

## **Court**

### **Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 10 April 2013 in the Rutherford McCowan Building, Dumfries Campus**

#### **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, Dr Marie Freel Senate Member, Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP Rector (chair from item 37.2), Mr Alan Macfarlane General Council Member, Mr Donald Mackay SRC Member on Court, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor's Representative, 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) (to item 37.1), Professor Michael Scott-Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Adrienne Scullion Senate Member, Dr Donald Spaeth Senate 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) (to item 3.1), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate), Professor John Chapman (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), 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)

#### **Apologies:**

**Members:** Professor Christine Forde Senate Member, Mr James Harrison SRC President, Cllr Matt Kerr Glasgow City Council Assessor, Mr Brian McBride General Council Member, Mr Kevin Sweeney General Council Member

**Attendees:** Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Murray Pittock (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal)

#### **CRT/2012/34. Announcements**

Court thanked Professor Andrea Nolan for her outstanding contribution to the University over many years and wished her well for her appointment as Principal of Edinburgh Napier University.

#### **CRT/2012/35. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 11 February 2013**

The minutes were approved.

#### **CRT/2012/36. Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising.

## **CRT/2012/37. Reports of Court Committees**

### *CRT/2012/37.1 Human Resources Committee*

#### *CRT/2012/37.1.1 Management of Organisational Change/Redundancy Policy*

At its December meeting, 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 the discussions had each felt that there remained merit in allowing further consultation to take place.

A 'tiered' approach had been developed to deal with the different types of organisational change, and to allow Court to adopt different approaches commensurate with the proposed change. For Tier 2, which had been the focus of much of the discussion at the December Court meeting, a new Committee of Court, the Court Procedural Review Group (CPRG) would be established to scrutinise proposals and, from the October to June Court meetings each year, recommend to Court the actions Court should take. Court would therefore be able to have strategic oversight of proposals, but might in some circumstances decide to leave them in the management sphere. During the summer months, the CPRG would decide on Tier 2 cases without automatic reference to Court. It was proposed that the policy be reviewed in October 2014: this review would include the effectiveness of the tiered approach and the CPRG.

David Anderson, chair of the HR Committee, reported that the HR committee, by majority, had approved the proposed policy at its meeting on 27 March 2013. Mr Anderson explained that, however, in his capacity as a lay member of Court he did not support the policy as now presented, which was also the position of the other lay members of the HR Committee.

Alan Owen, a Senate Assessor member of the HR Committee, reported that he was pleased to support the proposed policy.

Mr Anderson explained that the main reason for him not supporting the policy related to the arrangements relating to Tier 2 cases: one of the key objectives in reviewing the procedure had been to reduce the time spent by Court on looking at matters relating to management of organisational change, but what was being proposed effectively meant no change was occurring, and indeed some matters might be looked at twice, by the CPRG and by Court. Another objective of the review had been to allow managers to manage; this Mr Anderson considered had not been achieved. He also felt that there was an inconsistency in that the CPRG would be authorised to make decisions over the summer recess, whereas outside the summer recess matters of a similar nature would be required to be referred to Court. Mr Anderson considered that a compromise, rather than best HR practice, was being put forward.

A number of lay members of Court confirmed that they did not support the policy as presented, objecting to the extra layer required by Tier 2 cases coming to Court; to the potential additional work for Court in having to consider virtually all cases; and to their not considering that Court's role was to be engaged in such detail in the day to day management of the University.

The Principal commented that he appreciated concerns from lay members, but highlighted that the policy had been approved with the consent of the unions, which was positive from the University's perspective, and that the policy, including the role of the CPRG, could be reviewed in 2014 by way of safeguard. Ian Black commented that the policy had been rewritten to remove Redundancy and Structural Change Committees which had existed previously. The process would therefore be more streamlined than it had been, with Court being provided with more information earlier in the process, with an option to discuss

matters in more detail if it considered this necessary. There was also greater emphasis on avoidance and mitigation.

A number of Senate Assessors and staff representatives spoke in favour of the proposed policy, supporting the early identification of Tier 2 cases and the checks, balances and protections provided for in the policy, which were important in the context of trust; referring to Court's responsibility as the employer of all staff and therefore to it being correct that Court be involved; referring to the importance of reducing anxiety for staff affected in such situations; and reminding members that there existed a mechanism for the policy to be reviewed in 18 months.

Following the discussion and on a vote, Court approved the procedure by a majority of 12 to 8. Court noted that a review of the policy would take place in 2014.

David Anderson noted that strenuous efforts had rightly been made by the SMG to consult with Senate Assessors and employee representatives to ensure that their views were fully considered as the policy was developed. Lay members had not been consulted in the same way and this should be registered as a matter of concern. He believed that this raised an important issue around governance and asked that this be a topic at the Court governance discussion day. This was agreed.

#### *CRT/2012/37.1.2 Competency Procedure*

The policy had been commended to Court as providing a comprehensive, fair way of dealing with performance issues for staff. It encouraged early intervention and supportive action, and was triggered as circumstances arose and was not dependent on timetables and outcomes driven by other policies. It had been agreed with the campus Trade Unions after extensive consultation. The HR committee had approved the policy at its meeting on 27 March 2013.

Court approved the Competency Procedure.

#### *CRT/2012/37.1.3 Public Sector Equality Duty*

Court had received a paper detailing the University's requirements to meet the Public Sector Equality Duty. Some elements of this area related to students, and others to staff; the details had therefore been to a number of committees including the Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee, the Education Policy and Strategy Committee, and the HR Committee. The different committees had approved the relevant sections for both staff and students, and the 6 Equality Outcomes.

Court noted the content and action plans, and approved the following: the Equality Outcomes; the Equality and Diversity Strategy Action Plan as the University's Mainstreaming Report; the Equal Pay statement; and the timescale for the Equal Pay Audit.

#### *CRT/2012/37.2 Finance Committee*

##### *CA/2012/37.2.1. MRC Unit Transfer*

Finance Committee had 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 had agreed to recommend to Court that the transfer of the Units be 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 timetables for completion of the two transfers, Finance Committee had recommended that Court approve delegated authority to the Principal, the Secretary of Court and the Convenor of Court.

Court approved the recommendations.

*CA/2012/37.2.3 South Glasgow Hospital Learning and Teaching Facility*

Finance Committee had received a capital expenditure application requesting £4.975m to develop a learning and teaching facility at the new South Glasgow Hospital. Finance Committee had 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/2012/37.2.4 South Glasgow Clinical Research Facility*

The Committee had considered a capital expenditure application to develop a Clinical Research Facility at the South Glasgow Hospital. The application had noted that the capital expenditure (£4.989m) would be met by external donations and by fundraising through the Development and Alumni Office. Finance Committee had approved the development of the Clinical Research Facility.

*CA/2012/37.2.5 James Watt South Mezzanine/Chemistry Laboratory*

Finance Committee had approved applications from the College of Science and Engineering to develop additional research facilities within James Watt South Building; and to develop laboratory space to enhance the world class research opportunities in Chemistry.

*CRT/2012/37.2.6 Overview of Performance as at 28 February 2013*

Court noted an Overview of Performance.

With regard to the debtors' report it was noted that the level of student debt was not such that it was causing concern and indeed a more proactive approach to recovery had reduced the level compared to the previous year.

*CRT/2012/37.2.7 Investment Managers Report*

Court noted the Investment Report.

*CRT/2012/37.3 Estates Committee*

*CRT/2012/37.3.1 Heritage Lottery Fund HLF bid – Kelvin Hall*

Professor Neal Juster, Vice-Principal Strategy & Resources, updated Court on a proposed Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) bid connected to the 'Phase 1' redevelopment of the Kelvin Hall, where the aim was to contribute to a 'cultural quarter' in the West End, providing visitor attractions, a world class research and teaching resource, and also storage space for University collections which were currently widely dispersed, some in locations that were not fit for purpose. The deadline for submission to HLF was 13 June, and therefore a decision on this matter would require to be made before the next meeting of Court.

Court noted that the proposed redevelopment would be a significant cultural asset for the University and the city. There were several other partners involved in the project, who would also be required to confirm their commitment to it. In particular, the nature of the City Council's commitment must be made clear regarding the ongoing costs of maintaining the new facility. Court noted also the ambition to follow the Phase 1 Kelvin Hall development with an ambitious 'Phase 2' development that would involve locating the University's Hunterian Museum and Art Gallery collections at Kelvin Hall. This was an exciting prospect, on which Court would require much more information at a future date, in terms of anticipated costs, possible income streams, the commitments of other parties, and the prospects for fund-raising.

Court approved a request that discussions continue on the possible submission of the HLF bid and that delegated authority be given to Estates and Finance Committees to approve submission in order to meet the 13 June deadline. Such a decision would require further discussions at Senior Management Group, and options appraisals, relating to the academic and financial cases for investment and the building's fitness for purpose.

#### *CRT/2012/37.3.2 South Glasgow Hospital*

Court noted the University's underwriting risk in respect of the South Glasgow Hospital (Teaching and Learning and Clinical Research Facilities).

#### *CRT/2012/37.3.3 CapEx Applications*

Court noted Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications in respect of Gilmorehill Halls in the sum of £200k; Chemistry Laboratories, Joseph Black Building £2.955m; Queen Elizabeth Building, Glasgow Royal Infirmary £1.715m; and James Watt South Mezzanine (Room 455) £2.95m.

#### *CRT/2012/37.4 Audit Committee*

Court noted the report from the Audit Committee.

#### *CRT/2012/37.5 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee*

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

### **CRT/2012/38. Report from the Principal**

#### *CRT/2012/38.1 SFC Grant Award*

Court noted brief details of the 2013/14 SFC grant award, further details of which would be available for the next meeting. The awards had been approached differently because of the Outcome Agreements, with each institution receiving an individual letter in the first instance.

#### *CRT/2012/38.2 Trans-national Education*

Court noted the draft TNE strategy, which was now nearing the conclusion of a consultation process, and was due to go to Senate later in April for final comment and input. A presence in certain countries, as well as delivery of programmes, was important to the University's strategy in this area. Court noted that work was under way to ensure that students were well integrated

into the 'Glasgow experience' despite not being on the Glasgow campus, and to widen the subject areas being studied.

*CRT/2012/38.3 Nursing and Healthcare*

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 had 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. These were ongoing. Court noted the final report of the School of Medicine's internal working group.

Any proposal for a future model of provision would be brought back to Court.

*CRT/2012/38.4 Senior Management*

Court members had met in private at the beginning of the meeting and had approved a recommendation from the Principal that Professor Neal Juster be appointed as Senior Vice-Principal and Deputy Vice Chancellor in succession to Professor Andrea Nolan, for the period 1 July 2013 until 31 July 2016.

*CRT/2012/38.5 Key Activities*

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

**CRT/2012/39. Report from the Secretary of Court**

*CRT/2012/38.1 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 had 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 had been formed and consultants appointed to support the Steering Group in developing the new Code.

The Steering Group would publish a draft Code shortly. Court had agreed that a sub-group of Court might be convened, if required, to consider and comment on the draft Code. Court now approved the formation of the sub-group, to include the chairs of Court committees, Senate Assessor, a staff representative and the SRC President.

*CRT/2012/38.2 Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill*

Court had been briefed on the contents of the Post-16 Education Bill, and had submitted comments on it to the Education & Culture Committee. The Committee had concluded its Stage 1 consideration of the Bill on 20 March, and on 27 March the Scottish Parliament had approved the Bill's progress to Stage 2. With regard to University Governance, Section 3 of the draft bill placed a requirement on universities to comply with principles of good governance and management practice, as determined by Scottish Ministers. The University had 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 had encouraged the Minister to consider this suggested amendment, which might be adopted when Stage 2 was presented.

Court would be kept updated at future meetings.

*CRT/2012/38.3 Glasgow University Union*

The Senate Office had initiated an investigation into complaints against students of the University relating to events at this year's Glasgow University Union (GUU) Ancients Debating Championship. In addition, GUU's officers had committed to an independent review of the culture within the GUU to ensure that it provided a welcoming and safe environment for everyone. The GUU's officers were in discussion with the Principal, the Clerk of Senate and the Secretary of Court regarding the nature of this review.

*CRT/2012/38.4 Pensions Liability – University of Glasgow Pension Scheme UGPS*

In October 2012, Court had 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 had 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 had communicated again with Court in December, asking that the University increase substantially its financial commitment to the pension scheme.

Court had established an expert working group to provide advice on this matter, given its significance and the technical nature of the analysis required. The Group's role was 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 had been several discussions of this business, involving the Senior Management Group (SMG), the Pension Trustees and the Court working group. In addition, SMG members had briefed the relevant campus trade unions. Discussions were ongoing and it was anticipated that the working group would receive a proposal from SMG in time to consider it and report with recommendations to the meeting of Court on 19 June.

*CRT/2012/38.5 Nominations Committee*

Nominations Committee had 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 had approved this via email following the February meeting.

*CRT/2012/38.6 Staff Engagement Development Plan*

The Year 1 Review of the University Restructure had identified the need for managers to engage more effectively with staff throughout the University. The Staff Engagement Development Plan, setting out how this was being taken forward, was noted by Court.

*CRT/2012/38.7 Heads of School*

The following appointment had been made:

*College of Social Sciences*

*Business School*

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

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

*College of Arts*

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

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

*School of Critical Studies (current Head Professor Nigel Leask)*

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

*CRT/2012/38.8 Draft Resolutions*

The following draft Resolutions had been approved. They related to academic matters including degree regulations, and had been 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.

### **CRT/2012/39. Report on Research**

Professor Steve Beaumont, Vice Principal Research & Enterprise, provided a report on Research performance, KPIs and the Research Excellence Framework (REF).

