute and research group level KE and impact plans and invest in the provision of a support infrastructure to aid their delivery.
- A2.** Develop more targeted knowledge exchange training, mentoring and sharing of best practice.
- A3.** Review P&DR and Workload models to ensure that KE and impact generation are given appropriate recognition in job descriptions, promotion and zoning criteria.
- A4.** Invest in resources to develop and implement a coherent web and social media strategy for knowledge exchange and public engagement communications.
- A5.** Use existing interdisciplinary research, UG, PG and ECR networks more widely to promote KE opportunities to themselves, share their experiences and best practices and develop new models for engagement.
- A6.** Establish processes to track and record KE activities, partnerships and the impacts that arise from them.

B. Internationalisation

As a Global University, internationalisation is embedded in our core teaching and research activities and we need to ensure we build upon this base and embed KE within these programmes. For example embedding KE within our Transnational Education Programmes, and using our experience of leading large scale industrial and commercial programmes to enhance our international partnerships, could yield significant benefits in terms of our international offering.

Current position: Much of our international KE and impact activities focus on commercialisation or collaboration around specific research programmes and outcomes. Academics are also involved in influential, advisory capacities around the world, which is not something that is regularly recorded or captured. The other priority areas of the strategy support these developments for both local and international activities.

Objectives

To utilise our strong UK based KE track record (for example in developing and leading Innovation Centres) in the strategic development of our international partnerships and to attract business and other stakeholders to Scotland.

- B1.** Include 5 or 6 examples of strong KE and Impact examples within our International promotion activities. These should include the innovation centres and key partnerships such as Glasgow Life and CREATE.
- B2.** Use our international partners, networks and alumni to forge links with non-UK research users.
- B3.** To increase our visibility as a leading international research led university that delivers local, national and international impact through strategic and tactical partnerships and members of international networks.

C. Partnerships

The development of non-academic impacts clearly requires close cooperation and understanding between the University and other organisations and individuals. Partnerships are an essential element for effective knowledge exchange because they can provide a key link between user needs, long-term research and a clear route to application or exploitation of research outcomes. Experience shows that partnerships should be built on the **two-way flow of people and knowledge** and draw upon the **wider strengths of the University** beyond individual academics, including our facilities and teaching capabilities.

Current position: We currently engage with a large and diverse range of organisations, through which we exchange knowledge. However, only a small number of engagements have led to longer term, more strategic partnerships.

Objectives

Establish distinctive and user-focussed approaches to university-research user relationships that position us as a partner of choice for industry, cultural organisations and public service providers.

- C1.** Develop more long-term, structured or strategic partnerships with local, national and international organisations and implement a structured approach to relationship management.
- C2.** Create more opportunities for external engagements that lead to mutually beneficial research, collaborations through which we accelerate the impact of our research outcomes.
- C3.** Enhance our engagement with Scottish business, in particular small and medium sized companies.

D. Leadership

Research funders are increasingly moving towards consolidated funding of larger-scale centres, which involve elements of basic, user inspired and applied research, working alongside end-users. Typically these involve multi-disciplinary and multi-institution proposals. Building on strong external partnerships we also need strong leadership to manage such initiatives (for example innovation centres), and other large scale research and KE funding.

Current position: We are successfully leading large scale research and KE programmes in one or two areas. We have excellent research networks through which we should be able to develop our leadership.

Objectives

Position the University to proactively lead more collaborative, large-scale, multi-disciplinary research and KE programmes.

- D1.** Use peer-to-peer and formal training to up skill potential future leaders in KE and impact generation.
- D2.** Invest in resource to support current research networks (e.g GRAMNET, GCID, Global Security, Sustainability), and create new inter-disciplinary networks to lead the development and co-creation of research with industry, public sector, and society.
- D3.** Engage in strategic networks and committees that will contribute to setting local, regional, national and European priority areas for development.

E. Public Engagement

Public engagement describes the things we do to connect and share our research with the public. When we do it well it can generate mutual benefit, with all parties learning from each other through sharing knowledge, expertise and skills. The process can build trust, understanding and collaboration, and increase the sector's relevance to, and impact on, civil society.

Current position: Committed enthusiasts are largely responsible for most of our public engagement activity that takes places on a regional, national and international level. Whilst we have often adopted an innovative approach to the design of new channels it is not as integrated across the institution and culture as it might be.

Objectives

Stimulate a wider understanding of academic research by enthusing the public about current issues, the creative process and the aspirations and outcomes of our endeavours.

E1. Support researchers to build the capacity and capability to participate in high quality, effective engagement with the public, by forming a network of expertise.

E2. Embed a framework to support, manage, monitor and assess the success and impacts of public engagements.

E3. Make better use of our facilities and infrastructure such as the Hunterian Museum and local initiatives (Glasgow Science Centre and Glasgow Life) to further our leadership in public engagement based on our world-leading research.

F. Enterprise and Commercialisation

We are fortunate to have an environment that is rich with intellectual assets and facilities beyond the means of other organisations. As a result, the world leading research undertaken here often results in new inventions and innovations that have potential to contribute to disruptive industry solutions with significant economic and job creation potential. These developments are usually very early stage and high-risk and we often need to work with others to realise their value.

Current position: We have an excellent track record in enterprise and commercialisation and a strong strategic partnership with IP Group.

Objectives

Commercialise our intellectual assets, knowledge and expertise through innovative, flexible and pragmatic management practices that deliver value to all parties.

F1. Create high quality, high growth companies with significant potential for wealth and job creation in Scotland and make key early stage investments where necessary.

F2. Protect and license valuable and rapidly exploitable intellectual property on fair terms.

F3. Channel intellectual property into Easy Access IP as appropriate, and increase the volume of technologies available via this initiative.

F4. Increase the volume and value of translational research income to support the development and commercialisation of early stage Intellectual Property.

F5. Support the development of student and researcher enterprise through provision of appropriate training and facilities.

4. Implementation

To support the implementation of the strategy the University will put together a series of action plans, focusing on the priority areas for each of the 4 Colleges. In the first instance, we have identified the following 8 activities as the key tasks which must be undertaken.

1. Undertake a bench marking exercise to capture the breath of our KE activities and develop a system for capturing and sharing this knowledge across the University.
2. Review our support infrastructure and bench mark against other institutions and develop more focussed KE support structures.
3. Engage with policy makers to further influence how KE and Impact should be measured.
4. Promote the University's nationally and internationally as a globally engaged, Scottish based institution that is able to attract business to the region.
5. Identify developing companies that we should seek to build relationships with, using the business development teams and senior management support where required.
6. Establish a framework model of strategic partnerships.
7. Further enhance our engagement and influence with the UK's Enterprise agencies and key funders such as the Technology Strategy Board.
8. Develop and implement a coherent web, social media strategy for KE and public engagement communication.

5. Performance Indicators

- Increase the volume and value of collaborative research and KE activities by 7.5% year on year.
- Increase our income from the Technology Strategy Board.
- Identify 10 opportunities for strategic level engagements and well developed "value propositions" by 2015.
- Exchange at least 4 strategic research and KE related memorandums of understanding by 2015.
- Launch 2 innovation centres in 2013.
- Increase the number of public events, exhibitions or performances delivered based on our research outcomes.
- Grow third party translational funding to mature assets for investment, e.g. SE POC fund, RCUK follow-on fund, Biomedical Catalyst.
- Form 2-3 high growth spin-out companies per year.
- Conclude 5 new high value licenses per year.
- License 10 new Easy Access IP technologies per year.
- Increase the number of staff and research students engaging in KE engagement activities.