Court was reminded of the environmental factors currently existing. With regard to the SFC-related factors, the SFC Working party recommendations on single Knowledge Exchange office had been accepted, Innovation Centres had been launched, and Outcome Agreements were in place; with regard to Research Councils and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, the outcome of a spending review was awaited, Open Access was being promoted for publications and research data, and the Triennial Review was in progress. The EU's plans to increase the budget for research had not yet been approved but the current expectation was that it would be in the region of €70bn.

Court noted KPIs relating to Research, and trends in areas including: Research Award volume and contribution rates; contribution from KTG eligible awards, which continued to grow; research order book movement; PGR student population figures, where Court also noted details of the PGR Experience Survey. Court heard that there had been a recent increase in the run-rate of new awards, and noted significant achievements including: the establishment of CREATE, the UK wide research centre for copyright law and new business models in the creative economy, led from Glasgow; a new Centre of Excellence in Rheumatoid Arthritis Research; a £5M EPSRC Frontier Engineering award in the application of Synthetic Biology to water and wastewater treatment; and the University leading two (of three) Scottish Innovation Centres, in Stratified Medicine and Sensors & Imaging Systems. These achievements built on strategic investments in interdisciplinary research and the formation of research institutes.

Court received details of progress to date with regard to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) process; and details of academic appointments and leavers and actions arising from the latter. Court also noted progress on Case Impact studies relating to the REF.

Court thanked Professor Beaumont for the briefing.

**CRT/2012/40. Knowledge Exchange and Impact Strategy**

Court received a briefing on the Knowledge Exchange and Impact Strategy from Professor Steve Beaumont. The context was that the Government and research funder focus was moving towards the recognition and reward of academic endeavour beyond traditional research outputs and included a significant element covering the creation of economic, societal, cultural or policy related impacts. These impacts would be assessed for the first time in 2014. The expectation was that there would be increasing emphasis on impact in the quality profile and associated funding. Given the importance of this area, the University needed to become more systematic and proactive in ensuring that identifiable impacts were derived from research wherever possible.

The aim of the strategy was to capitalise on the breadth of the research portfolio and thereby to accelerate generation of economic and societal impacts in the UK and internationally, through proactive knowledge exchange activities and relationships. The strategy focused on 6 enabling themes which, once implemented, would maximise opportunities to make research relevant to users, have it taken up by them, and demonstrate impact. These themes included positioning the University as a partner of choice for industry, cultural organisations and public service providers; leadership development; commercialisation; and public engagement, accompanied by cross-theme institutional support and an intention to capitalise on impact generating opportunities arising from the internationalisation agenda. Court noted action plans associated with these areas.

Court approved the Knowledge Exchange and Impact Strategy.

**CRT/2012/41. Report from the Rector**

The Rector had no matters to raise.

**CRT/2012/42. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**CRT/2012/43. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 19 June 2013 in the Senate Room



**Court - Wednesday 19 June 2013**

## **Principal's Report**

### **Items A : For Discussion**

#### **1. Pension Scheme**

As Court is aware from reports to previous meetings, the chair of the Trustees of the UGPS advised the University in late 2012 that the UK's Pensions Regulator had raised concerns regarding the UGPS deficit recovery plan, the deficit having increased significantly because of the low rate of return applying to Government bonds. The Trustees commissioned an independent review of the strength of the University's financial covenant and a review of arrangements for funding the deficit. The Trustees subsequently asked the University to increase substantially its financial commitment to the pension scheme. Court established an expert working group to provide advice on the matter, to review proposals for addressing the current UGPS deficit, and to consider the future benefit structure of UGPS.

The Senior Management Group, the Pension Trustees and the Court working group have had a series of discussions on this issue. SMG members have also briefed the relevant campus trade unions.

#### **2. SFC Grant Award letter**

As in April, at the time of issue of the Court papers, the SFC has not issued its announcement of the annual grant to HEIs. A verbal update will be provided at the Court meeting should there be new information available.

The University of Glasgow has recently been awarded an additional £2.5million by the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) to support world leading (4\*) research. The sum is part of a £14.8 million package to be shared among Scottish Universities, based on their existing research ratings, to help further boost Scottish output of world leading research and help further improve the international reputation and standing of our universities.

### **Items B: For Information**

#### **3. University Rankings**

We now have data from the first two of the UK League Tables, The Complete University Guide and The Guardian. The next one out will be The Times around the 20 June.

In the Complete University Guide we have dropped to 23rd from 17th place last year. We are now 21st in the Guardian league table, down from 14th last year.

Planning Services has carried out an initial analysis of the data to try and understand if there are consistent messages coming through and which we can take action to address. As I have repeatedly stressed, however, we need to be careful and measured in how we respond and react to league tables and be certain that we are acting on real issues rather than selective perspectives.

The initial analysis suggests that our *Staff:Student* ratio has dropped for both tables and that this is putting a downward pressure on our rankings. We are also dropping in *Spend per Student*. It also appears that others are improving their scores in these metrics faster than we are. The Guardian table uses expenditure at “the Guardian subject” level rather than University level, where large changes have occurred and this is being investigated, but it may be that our bigger student population is driving this result.

We do however seem to be improving in:

- Graduate prospects (with this improving our ranking);
- Entry Tariff (though not as fast as others);
- Completion (but we are still behind the rest of the Russell Group and are 45<sup>th</sup> in the UK for completion rates in the Complete University Guide).

The gap we have enjoyed in previous years from our very good NSS score and which was previously compensating for our poorer scores on other metrics is diminishing. We are seeing less of an advantage now.

It appears that our NSS results from last year have fed into these league tables differently. We dropped a number of places in the Complete University Guide for student satisfaction (NSS) as our overall score had fallen slightly. The Guardian however focuses on some of the teaching questions as well as the overall satisfaction and they give their own weights to the NSS. As a consequence we appear to have improved in the individual NSS rankings for Teaching, Feedback and Overall Satisfaction.

With respect to specific subjects, we are performing well in some across the two league tables and this includes:

- Dentistry coming 1st and 2nd in the UK;
- Vet Medicine coming 1<sup>st</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> in the UK;
- Computing Science coming 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> in the UK;
- Geography and Environmental Science coming 5<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>;
- Drama and Dance coming 5<sup>th</sup> in the Complete University Guide.

There are some subjects, however, where we are not performing as well, and we need to look at the reasons for this and develop action plans for improvement where necessary.

With respect to the Russell Group (RG) we have held up well in the Guardian. While we have dropped from 9th to 12th this year in the RG ranking, this is because 3 of the new RG members are above us. On a positive note, our NSS scores are strong in the RG, and we are joint top for the overall NSS score.

In the Complete University Guide we are now 16th in the Russell Group down from 10th last year, again partly because the 3 new RG institutions are now showing ahead of us. This does, though, leave us 3 places further back. High *student:staff ratio* (only Exeter and Leeds are higher) and bottom of the table for *Degree Completion* are the main drivers for this. We are still improving on completion rates and we will be doing further work on the HESA data this year in an attempt to further enhance this.

With respect to Scotland, we are 3<sup>rd</sup> in the Complete University guide, behind Edinburgh and St Andrews which is consistent with previous outcomes. In the Guardian however, we have dropped from 2<sup>nd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> and are now behind Edinburgh and Heriot-Watt.

Over the coming months we are intending to produce some further analysis on what we can do about it in terms of the data quality of our Returns and/or by specific actions.

#### **4. 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.

##### ***4.1 Academic Development and Strategy***

I had the pleasure of opening the 6<sup>th</sup> Annual University of Glasgow Learning and Teaching Conference on 19 April. It had an interesting and very pertinent programme particularly focusing on how we can harness technology to enhance the student learning experience. Exciting and challenging prospects lie ahead as we seek to maximise the use of technology and marry it with our physical campus in the delivery of learning and teaching excellence.

On 26 April, I was involved in the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA)/Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons/AVMA exit interviews in relation to the Accreditation of the Vet school. AVMA accreditation is very important to our Vet school in terms of reputation and standing in the USA, a key area for international recruitment to the school.

Court will know that we met on 31 May to consider and discuss particular areas in relation to the draft Code of Good HE Governance. I hope, like me, you found this exercise to be very useful and important in clarifying our thoughts on the way forward.

As reported in previous Court reports, I have been involved in Chair appointments though due to pressures on my diary, I have not been so heavily committed over the last few weeks. The most recent interview was for the Chair in Urban Economics and Finance (6 June).

Externally, I was involved in Universities Scotland meetings on 16 April and again on 4 June for the main committee which was followed by a Universities Scotland-SFC Liaison meeting. I also attended a Russell Group meeting (25 April).

On the 12 June I will be hosting a dinner in the Lodging in connection with the Association of MBA's (AMBA) re-accreditation visit for our MBA programme delivered through the Adam Smith Business School. The visit will take place over two days and is a vital element of the ASBS profile given the international standing and recognition of AMBA accreditation.

I will also be participating in the CRUK quinquennial Review of the Beatson Institute (12-14 June), meeting the review panel on the 14<sup>th</sup>.

The University in partnership with the Bishops' Conference of Scotland is hosting the launch of the St Andrew's foundation, which is a new initiative in the School of Education and will serve as the hub of the University's commitment to Catholic teacher education in Scotland. Centred around the launch will be the Cardinal Winning Lecture which will be given by Archbishop Gerhard Müller, the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith. His Excellency, Archbishop Antonio Mennini, Apostolic Nuncio to Great Britain will also be in attendance. In addition to the lecture there will be a panel discussion, a performance by the University Choir and on the Saturday evening I will host a dinner in the Lodging.

## ***4.2 International Activities***

On the 11th April I met and hosted one of our key alumni contacts from Indonesia, for a discussion on how to progress our links in a country which is a major recruitment prospect in Asia. This follows our recent hosting of a visit by several Indonesian Vice-Rectors.

From the 21 to the 24 April I visited India and Delhi. I was part of one of the largest University delegations to India. Our party included academic representatives from our 4 Colleges, and colleagues from the Recruitment and International Office (RIO), the Development and Alumni Office (DAO) and Corporate Communications. The trip included several events. On the 22 April, we held a day Conference for our key Agents in India. Agents are companies who recruit to the University on our behalf. The purpose of the conference was to try and bring them together as a group, to underline their importance to our activities, seek their input and ideas for maximising our recruitment activity in India, where the UK universities have experienced very challenging recruitment trends, and to stress the University's current strengths, strategy and ambition for the future.

On the evening of 22<sup>nd</sup> we held a reception in the British High Commissioner's residence for Alumni which gave us the opportunity to update our friends and supporters on the University and encourage them to support us and our activities. On the 23<sup>rd</sup> we had meetings in the University of Delhi, and later took part in a Students' recruitment networking event. I was also able to give a press interview the following day.

Back home and on the 3 May, I and the Head of College Social Science welcomed Professor Samad Seyidov, the Rector, and a senior delegation, from Azerbaijan University of Languages (AUL). Our initial link with AUL started in 2009, and since then we have been exploring possible collaborations between our two institutions. At the moment the focus is on the possibility of TEMPUS bids, and a double degree between our two institutions. During the visit a Study Abroad (SA) agreement was signed, the first step in effect towards a double degree programme in Teaching English. The SA agreement will allow a small number of AUL students to join Glasgow for a semester as part of their current AUL masters degree.

On 15 May I travelled with colleagues from the College of Science & Engineering, DAO and the press office to Chengdu to visit the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC) and launch our first joint educational partnership in China, a joint School of Engineering with UESTC. Our relationship with UESTC (one of China's top universities, part of the '985 programme') also dates back to 2009 when we first signed an agreement to promote joint research and student mobility. We are now entering into a new and exciting phase of development with UESTC and one of the purposes of the visit was to celebrate the joint educational programme partnership between us and specifically the joint delivery of the four year undergraduate BEng (Honours) program in Electronics and Electrical Engineering. On 16 May we had the formal ceremony to launch the joint school with a signing ceremony involving the President, Li Yanrong, followed by a press conference.

As part of the visit, I had been asked to give an Economics lecture to students and so on the afternoon of the 16<sup>th</sup>, I gave a talk entitled *After the financial crisis: the need for co-operation in the world economy*. The day was concluded with a dinner hosted by the Vice President of UESTC for the Glasgow delegation. On Friday 17 a workshop on Advanced Technology of Electronic Information Engineering was held and this gave Glasgow and UESTC colleagues the opportunity to meet, review and consolidate academic relations in this area. In the evening we hosted a reception for local alumni and specially invited guests to celebrate the new Joint Educational programme and to develop relations with alumni in Chengdu. The day ended with a dinner for VIP guests. Finally, on the Saturday morning we attended an admissions event hosted and run by the UESTC covering all UESTC programmes. We were able to mount a stand and so take the opportunity to publicise the joint program and the university to students and their parents.

On the 20 May, MVLS organised an event to celebrate and explore Tanzania's national heritage in relation to the conservation and development of the country's biodiversity. This whole area is of particular interest to a range of disciplines and units at Glasgow including the Wellcome Trust Centre for Molecular Parasitology, our newly established Centre for Virus Research, the Boyd Orr Centre for Population Health and our Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine. We have come to understand, that the impact of tropical diseases (an area of expertise in Glasgow) on human and animal health is not just about drugs, genes and molecules but is inextricably linked with the environment, landscapes and the ecological diversity that characterises tropical regions. Tanzania provides the ideal environment for the interplay of all these factors, and a multidisciplinary approach to understanding these and their interconnections, and which is in place at Glasgow, offers tremendous opportunities for the University and established national bodies in Tanzania to work in partnership. A high level delegation from Tanzania attended the event including Dr Alan Kijazi, the Director General of Tanzanian National Parks, Dr Simon Mduma, the Director General of the Tanzanian Wildlife Research Institute, Dr Julius Keyyu, Director of Research at the Tanzanian Wildlife Research Institute and Dr Matthew Maziku, head of the WHO rabies control program in Tanzania. Dr Mduma delivered the first lecture on *The Natural History of Tanzanian and its Conservation Responsibilities*. This was then followed by the inaugural lecture of Professor Markus Borner, a recently appointed Honorary Professor with MVLS who has over 40 years experience and is a leading expert on the Serengeti ecosystem. The Institute and associated groups are immensely excited about this growing relationship and are looking forward to building and extending their partnerships with the Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute and Tanzania National Parks. They hope to develop formal exchange programs between our veterinary science and conservation communities and are committed to seeing how we might best grow and sustain these relationships into the future. The lectures were followed by a reception and dinner in the Lodging.

On 28 May I met Dr Abdelbaset Gadour, Cultural Attaché from Libya and colleagues Dr Nasser Ghaith, External Relations Co-ordinator and Osama Rajhi, Internal Relations co-ordinator. Prior to our meeting, the delegation met with the Colleges of Science & Engineering and MVLS and the Clerk of Senate in his capacity as International lead for Africa. Opportunities to rekindle collaborations with Libyan Universities, particularly in the area of higher degrees, is now a very real prospect after the political difficulties of recent times.

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

Over the period of this report, I continued to fulfil commitments to some of the external bodies I am associated with. I took part in a USS teleconference (12 April) and a USS group meeting in London on 1 May and chaired a meeting of the Glasgow Economic Leadership – Higher & Further Education work stream (19 April).

I have been asked to be a Trustee of CASE Europe, the main organisation for fundraising, marketing and external relations in education, and will take up this role on the 1 July 2013.

With respect to government interactions, Professor Dominiczak and I met with Alex Neil, Cabinet Secretary for Health and Well-being and Robert Calderwood Chief Executive of Greater Glasgow and Clyde NHS Board in Edinburgh (18 April).

On the 3rd and 28th May I had meetings with our liaison officer at Scottish Enterprise and with the Chief Executive of SE.

I received a courtesy visit from Verena Gräfin von Roedern the German Consul General for Scotland and North England (12 April).

From 8<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> May I attended the Universitas 21 AGM held in the University of British Columbia, Vancouver Canada. Apart from the formal business it was also an opportunity, through a brief presentation, to introduce Glasgow to the delegates as we will have the honour (and opportunity) of hosting the AGM next year (2014). This is the first time U21 will have held their annual meetings in the UK.

I was invited by John Hardie, Chief Executive Officer ITN in his capacity as Chairman, Marketing Group of Great Britain, to attend the Group's April dinner in London (30 April). The guest speaker was First Minister of Scotland, Alex Salmond, and I had a good opportunity to have a dinner discussion with the FM.

Through the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, I was asked to take part in the series called *Glasgow Talks* and to present jointly with Martin Wolf, Chief Economics Commentator, Financial Times on the challenges faced by the world economy and what lessons we might learn from the recent crisis. My presentation focused on three areas: whether the policy actions pursued by the G7 were sufficient to produce a sustained world economic recovery, or whether a more active (less austerity-driven) fiscal policy was required; the medium-term risks of the loose monetary policies (quantitative easing) pursued by some central banks; and whether a more co-ordinated macroeconomic policy response between the G20 would be preferable.

Glasgow City Marketing Bureau is in the process of developing and updating the city brand and I met with Scott Taylor, the Bureau's Director, as part of the early stages of the consultation process, to share my thoughts on what the nature, look and feel of the new brand might be.

I had the pleasure of meeting Professor Tom Inns the new Director of Glasgow School of Art. SMG members then joined me for the second part of the meeting for more general introductions. As Court will know, the University has a good relationship with the GSA, one that we want to foster and maintain. I attended the GSA Honorary Graduation dinner and ceremony on the 13 & 14 June.

As this report goes to print, we will be preparing for Commemoration Day and welcoming our latest honorary graduates into our University community. It's always a special day, a real celebration of our history and heritage, but also a reminder of how much we have depended on the support of many down through the centuries. It's also an opportunity to look forward and to reassert our ambitions for the future.

On Monday 17 June, I will be travelling to London with DAO colleagues to meet with some key donors and supporters. It will be an opportunity to update them on the University and in particular to share in general terms the exciting prospects for the Western site.

I attended the installation of the new Chancellor, Dr Robert Buchan at Heriot-Watt on Monday 10 June.

#### ***4.4. Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events***

Over the period of this report I continued with my Podcasts and undertook another Principal's Surgery. I held a drinks reception in the Lodging (22 May) for staff from economics.

On 29 May I visited the College of Science & Engineering with Rachel Sandison the Director of RIO as part of my plan to visit all College Management groups to discuss internationalisation. Among the key aims of these meetings is to stress the vital importance of our international strategy and the need to bring our vision of it together across the Colleges and RIO to ensure that a coordinated and effective approach is achieved and delivered. I am scheduled to visit the College of Social Sciences CMG on Tuesday 14 June.



As has become normal practice, I was able to speak to new staff at the start of an 'induction day' event, and so formally welcome them to the University and say a little about our strategy and vision for the future.

On the evening of 2 May, I travelled through to Edinburgh and had the pleasure of attending the Edinburgh Society Glasgow University Graduates annual dinner and replying to the toast to the University.

On the evening of 4 June, I attended the book launch of 'Building Knowledge', the excellent publication which reviews the architectural history of the University. Written by Nick Hayes, the book was a collaborative venture with Historic Scotland, and will be an excellent and invaluable addition to resources about the University. Fiona Hyslop, Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs, also attended the launch and said a few words.

Finally I hosted a special dinner in the Lodging in honour of Professor Andrea Nolan. A more formal presentation and reception involving the wider University community was held for Andrea on Wednesday 5 May, and while her move to Edinburgh Napier will be our loss, their gain, she goes with the respect, gratitude and affection of many in the University community. It was also a tremendous pleasure to see that Andrea has been awarded an OBE for services to Higher Education and our University.

## **5. 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 17 April 2013***

- Fees Setting
- HR/Payroll Project
- Media Activity Report
- University of Glasgow – University of Nankai Joint Graduate School

### ***SMG Meeting of 13 May 2013***

- Kelvin Hall
- Update on Maximising Academic Performance and Career Development (MAPCD) & Early Career Development Programme
- Graduate Entrepreneur Invitation – Review Position
- University of Glasgow Pension Scheme
- Capital Plan
- Outcome of Risk Workshop
- International Student Recruitment Forecast
- GIC Update – Annual Report
- Confucius Institute – Annual report
- Update on MyCampus



**Court - Wednesday 19 June 2013**

**Report from the Secretary of Court**

## **SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION**

### *A.1 Governance Discussion Day 31 May*

A report containing recommendations and proposed actions arising from the Court Governance discussion day is at **Annex 1**. **Court's approval of this document is sought**, following which a large part of the actions will be taken forward over the coming months, with an update to the October meeting of Court. The working group which will look further at the composition of Court will report to October Court as indicated in the paper. Subject to **Court's agreement which is now sought**, the working group will comprise the senior Senate Assessor, the SRC President, an Employee Representative and three lay members of Court.

### *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. Court will recall that Section 3 of the draft bill placed a requirement on universities to comply with principles of good governance and management practice, as determined by Scottish Ministers. The University supported a suggested amendment to that part of the Bill, as proposed by Universities Scotland, having the impact that, instead of the above, universities would in future be required to comply with a Code of Good Governance practice, as developed by the HE sector. The amended Bill now requires universities to comply with principles of good governance, as determined by the SFC. In the next few days, consultation on the draft Scottish Code of Good Governance will be complete, and we will learn whether the SFC will endorse the Code. While the Government has therefore responded to concerns expressed by the universities regarding the Governance proposals within the Post-16 Bill, it has not given any ground in relation to Widening Participation. The bill as drafted will give a government minister the authority to determine, as a condition of funding, the nature of a University's requirements in relation to widening access.

### *A.3 Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching)*

Professor Frank Coton's current appointment as Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) expires on 31 December 2013. The Principal would like to extend Professor Coton's appointment for a second term of four years, through until 31.12.17. Court's approval is sought for this re-appointment.

#### A.4 *Nominations Committee*

The Nominations Committee met in April, as there were a number of Court and Committee membership items for discussion. Where recommendations are made below, they are made on the Nominations Committee's behalf.

##### i) Co-opted members

Ken Brown and Margaret Morton finish their first term on Court on 31 December 2013. Both are willing to serve a further four years on Court, and have the clear support of the Nominations Committee and Court members, the latter having been contacted since the meeting of the Nominations Committee. On this basis, **Court is asked to approve a recommendation** that Ken's and Margaret's terms on Court continue for a further 4 years from 1 January 2014.

Nominations Committee, and Court members on the relevant Committees, are fully supportive also of Ken's and Margaret's continuation as (respectively) chair and member of the Finance and Estates Committee. **Court's approval of this is sought.**

Peter Daniels and Robin Easton will end their second term on Court on 31 December 2013 and Michael Scott Morton will end his second term on Court on 31 March 2014. Replacements for them will be needed. **Court is asked to approve a recommendation** that an advertisement seeking co-opted members of Court be drawn up, with the aim of recruiting three suitably qualified members with particular expertise in, respectively, finance, estates and academic (specifically research and/or knowledge transfer) matters. The advertisement, to be placed in publications including specialist media, will include both generic and specific criteria, and mention the additional possibility of service on one of the Finance Committee, Estates Committee or Research Planning & Strategy Committee.

##### ii) Chancellor's Assessor

Murdoch MacLennan's period of office as a member of Court expires on 31 December 2013. The Chancellor would like Murdoch to serve for a second term of four years, and Murdoch has confirmed that he is willing to do so.

##### iii) Audit Committee

There is one current vacancy on the Audit Committee, and there will also be a vacancy for Chair of the Audit Committee with the expiry of Kevin Sweeney's period of office (co-terminous with his term on Court) in July 2014. It is recommended that an advertisement be placed to attract a qualified accountant onto the Audit Committee, to fill the existing vacancy. **Court's agreement to this is sought.** At a later date, lay Court members' terms, qualifications and willingness to serve as member and Chair of this Committee will be established.

##### iv) Estates Committee

When Peter Daniels' term on Court ends in December 2013, there will be a vacancy for Chair of the Estates Committee. Margaret Morton, who is a current member of the Estates Committee, has a property (legal) background and is willing to be Chair following Peter's departure. Members of the Estates Committee have been consulted on this and are fully supportive. **Court is asked to approve a recommendation** that Margaret be appointed as Chair of the Estates Committee from 1 January 2014.

v) Remuneration Committee

The Nominations Committee originally proposed that the current Lay Member vacancy on the Remuneration Committee be filled once new co-opted members of Court are appointed; however, at the recent governance discussions, Court has indicated that this vacancy should be filled as soon as possible. The Lay Member will be identified as soon as possible in discussion with Court members. Although not discussed by the Nominations Committee at its April meeting, Court has agreed as part of the recent governance discussions that this Committee should be further augmented by the appointment of an external lay member. This position will be advertised - **Court's agreement to this is sought.**

vi) Nominations Committee

The Lay Member vacancy that will arise from Robin Easton leaving Court in December 2013 will be filled once the new co-opted members of Court are appointed. Although not discussed by the Nominations Committee itself, Court has agreed as part of the recent governance discussions that this Committee should be augmented by one (further) lay member, in addition to the appointment to the Committee of the SRC President. The further lay member will be identified as soon as possible in discussion with Court members.

vii) Court Procedural Review Group

The CPRG will be convened for Tier 2 cases under the Management of Organisational Change policy, to scrutinise proposals and, from the October to June Court meetings each year, recommend to Court the actions Court should take; during the summer months, the CPRG will decide on Tier 2 cases without automatic reference to Court.

Membership is **recommended for Court approval** as follows, the individuals being willing to serve: one lay member of HR Committee (Alan MacFarlane); one other lay member (not a member of HR Committee) (Kevin Sweeney); one Senate Assessor (Donald Spaeth). This membership will be supplemented on each occasion by the relevant Head of College/Head of University Services.

#### A.5 *Court Convenership*

I recently consulted with all members of Court individually regarding the convenership of Court, David Ross's current term as convener expires on 31 December 2013. David has indicated that, if Court would like, he is willing to continue as Convener through until the expiry of his current period of office as a General Council Member, which runs until 31 July 2016. Court members have, unanimously, made clear that they would like David to continue as Convener, and support his proposal that this should be until 31 July 2016. **Court is asked to approve a recommendation** that David Ross be reappointed as Convener for the period 1.1.14 to 31.7.16.

Members of Court will be interested to hear that David Ross has been invited also to convene the Committee of Scottish University Chairs, a role that he takes over as of 1.8.13 and that will run for three years, ending – coincidentally – on the same date as his current membership of Court.

#### A.6 *Introduction of New University Complaints Procedure*

The Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO) requires the University, along with all other Scottish HE Institutions, to introduce a new Complaints Procedure by the end of August 2013. A compliance statement must be returned to SPSO by 28 June 2013 in order for the SPSO to confirm to the Scottish Funding Council that the University is compliant with the Model Complaints Handling Procedure which is now a condition of the SFC funding agreement.

The Model Complaints Handling Procedure, published by the SPSO, is the template which the University is required to follow. The new procedure will come into force on 12 August 2013, on publication of the University Calendar 2013-14. It will form Chapter 29 of the Calendar, replacing the current Complaints Procedure.

**Annex 2** describes briefly the main features of the new complaints procedure and how it compares with the current procedure. The full procedure is not being sent out with the hard-copy Court papers, but will be issued electronically so that Court members may refer to it if they so wish.

Court is asked to approve the introduction of the new complaints procedure.

### **SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL**

#### B.1 *Court Strategy Day*

A strategy day will be held in September, on a date to be circulated shortly. Further details will be sent nearer the time. The agenda will be mindful of Court's wish, as stated at the governance discussion day, that it wishes to have greater involvement in early development of major strategic items.

#### B.2 *Glasgow University Union*

As Court was advised at the last meeting, GUU's officers are undertaking an independent review of the culture within the GUU, following complaints made by two visiting women speakers about sexist abuse at this year's Glasgow University Union (GUU) Ancients Debating Championship. Court will be kept updated.

#### B.3 *Senate Assessors on Court*

The following have been elected to Court until 31 July 2017:

Professor Nicholas Jonsson (College of Medical, Veterinary & Life Sciences Professorial member)

Dr Duncan Ross (College of Social Sciences non-Professorial member)

Professor Karen Lury (College of Arts Professorial member)

For Court's information, following the University restructuring, the composition of the group of seven Senate Assessors on Court is as follows:

- One professorial Assessor appointed from each of the four Colleges
- One non-professorial Assessor appointed by three of the four Colleges in turn

#### B.4 *SRC Elections*

The following candidates were successful in the Spring 2013 SRC elections and will take up sabbatical officer posts on 1st July 2013:

President	Jess McGrellis
VP Education	Oli Coombs
VP Student Support	Louise Graham
VP Student Activities	Breffni O'Connor

#### B.5 *Heads of School*

The following appointments have been made:

##### *College of Social Sciences*

School of Law (current Head Professor Rosa Greaves)

Professor Mark Furse from 1 August 2013 for a period of two years

Professor Iain MacNeil to be Deputy Head of School from 1 August 2013 for two years and then Head of School for four years from 1 August 2015 with Professor Furse as his deputy for a period to be agreed

##### *College of Arts*

School of Modern Languages and Cultures (current Head Professor John Macklin, acting Head Dr Barbara Burns)

Professor Kathryn Crameri from 1 January 2014 until 31 July 2017

School of Critical Studies (current Head Professor Nigel Leask)

Professor Jeremy Smith from 1 January 2014 until 31 July 2017

The following Senate Assessor will serve on the appointing Committee for a Head of School where a vacancy is occurring in July 2013:

##### *College of Social Sciences*

School of Social and Political Sciences (current Head Professor Mike French)

Professor Adrienne Scullion will be the Senate Assessor on the appointing committee

#### B.6 *Resolutions*

The following 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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 597-2 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS (SOCIAL SCIENCES)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 645 – DEGREE OF MASTER OF RESEARCH

DN/DM

## **Review of Governance Arrangements**

### **Introduction**

Court met on 31 May to discuss a range of Governance issues that have been raised by the Lauwerys Report and by the Draft Scottish Code on HE Governance. This paper sets out a series of recommendations arising from that discussion. There were many areas on which there was agreement on 31 May, and this is reflected below. One area that requires further work is the future composition of Court, and to that end Recommendation 1 proposes the establishment of a short-term working group, reporting to Court in October.

**Appendix 1** to this paper sets out the Lauwerys Recommendations and, against each one, records Court's view on the recommendation and/or who is now responsible for taking action. **Appendix 2** and **Appendix 3** are for reference, being the discussion papers – on the Lauwerys Report and on the Draft Scottish Code - that were considered by Court on 31 May.

### **Recommendations**

#### ***A Recommendations arising from consideration of the Lauwerys Report***

- 1 A Court Working Group (to include a staff representative a student, a Senate Assessor and three lay members) should consider further the future composition of Court, having regard to:
  - the progress of the draft Scottish Code;
  - the status of the Draft Ordinance on Court membership, submitted by Court to the Privy Council in 2011; and
  - those aspects of Court membership that were agreed on 31 May, namely; that there should be a clear lay majority, that the size of Court should not grow, that the number of General Council members should be reduced from 5 to 2, that the post of Chancellor's Assessor should be abolished and replaced by an additional Co-opted position, and that the post of Convener should be established as a separately identified post on Court to be occupied by a lay member.
  - the appropriate number of Senate Assessors (the majority view on 31 May was that the number should be reduced from 7 to 5), and the requirements that should be placed on Senate Assessors by the University.
  - the merits of Lauwerys Recommendation 15, regarding the method of selecting General Council members of Court.

The Working Group should report to Court in October.

- 2 Court should in future recruit to the post of Convener one year in advance, so as to allow a year in which the person selected may shadow the outgoing Convener.
- 3 Four years should be established as the standard term of office for all members of Court, with the exception of the student members.



- 4 One additional lay member should be appointed to the Nominations Committee (in addition to the appointment to the Committee of the SRC President: see Recommendation 18 below).
- 5 A lay member should be appointed without delay to the vacant position on the Remuneration Committee and, in addition, an external lay member should be appointed to the Committee.
- 6 The arrangement of the Court agenda – and the arrangement of the furniture – should be revisited with a view to promoting more focused and strategic discussion among Court members and reducing the amount of time spent listening to presentations.
- 7 Policy papers and annual reports should, where possible, be tailored specifically for Court. In addition, in the same way as Court Committee reports, they should have a brief summary setting out the significant points.
- 8 Court should experiment with different timings for its meetings, to establish whether there is a more convenient time than Wednesday afternoons.
- 9 The annual induction session should run in November each year.
- 10 The Secretary should provide October Court with an update on action taken in respect of each of the Lauwerys Recommendations (see current status of Recommendations in **Appendix 1**).

***B Recommendations arising from consideration of the Draft Scottish Code***

- 11 Court should engage more fully with promoting Equality and Diversity in its membership, through:
  - emphasising in all its recruitment material its desire for a diverse membership;
  - publicising its commitment that no lay member will be financially disadvantaged as a result of serving on Court, with the University committed to fund all reasonable expenses, including Childcare and Lost Earnings;
  - advertising its desire to cooperate with employers to assist their staff to serve on Court as part of their professional development;
  - requiring all those parties who nominate members to Court (Senate, General Council, SRC, Staff) to demonstrate that they are actively promoting diversity;
  - experimenting with the timing of Court meetings, per Recommendation 8 above, to establish if another time will be more convenient.
- 12 The Selection Panel for the future appointment of a Principal should include the SRC President as a full member.
- 13 When the position of Convener is filled in future, the position should be advertised widely and (per Recommendation 2 above) it should be filled one year in advance so that the incoming Convener can shadow his/her predecessor. While non-members of Court will be eligible to apply, the selection criteria will be such that the

person appointed will be required to provide evidence of substantial experience and effectiveness as a University governor, including extensive active engagement with major policies and decisions.

- 14 Court should annually select one of its members to conduct a P&DR discussion with the Convener. The person selected should solicit the views of all Court members on the performance of the Convener in advance of the P&DR discussion.
- 15 Effectiveness Reviews should be undertaken by Court every 3 years, with the assistance on each occasion of an external facilitator. Every 6 years, the review should be extensive in scope, while the intervening reviews should be lighter-touch. A different facilitator should be appointed on each occasion.
- 16 Court members should not be remunerated, but all reasonable expenses incurred by Court members should be met. No one should be financially disadvantaged as a result of deciding to serve as a lay member of Court.
- 17 Court members' Register of Interests should in future be published on the Court Office webpages.
- 18 The SRC President should be added to the membership of the Nominations Committee.

DN,

2.6.13

## **ANNEX 1, APPENDIX 1 - RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LAUWERYS REPORT**

- 1 In light of this Governance Effectiveness Review, the Court should decide what changes it believes are necessary and appropriate to strengthen the University's governance arrangements. The Court should not, however, make changes which anticipate the Von Prondzynski Report's recommendations becoming mandatory unless any of these recommendations coincide with the Court's view.

*Agreed.*

- 2 It is desirable that the University's governance instruments relating to the duties and powers of the Court and the Senate be clarified and modernised. This might best be considered following the publication of the new Scottish Code of Higher Education Governance.

*Agreed.*

- 3 There should be an active annual review by the Court of the Statement of its Primary Responsibilities along with the Scheme of Delegated Authorities. This latter document should be reviewed to ensure that there is no ambiguity about where authority and responsibility lie in regard to delegated matters. The Court should also consider whether it could and should delegate more matters to its Committees and/or the University Executive.

*Agreed. To be progressed by DN/DM.*

- 4 Members of Court should act first and foremost as Governors of the University and avoid acting, or being seen to act, as representatives of particular constituencies.

*Agreed.*

- 5 A more suitable venue should be found for Court meetings which has better acoustics and brings people closer together round a table arrangement.

*Discussed and agreed on 31 May. See Recommendation 6 to June Court.*

- 6 The number of non-members attending Court should be reduced with, in general, members of the Senior Executive only attending for items explicitly related to their specific responsibilities. In addition to the University Secretary, the Senior V.P., the V.P. (Strategy and Resources) and the Finance Director should however attend throughout all meetings.

*Discussed and Rejected on 31 May. Court members find it helpful to have senior executive members of staff present to provide information and advice as required.*

- 7 The format of Court meetings should be changed to enable it to focus more on strategic issues, and when it is considering strategy there should be two distinct phases to the process. The first stage should focus on a 'scoping' discussion leading to the identification of key issues and presenting options for further development. The second would bring forward a developed draft for discussion and approval arising out of the first stage consideration.

***Discussed and Rejected on 31 May. The focus on strategic issues should be addressed instead through: a) using the annual Strategy Day effectively; and b) more thoughtful preparation of the Court agenda, per Recommendation 6 to June Court.***

- 8 A set of 'super' KPIs, up to perhaps ten in number, should be developed and be provided with every Court meeting agenda as a constant reminder of performance targets.

***Discussed on 31 May. Court recently reviewed the current KPIs (20 in all) and felt that they were suitable. Agreed, however, that it would be useful to invite SMG's view on this recommendation.***

- 9 The Court should make significant efforts to improve the diversity of its membership not just in terms of gender balance but also in regard to ethnic diversity and age balance. To assist this process, a template should be developed identifying what an ideal balance in the membership might be, both in this respect and in regard to the breadth of knowledge and experience of the lay members.

***Discussed on 31 May. See Recommendation 11 to June Court.***

- 10 The composition of the membership of the Court should be amended substantially, particularly to ensure there is an effective lay majority, but the total number of members should stay at 25.

***Discussed and agreed on 31 May. See Recommendation 1 to June Court.***

- 11 The Rector should cease to be a member of Court but if this proposal is not implemented, the Rector should cease to be President and Chair of Court.

***Discussed and Rejected on 31 May. The Rector's membership of Court is felt by all Court members to be valuable and there should be no question of terminating it. There is a recognised need in the ancient universities to distinguish between the roles of the Rector and the Convener. Court members believe this has been addressed effectively at Glasgow, with a convention that is well-established and is reflected in Court's Standing Orders.***

- 12 The post of Chancellor's Representative should be deleted as an explicit membership category, but the number of co-opted lay members should then be increased by one.

***Discussed and agreed on 31 May. See Recommendation 1 to June Court.***

- 13 The post of Convener of the Court should be explicitly recognised as a separately identified post in the Court membership.

*Discussed and agreed on 31 May. See Recommendation 1 to June Court.*

- 14 The post of Deputy Convener of the Court should be established and again explicitly recognised as a separately identified post in the court membership.

*Discussed and Rejected on 31 May. An ad hoc need to deputise can be addressed: there is no need for a standing post of Deputy. Court does, however, see benefit in identifying the next Convener well in advance of the end of the current Convener's term of office, to allow a period of overlap. See Recommendation 2 to June Court.*

- 15 The General Council Business Committee should be formally designated as the appointing body for the General Council posts on the Court.

*To be discussed by a Court working group. See Recommendation 1 to June Court.*

- 16 The City of Glasgow member of the Court should be appointed by the Court.

*Not currently within Court's gift. The Council Leader has been approached to ask that a suitably qualified and committed member of the Council be identified.*

- 17 Elected staff members of Court should no longer be nominated by the Joint Union Liaison Committee but rather elected by the whole of the relevant Staff Constituency on the basis of a general invitation for candidates to stand for election.

*This recommendation fails to acknowledge that positions are indeed advertised and that any member of staff may stand. It does not seem appropriate to prohibit JULC from making a nomination.*

- 18 The Senior Vice Principal should become an ex-officio member of the Court.

*Discussed and Rejected on 31 May. Court benefits from having senior executive members present to provide information and advice. However, this recommendation runs counter to the established good practice of having a clear lay majority.*

- 19 The number of co-opted members on Court should be increased from five to nine (which includes the place currently held by the Chancellor's Representative). The number of General Council members should reduce from five to two and the number of Senate Representatives should reduce from seven to five.

*Discussed on 31 May. Agreed that the number of Co-opted members should rise and that the number of GC members should be reduced from 5 to 2. There was a majority in favour of reducing the number of Senate members from 7 to 5. See Recommendation 1 to June Court.*

- 20 The terms of appointment for lay members should be for three years, renewable on a maximum of two occasions, making an absolute limit of nine years as an ordinary member. The term of office of Convener (and Deputy Convener, if established) should be for three years, renewable on just one occasion. These terms of office should however start afresh if the Convener (and Deputy Convener) is appointed from among the existing lay membership of Court.

*Discussed on 31 May. Court members did not favour 3-year terms, but agreed that terms of office should be standardised. See Recommendation 3 to June Court.*

- 21 The Court should review the time of its meetings and in so doing give particular thought to the convenience of the timing of meetings to members, and potential members, who may be at the most demanding stages of their careers and who may have limited flexibility in taking on external commitments.

*Discussed and agreed on 31 May. See Recommendation 8 to June Court.*

- 22 Consideration should be given to ways in which the bulk of Court papers could be reduced and how Court members could be helped to engage in, and understand, the key issues raised in agenda papers.

*Discussed and agreed on 31 May. See Recommendations 6 and 7 to June Court.*

- 23 Court Standing Orders should be revised in light of the recommendations which may be adopted arising from this Review. The Quorum provisions should specify the lay proportion of the membership which should be present to make a meeting quorate.

*To be actioned by DN/DM following June Court.*

- 24 Major issues within the remit of Court Committees should be submitted to the Full Court for discussion on the basis of papers prepared for the purpose and not just by providing a recommendation from the relevant Committee for formal approval.

*Discussed and Rejected on 31 May. Court has the opportunity to interrogate the Committee chair on all Committee business. It would be wrong to re-run at Court items of business that have already been determined by a Committee.*

- 25 The membership of the Finance Committee should be strengthened by the addition of another lay member. The University Secretary and the Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources) should, like the Director of Finance, be full members of the Committee and not just be 'in attendance'.

*Discussed on 31 May and Rejected. The Committee benefits from the availability of senior executives to provide information and advice. Their designation as full members would serve no practical purpose other than to reduce the power of the Court members themselves in the event of a vote being required.*

- 26 The role and function of the Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee should be reviewed including taking the views of its members and trade union representatives.  
*To be taken forward by DN as Convener of H, S & W Committee.*
- 27 The Nominations Committee membership should be strengthened by adding the Deputy Convener (if established) or another lay member and the Senior Vice Principal.  
*Discussed on 31 May and agreed to strengthen the membership of the Nominations Committee through Recommendations 4 and 18 to June Court.*
- 28 The membership of the Remuneration Committee should be strengthened by adding two additional lay members (one from outside the Court's membership). The Committee should also receive a report on the salaries of all staff at the level of Professor or equivalent.  
*Discussed and agreed on 31 May. See Recommendation 5 to June Court.*
- 29 In order to further support Court members, the governance website should be developed including providing links to relevant material and information relating to the work of the Court. Thought should be given to means of raising the profile of Court and its members within the University and to providing additional opportunities for Court members to learn more about the University through visits, etc.  
*To be actioned by DN/DM.*
- 30 Induction and training for Court members should be further developed and a bespoke programme should be offered to each new member, designed to suit their individual needs and interests.  
*Discussed on 31 May and agreed that bespoke training is not necessarily required. DN/DM to continue to point members to whatever training may be beneficial to each of them. In addition, regarding Induction, see Recommendation 9 to June Court.*
- 31 An Effectiveness Review should be conducted of the Senate and its Committees.  
*Agreed. This is University policy, and will move to a 3-yearly cycle in the context of the Scottish Code of Governance. See Recommendation 15 to June Court.*
- 32 The regular meeting of the Chairs of Court Committees should be formalised so that it can function as a Standing Committee of Court able to act on behalf of Court between Full Court meetings.  
*Discussed and Rejected on 31 May. This would cut across the well-established protocols Court has established for dealing with business between meetings, as set out in the Standing Orders.*
- 33 The Court should more often establish 'task and finish' groups to deal with specific issues on its behalf.  
*To be considered by Court on a continuing basis. A task and finish group has recently addressed the Draft Scottish Governance Code. Another will be established in relation to Court membership if Recommendation 1 to the June Court is accepted.*

## ANNEX 1, APPENDIX 2 - REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

Court commissioned John Lauwerys to conduct a review of effectiveness, and he reported in January 2013. The Lauwerys Report has 33 recommendations. Discussion on 31 May will focus principally on those Recommendations set out in Section A (People Issues) and Section B (Organisation Issues) below. Section C shows the remaining recommendations. Several of these are simply for noting; others will be taken forward by the Convener and the Secretary and will be the subject of a future report to Court.

### Section A – People Issues, for discussion by Court on 31 May

#### 1. Executive Officers

*'The number of non-members attending Court should be reduced with, in general, members of the Senior Executive only attending for items explicitly related to their specific responsibilities. In addition to the University Secretary, the Senior V.P., the V.P. (Strategy and Resources) and the Finance Director should however attend throughout all meetings'. (Rec 6)*

#### 2. Composition of Court

It should be noted that Court cannot alter its composition without Privy Council approval of a new Ordinance. Lauwerys has seven recommendations on Court membership (Recommendations 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18 and 19). They include the creation of a post of Deputy Convener of Court, the admission of the Senior Vice-Principal as a member of Court and the termination of the Rector's membership of Court. Taken together, their outcome is summarised on the following Table, which shows: a) the current composition of Court; b) the composition proposed by Court two years ago when it submitted a draft Ordinance to the Privy Council; and c) the composition suggested by Lauwerys.

<i>Court membership</i>	<i>a. Current</i>	<i>b. Draft Ordinance</i>	<i>c. Lauwerys</i>
Coopted	5	10	9
General Council	5	2	2
Glasgow CC	1	1	1
Chancellors Assessor	1	1	
Rector	1	1	
Convener			1
Deputy Convener			1
<b>Lay Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>
Senate	7	5	5
Staff	2	2	2
Student	2	2	2
Principal	1	1	1
Senior Vice-Principal			1
<b>Staff / Student Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>



### **3. Terms of Office**

The current term of office for lay members is 4 years, which can be renewed for a second term. Lauwerys's recommendation is that:

*'The terms of appointment for lay members should be for three years, renewable on a maximum of two occasions, making an absolute limit of nine years as an ordinary member. The term of office of Convener (and Deputy Convener, if established) should be for three years, renewable on just one occasion. These terms of office should however start afresh if the Convener (and Deputy Convener) is appointed from among the existing lay membership of Court'. (Rec 20)*

### **4. Finance Committee Membership**

The current membership of Finance Committee is: three lay members of Court, one external lay member, two Senate Assessors, the Principal, the Director of Finance and the President of the SRC. Lauwerys recommends that:

*'The membership of the Finance Committee should be strengthened by the addition of another lay member. The University Secretary and the Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources) should, like the Director of Finance, be full members of the Committee and not just be in attendance'. (Rec 25)*

### **5. Nominations Committee Membership**

Current membership of the Nominations Committee is: The Convener of Court, two other lay members, the Senior Senate Assessor, the Principal, the Secretary of Court. It should be noted that the Draft Scottish Code proposes that there should also in future be a student member. Lauwerys recommends that:

*'The Nominations Committee membership should be strengthened by adding the Deputy Convener (if established) or another lay member and the Senior Vice Principal'. (Rec 27)*

### **6. Remuneration Committee Membership**

Current membership of the Remuneration Committee is: The Convener of Court, three other lay members, the Principal. Lauwerys recommends that:

*'The membership of the Remuneration Committee should be strengthened by adding two additional lay members (one from outside the Court's membership). The Committee should also receive a report on the salaries of all staff at the level of Professor or equivalent'. (Rec 28)*

### **7. Meetings of Chairs of Court Committees**

The chairs of Court Committees (Finance, HR, Estates, Audit) meet with the Convener, the Principal and the Secretary about two weeks before each meeting of Court to discuss current business and review the draft Court agenda. Lauwerys recommends that:

*'The regular meeting of the Chairs of Court Committees should be formalised so that it can function as a Standing Committee of Court able to act on behalf of Court between Full Court meetings'. (Rec 32)*

## **Section B – Organisation Issues, for discussion by Court on 31 May**

### **1. Venue**

*'A more suitable venue should be found for Court meetings which has better acoustics and brings people closer together round a table arrangement. (Rec 5)*

### **2. Strategic discussion**

*'The format of Court meetings should be changed to enable it to focus more on strategic issues, and when it is considering strategy there should be two distinct phases to the process. The first stage should focus on a 'scoping' discussion leading to the identification of key issues and presenting options for further development. The second would bring forward a developed draft for discussion and approval arising out of the first stage consideration'. (Rec 7)*

### **3. Super KPIs**

*'A set of 'super' KPIs, up to perhaps ten in number, should be developed and provided with every Court meeting agenda as a constant reminder of performance targets'. (Rec 8)*

### **4. Timing of Meetings**

*'The Court should review the time of its meetings and in so doing give particular thought to the convenience of the timing of meetings to members, and potential members, who may be at the most demanding stages of their careers and who may have limited flexibility in taking on external commitments'. (Rec 21)*

### **5. Court papers**

*'Consideration should be given to ways in which the bulk of Court papers could be reduced and how Court members could be helped to engage in, and understand, the key issues raised in agenda papers'. (Rec 22)*

### **6. Major items of Committee business**

*'Major issues within the remit of Court Committees should be submitted to the Full Court for discussion on the basis of papers prepared for the purpose and not just by providing a recommendation from the relevant Committee for formal approval'. (Rec 24)*

### **7. Induction and Training**

*'Induction and training for Court members should be further developed and a bespoke programme should be offered to each new member, designed to suit their individual needs and interests'. (Rec 30)*

## ANNEX 1, APPENDIX 3 - SCOTTISH CODE OF GOOD HE GOVERNANCE

The April meeting of Court asked that a working group meet to form an initial view on the draft Scottish Code of Good HE Governance and, if appropriate, to draft a submission from the University in response to the draft Code.

The Working Group met on 15 May. Membership was: Susan Ashworth, Peter Daniels, James Harrison, Alan MacFarlane, David Newall, Alan Owen, Kevin Sweeney.

The Steering Group responsible for publishing the Draft Code has made clear that it is seeking submissions at this stage only in order to provide new evidence which it may not already have considered. The Group discussed whether there was any requirement or merit in the University making a submission in response to the Draft Code, and it decided that no response was required.

The Working Group then spent some time reviewing the Draft Code in order to identify points which should be drawn to Court's attention. These are set out below, in two Sections. Section A highlights 6 matters which the Group suggests should be discussed at the special meeting on Governance on 31 May. Section B identifies 4 other points which Court should be aware of, but which do not require discussion.

### Section A - Points for Discussion by Court on 31 May

#### *1. Equality & Diversity*

Principle 1 of the Draft Code requires Court to ensure that it observes good practice in regard to equality and diversity. How can Court address this responsibility more effectively? What can it do to ensure that Senate and General Council, each of which selects several members of Court, will take steps to ensure a more diverse representation on Court?

Currently, Court has no ethnic minority members. Its gender composition is as follows:

	Male	Female
Senate Members	4	3
Staff Representatives	0	2
Student representatives	2	0
Principal	1	0
General Council Members	5	0
Coopted Members	4	1
Chancellor's Assessor	1	0
Rector	1	0
Glasgow CC Representative	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>

#### *2. Appointment and Appraisal of the Principal*

Principle 5 of the Draft Code includes a requirement that *'Both the appointment and monitoring of performance of the Principal shall include consultation with staff and*

*student members of the governing body*'. The Convener of Court has already introduced a process of consultation when undertaking the annual appraisal of the Principal. With regard to the appointment of the Principal, the Working Group suggests that the University should in future include the SRC President on the Search Committee. That would increase the size of the Committee from 7 to 8 members, as follows:

Convener of Court (chairing the Committee)  
Rector  
2 other lay members  
1 Senate Member  
1 Vice-Principal  
Clerk of Senate  
SRC President

### **3. *Appointment of the Convener***

The Von Prondzynski Report includes a recommendation that Chairs of University Courts should be elected. The Draft Code does not support this proposal, and leaves the selection of a new Chair firmly in the hands of Court. However, Principle 11 includes a requirement that *'When vacancies arise in the position of the chair of the governing body or in its appointed members they shall be widely publicised both within and outside the Institution.'* What are Court's views on this? It would leave open the possibility that Court might in future choose to appoint as Chair someone who was not a current member of Court.

### **4. *Monitoring / Appraisal of Convener's Performance***

The Guidance Notes on Page 19 state that *'The Governing Body should appoint one of its independent members as a sounding board for the chair and to serve as an intermediary for other members who might wish to raise concerns about the chair. Led by the independent member so appointed, the members of the Governing Body should meet without the chair present at least annually to appraise the chair's performance'*.

Court's Standing Orders already provide for two 'sounding boards' (the Senior Senate Assessor and the Chancellor's Assessor). The Working Group suggests that in future a lay member might take regular soundings of all Court members, leading to an annual discussion with the Convener about his/her performance. The Working Group is not comfortable, though, with the text above that suggests the Governing Body should meet without the Chair present.

### **5. *Effectiveness Reviews***

Court may like to discuss Principle 16's requirement that *'Normally not less than every three years [Court] shall undertake an externally-facilitated evaluation of its own effectiveness, and that of its committees and ensure that a parallel review is undertaken of the senate/academic board and its committees'*.

## **6. Remuneration of independent members**

Finally, Court may wish to consider the pros and cons of remunerating Court members. This is discussed in the text on Page 23 of the Draft Code. On balance, the Working Group is not in favour of remuneration, but feels that Court could make it clearer that it will reimburse all relevant expenses of Court members, including, for example, Childcare expenses and/or lost earnings.

### **Section B - Points for Court to Note**

- 1 If the Draft Code is endorsed by the Cabinet Secretary for Education, the Scottish Funding Council will require the University to follow the Code as a condition of funding.
2. Principle 6 of the Draft Code states that the Register of Interests of Court members should be published on the website.
3. Principle 9 states that the Governing Body should *'make public a full evaluation of the balance of skills, attributes and experience required for membership of the Governing Body, which shall inform the recruitment of independent members of the Governing Body.'* The Nominations Committee will address this requirement in the recruitment of new Co-opted members towards the end of Calendar Year 2013.
4. Principle 11 states that the Nominations Committee should include at least one staff and one student member of the Governing Body. Currently the Nominations Committee includes the Senior Senate Assessor. In future, it should also include the SRC President.

DN

**Court – Wednesday 19 June 2013**

## **Introduction of new University Complaints Procedure**

**Professor John Briggs, Clerk of Senate**

The Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO) requires the University, along with all other Scottish HE Institutions, to introduce a new Complaints Procedure by the end of August 2013. A compliance statement must be returned to SPSO by 28 June 2013 in order for the SPSO to confirm to the Scottish Funding Council that the University is compliant with the Model Complaints Handling Procedure which is now a condition of the SFC funding agreement.

The Model Complaints Handling Procedure, published by the SPSO, is the template which the University is required to follow.

The main features are:

### **1. What is a complaint?**

A complaint is defined as: 'An expression of dissatisfaction by one or more individuals about the standard of service, action or lack of action by or on behalf of the University.'

Under the new Procedure a complaint does not include: routine, first requests for a service; responses to feedback through formal mechanisms (such as questionnaires or committees); academic appeals; FOI/DPA requests; or staff grievances. Senate Office is working with individual areas of the University to assist in identifying matters that should be treated as 'complaints'.

### **2. Two stage procedure**

The University's current Complaints Procedure includes three stages:

- informal stage
- Stage 1 formal (investigation) and
- Stage 2 formal (review).

Under the new Procedure this will be replaced with two stages:

- Stage 1 frontline resolution (straightforward issues, quick to resolve) and
- Stage 2 investigation.

Thus for complex matters the University will have just one opportunity to provide its 'definitive response' to a complaint.

### **3. Time limit for lodging complaints**

The current time limit for students to lodge a complaint is twelve months from the last incident about which they wish to complain (and six months for former students or non-students). Under the new Procedure the time limit is six months for all complainants though there is provision for extensions to be requested.

### **4. Timescales**

The current University Complaints Procedure does not specify timescales for responding to complaints, except that complainants should be updated on the progress of formal investigations every 10 working days. Under the new Procedure, the final response to a complaint should be provided within five working days (where it is handled under Stage 1 frontline resolution) and 20

working days (Stage 2 investigation). Experience shows that complaint investigations (particularly in academic areas) often take substantially longer than 20 working days to complete. The new Procedure permits extensions to the 20 working days to be authorised by the Clerk of Senate where there is good reason, but the expectation is that the University should attempt to respond within 20 working days as the norm.

#### **5. All staff to be aware of the Complaints Procedure**

It is a requirement that all University staff must be aware of the Complaints Procedure. Thus all staff should either be able to attempt 'frontline resolution' of a complaint or be able to identify quickly the person best able to respond to a complaint. The Senate Office is leading on staff awareness-raising and is working with individual areas to discuss how frontline resolution will operate within those areas.

#### **6. Recording of complaints**

Formal complaints in academic areas are currently reported to Senate annually. The recording and reporting of informal complaints is not systematic. Historically there has been no central requirement to record or report complaints handled by University Services. The new Complaints Procedure includes the requirement that all complaints received by the University must be recorded, and sets out the nature of the information required (e.g. description of complaint, outcome, remedy offered, time taken to respond to complaint). The Senate Office is working with IT Services to develop a means for staff to record the required information. The information recorded for each complaint handled under Stage 1 - frontline resolution will be forwarded to, and collated by, Senate Office. (Senate Office will be closely involved in all Stage 2 Investigations so will record all the required information.)

#### **7. Reporting of complaints**

Under the new Procedure information on complaints handling must be reported within the University but also to SPSO and the SFC. There is a new emphasis on publication of information about the nature of complaints with a view to service improvement.

### **Implementation of new Procedure**

The new Procedure will come into force on 12 August 2013, on publication of the University Calendar 2013-14. The new Procedure will form chapter 29 of the Calendar, replacing the current Complaints Procedure.

#### **Court is asked to approve the introduction of the new Procedure.**

*The full text of the procedure has not been issued with the hard-copy Court papers, but an electronic version will be issued to all Court members so that they can refer to it if they wish.*

Further information is available on the SPSO website at: <http://www.valuingcomplaints.org.uk/further-and-higher-education/>

Developments within the University will be reported at: <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/workingwithstudents/complaints/newcomplaintsprocedure/>

Key contacts in the Senate Office: [Mrs Ruth Cole](#) (x8112) and [Ms Fiona Dick](#) (x 2096).

# **The University of Glasgow Complaints Procedure**





## **Complaints Procedure**

The University has a duty to maintain and enhance the quality of its provision and to provide an effective system for handling complaints. Complainants should have a full opportunity to raise individually or collectively, matters of proper concern to them without fear of disadvantage and in the knowledge that privacy and confidentiality will be respected.

This procedure operates in accordance with the University's Equality & Diversity Policy which requires that complainants will be treated fairly and consistently without discrimination.

Students should be aware that the Complaints Procedure is not the only means of raising concerns with the University. For instance, concerns about the quality or organisation of programmes of study might most effectively be referred in the first instance to the appropriate Staff/Student Committee through the Class/Year Representative or the Students' Representative Council (SRC) representative for the relevant area. Students can also discuss matters informally with the Head of School, Head of the Administrative Department or Support Service, an Adviser of Studies, Supervisor, Course Co-ordinator, College Administrator or other member of staff without invoking the Complaints Procedure.

## What is a complaint?

For the purpose of this procedure, a complaint may be defined as:

'An expression of dissatisfaction by one or more individuals about the standard of service, action or lack of action by or on behalf of the University.'

A complaint may relate to:

- the quality and standard of service
- failure to provide a service
- the quality of facilities or learning resources
- treatment by or attitude of a staff member, student or contractor
- inappropriate behaviour by a staff member, student or contractor
- the failure of the University to follow an appropriate administrative process
- dissatisfaction with University policy, although it is recognised that policy is set at the discretion of the University

The definition of a complaint is very broad and the list above is not exhaustive. However, not every concern raised with the University is a complaint. For example, the following **are not complaints**:

- a routine, first-time request for a service
- a request under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act or Data Protection Act
- a request for information or an explanation of policy or practice
- a response to an invitation to provide feedback through a formal mechanism such as a questionnaire<sup>1</sup> or committee membership<sup>2</sup> will generally not be treated as a complaint
- an insurance claim
- an issue which is being, or has been, considered by a court or tribunal
- an attempt to have a complaint reconsidered where the University's Complaints Procedure has been completed and a decision has been issued
- a grievance by a member of staff which is eligible for handling through the [Grievance Procedure]
- a challenge to an academic judgement or an appeal against a decision concerning progress, assessment or award. (However, if the complaint concerns the quality of supervision or teaching which the complainant

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, annual monitoring, or a formal consultation.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Staff-Student Liaison Committee, or student representation on a School Learning & Teaching Committee.

considers contributed to a failure to achieve a required academic standard, the matter should be considered under the Complaints Procedure.)

These issues will be dealt with under the alternative appropriate processes rather than under the Complaints Procedure. It should be noted, however, that some situations can involve a combination of issues, some are complaints and others are not, and each should be assessed on a case by case basis.

### **Who can make a complaint?**

The Complaints Procedure covers complaints from anyone who receives, requests or is affected by the University's services. This includes, although is not limited to:

- a student's experience during their time at the University (all referred to as 'students' through the remainder of this document);
- members of the public, where they have a complaint about matters which are (or which were at the time the issue arose) the responsibility of the University;
- members of the public who are applying for admission to the University and whose complaint does not relate to academic judgement;
- members of staff, where they are users of services provided by the University.

The basic processes for investigating complaints are the same for students, members of staff, members of the public and applicants to the University.

Sometimes individuals may be unable or reluctant to make a complaint on their own. The University will accept complaints brought by third parties, as long as the individual affected is under the age of 18 or has given their personal consent under the requirements of the Data Protection Act (1998). The giving of personal consent usually means that the individual affected must give clear written authority for the third party to act on their behalf. Complaints made by a third party will be dealt with according to the same timescales.

### **Joint Complaints**

In the case of a complaint raised jointly, a lead person shall be identified who will represent those raising the complaint.

### **Anonymous Complaints**

Complaints submitted anonymously will be considered if there is enough information in the complaint to enable the University to make further enquiries. If, however, an anonymous complaint does not provide enough information to enable the University to take further action, the University may decide not to pursue it further. However,

the University may give consideration to the issues raised, and will record the complaint so that corrective action can be taken if appropriate.

Any decision not to pursue an anonymous complaint will be authorised by the Clerk of Senate. If an anonymous complaint contains serious allegations, it should be referred to the Clerk of Senate immediately.

### **Complaints involving more than one department**

If a complaint relates to the actions of two or more service departments / Schools/ Colleges,

- (a) in the case of a Stage One complaint: the staff member receiving the complaint must confer with the other area(s) to decide who will take the lead on the complaint.
- (b) In the case of a Stage Two complaint: the Director of the Senate Office will determine who will act as the Complaint Investigator.

The complainant will be told to whom the complaint is being passed and given their contact details. Coordination may still be required between different areas of the University to ensure that the complaint is fully addressed in a single response. The nature of the complaint may also require parallel procedures to be initiated (such as an academic appeal or disciplinary procedures).

### **Complaints involving other organisations or contractors who provide a service on behalf of the University**

If an individual complains to the University about the service of another organisation, but the University has no involvement in the issue, the individual should be advised to contact the appropriate organisation directly.

Where a complaint relates to a University service and the service of another organisation the University will investigate its own involvement in the matter in accordance with the Complaints Procedure. When entering into a formal agreement relating to the provision of services (such as with partner institutions and contractors) the University will, where reasonable, include the requirement that the other organisation will investigate complaints – or co-operate with University complaints investigations – in accordance with the principles of this procedure. Where there is no formal agreement between the University and the other organisation, the University will make the other organisation aware of the terms of the Complaints Procedure and request the other organisation's cooperation in addressing complaints in accordance with the principles of the Complaints Procedure.

If enquiries to an outside organisation in relation to the complaint are required, care will be taken to comply with Data Protection legislation and the guidance on handling personal information. Such complaints may include, for example:

- A complaint made in relation to provision of third-party services, for example IT systems.
- A complaint made about a service that is contracted out, such as catering services.
- A complaint made to the University about a student loan where the dissatisfaction relates to both the service the University has provided and the service the Student Awards Agency for Scotland has provided.

### **Time limit for making complaints**

Complaints should be raised with the University as soon as problems arise to enable prompt investigation and swift resolution. The time limit for raising a complaint with the University is six months, starting from when the complainant first became aware of the problem, unless there are special circumstances for requesting consideration of a complaint beyond this time.

Beyond the six-month time limit, the University will exercise discretion in the way that the time limit is applied. This will take account of the time limit within which a member of the public can normally ask the SPSO to consider complaints, which is twelve months from when the person first became aware of the issue about which they are complaining. An extension to the six-month time limit shall be granted only where the Clerk of Senate accepts as reasonable, the explanation for the delay in presenting the complaint.

### **The Complaints Procedure**

The Complaints Procedure is intended to provide a quick, simple and streamlined process with a strong focus on early resolution by empowered and well-trained staff.

The procedure involves up to two stages:

**1 Frontline resolution** seeks to resolve straightforward complaints swiftly and effectively at the point at which the complaint is made, or as close to that point as possible.<sup>3</sup>

**2 Investigation** is appropriate where a complainant is dissatisfied with the outcome of frontline resolution, or where frontline resolution is not possible or appropriate due to the complexity or seriousness of the case.

---

<sup>3</sup> For clarity, the term 'frontline resolution' refers to the first stage of the complaints process. It is not intended to reflect any job description within the University; rather it refers to the process which seeks to resolve complaints as soon as possible.

**Stage One: frontline resolution – to be completed within 5 working days<sup>4</sup>**

Anyone who has a complaint is encouraged to raise it initially at the point of, or as close to the point of, becoming aware of it as possible and to raise it with the department in which the issue arose. Complaints at this stage may be made face-to-face, by phone, in writing or by email. However, when the complainant is in possession of documentation that is relevant to the complaint a copy should be provided at the point that the complaint is made.

The purpose of frontline resolution is to attempt to resolve as quickly as possible complaints which are straightforward and require little or no investigation. Complaints at this stage of the process may be addressed by any relevant member of the University's staff and may be handled by way of a face-to-face discussion with the complainant, or by asking an appropriate member of staff to deal with the complaint.

Members of staff to whom complaints are made will consider some key questions:

- Is this a complaint or should the individual be referred to another procedure?
- What specifically is the complaint (or complaints) about and which area(s) of the University is /are involved?
- What outcome is the complainant hoping for and can it be achieved?
- Is this complaint straightforward and likely to be resolved with little or no investigation?
- Can the complaint be resolved on the spot by providing an apology /explanation / alternative solution?
- Can another member of staff assist in seeking a frontline resolution?
- What assistance can be provided to the complainant in taking this forward?

If responsibility for the issue being complained about lies in the staff member's area of work, every attempt will be made to resolve the problem at source. If responsibility lies elsewhere, the staff member receiving the complaint will liaise with the relevant area rather than simply passing the complainant on to another office.

Where the complaint relates to the conduct of a particular member of staff, the member of staff will be given the opportunity to provide to the complaint handler a response to the complaint.

---

<sup>4</sup> For the purposes of this Procedure, Monday to Friday are counted as working days except where the University is closed for a Public Holiday. Saturdays and Sundays are not counted as working days.

Resolution may be achieved by providing an on-the-spot explanation of why the issue occurred and/or an apology and, where possible, information about what will be done to stop any identified service failure happening again in the future.

### **Extension to the five day timeline**

Frontline resolution should normally be completed within 5 working days, though a resolution may be achieved more quickly. In exceptional circumstances a short extension of time may be necessary to increase the possibility of resolving the complaint at the frontline resolution stage (for example, by obtaining information from other areas where no single area of the University is responsible for the issue(s) being complained about). Requests for an extension will be agreed if the Director of the Senate Office accepts as reasonable the grounds presented by the complaint handler. The complainant will be told of the reasons for extending the deadline and advised of the new timescale for resolution. The maximum extension which can be granted is 5 working days (i.e. not more than 10 working days in total from the date of receipt of the complaint).

### **Closing the complaint at the frontline resolution stage**

The outcome will be communicated to the complainant. This may be face-to-face, by phone, in writing or by email. There is no requirement to send out further written communication to the complainant, although where the outcome has been communicated in person, it would normally be expected that the outcome would be confirmed in writing. The response to the complainant must address all the topics for which the University is responsible, and explain the reasons for the decision.

Once a decision has been issued, the record of the complaint will be forwarded to the Senate Office, including details of the decision reached. The complaint should then be closed.

Where a complaint is upheld, the University should defray reasonable and proportionate incidental expenses necessarily incurred by the complainant in the process of pursuing the complaint.

### **Stage two: investigation – to be completed within 20 working days**

These complaints may already have been considered at the frontline resolution stage, or they may be complaints identified upon receipt as appropriate for immediate investigation.

A complaint will be addressed under the investigation stage when:

- frontline resolution was attempted, but the complainant remains dissatisfied. This may be after the case has been closed following the frontline resolution stage. In such a case the complainant must make the complaint, explaining in what respect(s) they remain dissatisfied.



- the complainant refuses to recognise or engage with the frontline resolution process and is insistent that the issue be addressed by a more senior member of staff, except where the Clerk of Senate determines that this view is unreasonable and that frontline resolution must be attempted in the first instance.
- the issues raised are complex and will require detailed investigation. In such cases the complainant may choose to submit the complaint to Stage 2, stating the reasons for not having initially pursued the complaint under Stage 1. Alternatively, a member of staff receiving a Stage 1 complaint may consider that the matter should be immediately referred to the Senate Office for consideration as a Stage 2 investigation.
- the complaint relates to issues that have been identified by the University as high risk or high profile.

Special attention will be given to identifying complaints considered high risk or high profile, as these may require particular action or may raise critical issues requiring direct input from senior management. Potential high risk /high profile complaints may:

- involve a death or serious injury
- involve serious service failure, for example major delays in service provision or repeated failures to provide a service
- generate significant and on-going press interest
- pose a serious operational risk to the Institution
- present issues of a highly sensitive nature.

Stage 2 complaints must be raised through the Senate Office:

By email: [complaints@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:complaints@glasgow.ac.uk)

In writing: The Senate Office, The University of Glasgow, Glasgow, G12 8QQ.

By telephone: 0141 330 2241.

In person: The Senate Office, Gilbert Scott Building, University of Glasgow.

For a complaint that will be considered at the investigation stage, the complainant will be asked to complete the [\[complaint form\]](#) to provide full details of the complaint and any relevant documentation. If they choose not to write it down and would prefer to complain in person, the complaint form can be completed with them and a letter to confirm the scope of the complaint issued to them.

Information and documentation material to the complaint should be provided by the complainant and by the University while taking account of the privacy, confidentiality and reasonable interests of any relevant third parties. Unauthorised electronic recordings of previous meetings or events will not be admissible as evidence for the complaint.

The purpose of conducting an investigation is to establish all of the facts relevant to the points made in the complaint and to provide a full, objective and proportionate response to the complainant that represents the University's definitive position.

### **What the University will do when it receives a complaint for investigation**

The University will allocate the complaint to an Investigating Officer. It is important to be clear from the start of the investigation stage exactly what is being investigated, and to ensure that both the complainant and the Investigating Officer understand the scope of the investigation. In discussion with the complainant, three key questions should be considered:

1. What specifically is the complaint (or complaints)?
2. What does the complainant want to achieve by complaining?
3. Do the complainant's expectations appear to be reasonable and achievable?

If the complainant's expectations appear to exceed what the University can reasonably provide or are not within the University's power to provide, the complainant will be advised of this as soon as possible in order to manage expectations about possible outcomes.

The Investigating Officer will seek a response from the department(s) to which the complaint relates. Where the complaint relates to the conduct of a particular member of staff, the member of staff will be asked to provide to the Investigating Officer a response to the complaint.

Details of the complaint will be recorded on the system for recording complaints. Where the complaint has been through the frontline resolution stage this will be shown in the complaints log. At the conclusion of the investigation the log will be updated to reflect the final outcome and any action taken in response to the complaint.

### **Timelines**

The following deadlines will be used for cases at the investigation stage of the Complaints Procedure:

- complaints will be acknowledged in writing within 3 working days<sup>5</sup>
- the University will provide a full response to the complaint as soon as possible but not later than 20 working days from the time that the complaint was received for investigation.

---

<sup>5</sup> For the purposes of this Procedure, Monday to Friday are counted as working days except where the University is closed for a Public Holiday. Saturdays and Sundays are not counted as working days.

### **Extension to the timeline**

Not all investigations will be able to meet this deadline; for example some complaints are so complex that they will require careful consideration and detailed investigation beyond the 20 working days timeline. Where there are clear and justifiable reasons for extending the timescale (e.g. volume of documentation to be considered, number of responses to the complaint to be obtained), the Clerk of Senate will exercise judgement and will set time limits on any extended investigation, with the agreement of the complainant. If the complainant does not agree to an extension but it is unavoidable and reasonable, then the Clerk of Senate must consider and confirm the extension. In such circumstances, the complainant must be kept updated on the reason for the delay and given a revised timescale for bringing the investigation to a conclusion. It is expected, however, that this will be the exception and that the University will always strive to deliver a definitive response to the complaint within 20 working days.

Where an extension has been agreed, this will be recorded appropriately and the proportion of complaints that exceed the 20 working day-limit will be evident from reported statistics.

### **Mediation**

Some complex complaints (where, for example, the complainant and/or other involved parties have become entrenched in their position) may benefit from a different approach to resolving the complaint. Using mediation can help both parties to understand what is driving the complaint, and may be more likely to result in a mutually satisfactory conclusion being reached. Whilst the University does not have a formal mediation service, parties wishing to consider alternatives to a complaint investigation should enquire about this with the investigating officer. Where other means of dispute resolution are attempted, the complaint investigation will be suspended. If the matter is not resolved through mediation revised timescales will be agreed.

### **Closing the complaint at the investigation stage**

The outcome of the investigation will be communicated to the complainant and to the subject of the complaint in writing together with details of the investigation, an explanation of the grounds for the decision and copies of relevant documentation. Where a complaint is upheld, the University should defray reasonable and proportionate incidental expenses necessarily incurred by the complainant in the process of pursuing the complaint.

The decision, and details of how and when it was communicated to the complainant, will be recorded on the system for recording complaints. The complainant will also be advised about:

- their right to ask the SPSO to review the complaint
- the time limit for doing so
- how to contact the SPSO.

### **Independent external review (SPSO)**

Once the investigation stage has been completed, the complainant is entitled to ask the SPSO to look at their complaint. The SPSO considers complaints from people who remain dissatisfied at the conclusion of the University's Complaints Procedure. The SPSO looks at issues such as service failure and maladministration (administrative fault) as well as the way the University has handled the complaint.

The SPSO requires the University to use standard wording to inform complainants of their right to ask the SPSO to review the complaint.

### **Information about the SPSO**

The Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO) is the final stage for complaints about public services in Scotland. This includes complaints about Scottish universities. Complainants who remain dissatisfied with the University after its complaints process can ask the SPSO to look at the complaint. The SPSO cannot normally look at complaints:

- which have not been all the way through the university's complaints handling procedure
- more than 12 months after the complainant became aware of the matter complained about, or
- that have been or are being considered in court.

## **Governance of the Complaints Handling Procedure**

### **Roles and Responsibilities**

All staff will be aware of:

- the Complaints Procedure
- how to handle and record complaints at the frontline resolution stage
- who they can refer a complaint to if they are unable to handle the matter personally
- the need to try and resolve complaints early and as locally (within their department) as possible and
- their clear authority to attempt to resolve any complaints they may be called upon to deal with.

Senior management will ensure that:

- the University's final position on a complaint investigation is signed off by the Clerk of Senate in order to provide assurance that this is the definitive response of the University and that the complainant's concerns have been taken seriously

- it maintains overall responsibility and accountability for the management and governance of complaints handling within the University
- it has an active role in, and understanding of, the Complaints Procedure (although not necessarily involved in the decision making process of complaints handling)
- mechanisms are in place to ensure a consistent approach to the way complaints handling information is managed, monitored, reviewed and reported at all levels in the University, and
- complaints information is used to improve services, and this is evident from regular publications.

**Principal:** The Principal provides leadership and direction to the University. This includes ensuring that there is an effective Complaints Procedure with a robust investigation process which demonstrates that organisational learning is in place. The Principal may delegate responsibility for the procedure, but must receive assurance of complaints performance by way of regular reporting. They should also ensure that complaints are used to identify service improvements, and that these improvements are implemented, and learning fed back to the wider organisation as appropriate.

**Clerk of Senate:** As a senior officer they may be responsible for signing response letters to complainants and therefore must be satisfied that the investigation is complete and that the response addresses all aspects of the complaint.

**Complaints Investigating Officer:** The Complaints Investigating Officer is a suitably trained staff member responsible for the conduct of complaints investigations, who has no material interest in the complaint and who is involved in the investigation and the co-ordination of all aspects of the response to the complainant. This may include preparing a comprehensive written report, including details of any recommended procedural changes to service delivery. Complaints Investigators must have a clear remit to investigate effectively and reach robust decisions on more complex complaints. This also requires clear direction and support from senior management on the extent and limits of discretion and responsibilities in investigating and resolving complaints, including the ability to identify failings, take effective remedial action and apologise, where it is appropriate to do so.

**All staff:** A complaint may be made to any member of staff. All staff must, therefore, be aware of the Complaints Procedure and how to handle and record complaints at the frontline resolution stage. They should also be aware of who to refer a complaint to, in case they are not able to personally handle the matter. The University encourages all staff to try to resolve complaints early, as close to the point of service delivery as possible, and quickly to prevent escalation.

**SPSO liaison officer** (or officer with this responsibility): This staff member's role may include providing complaints information in an orderly, structured way within requested timescales, providing comments on factual accuracy on behalf of the University in response to SPSO reports, confirming recommendations have been implemented, and providing evidence to verify this.

### **Complaints about senior staff**

Complaints about senior staff can be difficult to handle as there may be a conflict of interest for the staff investigating the complaint. When serious complaints are raised against senior staff it is particularly important that the investigation is conducted by an individual who is independent of the situation. The University will ensure that there are strong governance arrangements in place that set out clear procedures for handling such complaints.

### **Recording, reporting, publicising and learning**

Valuable feedback is obtained through complaints. One of the objectives of the Complaints Procedure is to identify opportunities to improve provision of services across the University. Staff must record all complaints so that the University can use the complaints data for analysis and management reporting. By recording and using complaints information in this way, the causes of complaints can be identified, addressed and, where appropriate, training opportunities can be identified and improvements introduced.

### **Recording complaints**

To collect suitable data, it is essential that all complaints are recorded in sufficient detail. The minimum requirements are as follows:

- name and contact details of the complainant and student matriculation number (if applicable)
- date of receipt of the complaint
- how the complaint was received
- category of complaint
- staff member responsible for handling the complaint
- department to which the complaint relates
- action taken and outcome at frontline resolution stage (if applicable)
- date the complaint was closed at the frontline resolution stage (if applicable)
- date the investigation stage was initiated (if applicable)
- action taken and outcome at investigation stage (if applicable)
- date the complaint was closed at the investigation stage (if applicable)
- underlying cause and remedial action taken (if applicable)
- response times at each stage

The University has a structured system for recording complaints, their outcomes and any resulting action so that the complaint data can be used for internal reporting as indicated below.

### **Reporting of complaints**

The University has a system for the internal reporting of complaints information, managed by the Director of the Senate Office. Regularly reporting the analysis of complaints information helps to inform management of where improvements are required. Information reported internally will include:

- performance statistics, detailing complaints volumes, types and key performance information, for example on time taken and stage at which complaints were resolved
- the trends and outcomes of complaints and the actions taken in response including examples to demonstrate how complaints have helped improve services.

This information will be reported at least quarterly to the Senior Management Group and at least annually to Court and Senate.

### **Publicising complaints performance information**

The University will publish on a quarterly basis a summary of complaints outcomes, trends and actions taken to improve services, with a focus on case studies and examples of how complaints have helped improve services. This may also include positive feedback from students and members of the public.

This demonstrates the University's approach to improving services on the basis of complaints and shows that complaints can influence the University's services. It also helps ensure transparency in the University's complaints handling service and will help to demonstrate to students and members of the public that the University values their complaints.

The University will report on complaints handling performance annually in line with SPSO requirements. This includes performance statistics showing the volume and type of complaints and key performance details, for example on the time taken and the stage at which complaints were resolved. Information will be made available on the [\[Senate Office website\]](#).

### **Learning from complaints**

The Complaints Investigator will always try to ensure that all parties involved understand the findings of the investigation and any decisions made. Senior management will ensure that the University has procedures in place to act on issues that are identified. These procedures facilitate:

- using complaints data to identify the root cause of complaints

- taking action to reduce the chance of any identified failings happening again
- recording the details of corrective action in the complaints file
- systematically reviewing complaints performance reports to improve performance.

The analysis of management reports detailing complaints performance will help to ensure that any trends or wider issues which may not be obvious from individual complaints are quickly identified and addressed. Where the University identifies the need for service improvement:

- an officer (or team) will be designated the 'owner' of the issue, with responsibility for ensuring that any identified action is taken
- a target date will be set for the action to be implemented, and followed up on to ensure delivery within this timescale
- where appropriate, performance in the academic or service area will be monitored to ensure that the issue has been resolved.

### **Maintaining confidentiality**

Confidentiality is an important factor in conducting complaints investigations. The University will always have regard to any legislative requirements; for example, data protection legislation and also internal policies on confidentiality and the use of complainant information. Complaints will be handled with an appropriate level of confidentiality and information released only to those who need it for the purposes of investigating or responding to the complaint. No third party will be told any more about the investigation than is strictly necessary in order to obtain the information required from them.

While privacy and confidentiality will be respected, it will be necessary (except in the case of anonymous complaints) to reveal the identity of the complainant in the course of the investigation and the complainant should be informed at the outset that the details of the complaint and his/her identity will be revealed to individuals from whom a response is required in the process of investigating the complaint.

Where a complaint has been raised against a student or member of staff and has been upheld, the complainant will be advised of this. However, it would not be appropriate to share specific details affecting specific students or staff members, particularly where disciplinary action is taken.

### **Managing unacceptable behaviour**

It is recognised that people may act out of character in times of trouble or distress. The circumstances leading to a complaint may result in the complainant acting in an unacceptable way. Complainants who display difficult behaviour may still have a



legitimate grievance, and the University will therefore treat all complaints seriously and assess them properly.

The actions of complainants who are angry, demanding or persistent may result in unreasonable demands on time and resources or unacceptable behaviour towards the University's staff. The University therefore has in place the [Code of Practice on Unacceptable Behaviour] to protect staff from such unacceptable behaviour. This includes the requirement for the University to inform the complainant in writing of any action it intends to take under the Code, the complainant's right of appeal, and any procedures for reviewing any decision to restrict contact.

The University reserves the right to suspend the Complaints Procedure if the complainant behaves inappropriately. In such cases the Clerk of Senate or his/her nominee shall suspend procedures and advise the complainant accordingly.

The University is not under obligation to investigate frivolous, vexatious or malicious complaints or complaints previously dealt with or to enter into further correspondence if a reasonable response has been provided.

### **Supporting the complainant**

Anyone who receives, requests or is directly affected by the services the University provides has the right to access the Complaints Procedure. Complainants who do not have English as a first language may need help with interpretation and translation services. Other complainants may have specific needs which the University will seek to address to ensure easy access to the Complaints Procedure by making reasonable adjustments to help the complainant. There are a number of support services available which can provide helpful support to those who wish to pursue a complaint with the University.

The [SRC Advice Centre] is an advice, information and representation service provided by the Students' Representative Council (SRC) for all Glasgow University students. The Advice Centre offers free and confidential advice.

Information on harassment and bullying is provided in the [Dignity at Work and Study Policy].

International students may seek advice from the International Student Adviser.

Research students may seek advice from the Graduate School Administrator.

### **Supporting the subject of the complaint**

Where the complaint is against a student, the student complained against may be represented by the Students' Representative Council or by any other appointed representative.

Where the complaint is against a member of staff, the member of staff may be represented by a Union official or any other representative.

## The University of Glasgow Complaints Procedure – a guide for students

The University is committed to providing an excellent education and high quality services to our students from enrolment to graduation.

### **We value complaints and use information from them to help us improve our services.**

If something goes wrong or you are dissatisfied with our services, please tell us. This leaflet describes our complaints procedure and how to make a complaint. It also tells you about our service standards and what you can expect from us.

### **What is a complaint?**

We regard a complaint as any expression of dissatisfaction about our action or lack of action, or about the standard of service provided by us or on our behalf.

### **What can I complain about?**

You can complain about things like:

- the quality and standard of any service we provide
- the quality of our facilities and learning resources
- the quality and standards of academic services and personal support services available to you
- the quality and standards of administrative processes
- unfair treatment by a student or staff member.

Your complaint may involve more than one of the University's services or be about someone working on our behalf.

### **What can't I complain about?**

There are some things we can't deal with through our complaints procedure. These include:

- a routine first-time request for a service
- a request for information or an explanation of policy or practice
- a request under freedom of information or data protection legislation
- matters that are covered by academic appeals
- an issue which is being, or has been, considered by a court or tribunal
- an attempt to reopen a previously concluded complaint or to have a complaint reconsidered where we have already given our final decision following an investigation. If you are still not satisfied, you can ask the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO) for an independent review of the complaint.

If other University procedures or rights of appeal can help you resolve your concerns, we will give information and advice to help you.

### **Who can complain?**

Anyone who receives, requests or is directly affected by the services of the University can make a complaint to us, including the representative of someone who is dissatisfied with our service. If you are making a complaint on someone else's behalf you will need their personal written consent. Please also read the section on 'Getting help to make your complaint'.

### **How do I complain?**

You can complain in person, by phone, in writing, or by email [[complaints@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:complaints@glasgow.ac.uk)]. Our complaints form is available at: [\[LINK\]](#).

It is easier for us to resolve a complaint if you make it quickly and directly to the service concerned. So please talk to a member of our staff within the department you are complaining about. Then they can try to resolve any problems on the spot.

When complaining, tell us:

- your full name and address
- as much as you can about the complaint
- what has gone wrong
- how you want us to resolve the matter.

### **How long do I have to make a complaint?**

Normally, you must make your complaint within six months of:

- the event you want to complain about, or
- finding out that you have a reason to complain.

In exceptional circumstances, we may be able to accept a complaint after the time limit. If you feel that the time limit should not apply to your complaint, please tell us why.

## **What happens when I have complained?**

We will always tell you who is dealing with your complaint.

Our complaints procedure has two stages:

### **Stage one – frontline resolution**

We aim to resolve complaints quickly and close to where we provided the service. This could mean an on-the-spot apology and explanation if something has clearly gone wrong, and immediate action to resolve the problem. Where possible, your concerns should be raised with the relevant staff member, lecturer, school office or relevant administrative service. This can be done face-to-face, by phone, in writing or by email.

We will give you our decision at Stage 1 in five working days or less, unless there are exceptional circumstances.

If you are not satisfied with the response we give at this stage, we will tell you what you can do next. If you choose to, you can take your complaint to Stage 2 of the complaints procedure. You may choose to do this immediately or shortly after you get our initial decision.

### **Stage two – investigation**

Stage 2 deals with two types of complaint: those that have not been resolved at Stage 1 and those that are complex and require detailed investigation. We have a [\[complaint form\]](#), which will help you to state your complaint clearly to us. Although we will also accept complaints that are made in person or on the phone, we encourage you to complete the complaint form in the interests of clarity and in order to best assist the investigation process.

Stage 2 complaints should be raised through the Senate Office:

By email: [complaints@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:complaints@glasgow.ac.uk)

In writing: The Senate Office, The University of Glasgow, Glasgow, G12 8QQ.

By telephone: 0141 330 2241.

In person: at The Senate Office, Gilbert Scott Building, University of Glasgow.

When using Stage 2 we will:

- acknowledge receipt of your complaint within three working days
- discuss your complaint with you to understand why you are dissatisfied and what outcome you are looking for
- give you a full response to the complaint as soon as possible and within 20 working days.

If our investigation will take longer than 20 working days, we will tell you. We will agree revised time limits with you and keep you updated on progress.

### What if I'm still dissatisfied?

After we have fully investigated, if you are still dissatisfied with our decision or the way we dealt with your complaint, you can ask the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO) to look at it.

The SPSO **cannot** normally look at:

- a complaint that has not completed our complaints procedure (**so please make sure it has done so before contacting the SPSO**)
- events that happened, or that you became aware of, more than a year ago
- a matter that has been or is being considered in court.

You can contact the SPSO:

In Person:

SPSO  
4 Melville Street  
Edinburgh  
EH3 7NS

By Post:

SPSO  
Freepost EH641  
Edinburgh  
EH3 0BR

Freephone: 0800 377 7330

Online contact [www.spsso.org.uk/contact-us](http://www.spsso.org.uk/contact-us)

Website: [www.spsso.org.uk](http://www.spsso.org.uk)

Mobile site: <http://m.spsso.org.uk>

### Getting help to make your complaint

We understand that you may be unable, or reluctant, to make a complaint yourself. We accept complaints from the representative of a person who is dissatisfied with our service. We can take complaints from a friend, relative, or an advocate, if you have given them your written consent to complain for you.

The Students' Representative Council (SRC) Advice Centre is an advice, information and representation service provided by the SRC for all Glasgow University students. The Advice Centre offer free and confidential advice.

Students' Representative Council (SRC) Advice Centre  
John McIntyre Building, University of Glasgow

Tel: 0141 330 5360 or email: [advice@src.gla.ac.uk](mailto:advice@src.gla.ac.uk)

We are committed to making our service easy to use for all students. In line with our statutory equalities duties, we will always ensure that reasonable adjustments are made to help you access and use our services. If you have trouble putting your complaint in writing, or want this information in another format, such as **large print**, or Braille, please let us know.

Please contact us at:

The Senate Office  
University of Glasgow  
Glasgow  
G12 8QQ

Tel: 0141 330 2241 or e-mail: [complaints@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:complaints@glasgow.ac.uk)

---

## Quick guide to our complaints procedure

### Complaints procedure

You can make your complaint in person, by phone, by e-mail or in writing.

We have a **two-stage complaints procedure**. We will always try to deal with your complaint quickly. But if it is clear that the matter will need a detailed investigation, we will tell you and keep you updated on our progress.

### Stage 1: frontline resolution

We will always try to resolve your complaint quickly, within **five working days** if we can.

If you are dissatisfied with our response, you can ask us to consider your complaint at Stage 2.

### Stage 2: investigation

We will look at your complaint at this stage if you are dissatisfied with our response at Stage 1. We also look at some complaints immediately at this stage, if it is clear that they are complex or need detailed investigation.

We will acknowledge your complaint within **three working days**. We will give you our decision as soon as possible. This will be after no more than **20 working days** *unless* there is clearly a good reason for needing more time.

### The Scottish Public Services Ombudsman

If, after receiving our final decision on your complaint, you remain dissatisfied with our decision or the way we have handled your complaint, you can ask the SPSO to consider it.

We will tell you how to do this when we send you our final decision.

---





**Court – Wednesday 19 June 2013**

**Report from the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on**

**3 June 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/2012/68. Budget 2013-14 and Four Year Forecast**

Finance Committee received the proposed budget for 2013-14 and financial forecasts to 2016-17. The 2013-14 budget outlined a management accounting surplus of £2.9m on activity based in Glasgow, rising to £4.0m after net income from overseas income (SIT and UESTC collaborations) was included.

The financial forecasts project management accounting surpluses of £6.2m, £16.1m and £18.0m on activity based in Glasgow in 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 respectively. Projected surpluses rise to £8.2m, £18.1m and £20m after net income from overseas income is included.

Finance Committee recognised that these are demanding budgets and forecasts and **agreed to recommend** them to Court.

#### **CA/2012/69. Capital Plan**

The Committee noted that the capital plan was flexible and responsive and would be impacted significantly by the new Estates Strategy expected in June 2014. The Capital Plan forecast £222.4m of capital and revenue spending on estates development projects through to 2016-17 and an additional £78.2m on estates operations costs.

Finance Committee commended the revised Capital Plan and acknowledged the importance of the new Estates Strategy.

**Finance Committee agreed to recommend the Capital Plan to Court.**

## **B Items – for noting**

### **CA/2012/71. Gregory Building Labs**

Finance Committee considered an application from the College of Science and Engineering to support the continued learning and teaching infrastructure investment programme by refurbishment of laboratory space in the Gregory Building. The request outlined £1.05m of investment to refurbish the laboratories to support the increased student numbers and to provide learning and teaching space which compares to UK competitors. The investment will allow for improved digital imaging and data capture facilities, more flexible workspaces to allow didactic or small group working and improved research facilities.

**Finance Committee approved the application.**

### **CA/2012/73. South Glasgow Hospital Teaching and Learning and Facility with Innovation Centre**

Finance Committee received an updated paper in relation to the Learning and Teaching Facility development at the South Glasgow Hospital. Finance Committee approved the initial proposed development at its meeting on 27 March 2013 and sought assurances in relation to provision of equipment, cost splitting and cost capping. It was noted that these discussions were ongoing.

The revised capital expenditure application reflected the decision to develop a 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the building to accommodate the Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre. Finance Committee noted that the additional construction costs of £5.5m would be met by Scottish Government and Glasgow City Council funding.

**Finance Committee approved the revised expenditure.**

### **CA/2012/74. Nankai Graduate School Development**

Finance Committee received proposals to develop a Joint Graduate School with Nankai University (financial analyses were considered by Finance Committee but are not included in Court paperwork). The Joint Graduate School will deliver three taught postgraduate dual degree programmes in China in International Relations, Politics and Development, Urban Planning and Environmental Management.

The Committee noted the level of fee that would be required to make the Graduate School arrangement financially sustainable and, subject to agreement on that fee level being achieved with Nankai University, **approved the development of a Joint Graduate School with Nankai University.**

### **CA/2012/76. Expenses Policy**

Finance Committee received a revised University Expenses Policy for approval. It was noted that the introduction of Core Expenses, as part of the new HR system, necessitated a number of minor amendments to the policy. The paper highlighted six key changes.

**Finance Committee approved the revised Expenses Policy.**

### **CA/2012/80. Overview of Performance at 30 April 2013**

Finance Committee noted that the Period 9 results were £7.0m ahead of budget at £18.5m. The full year outlook at period 9 was £10.4m, £5.0m higher than budget. The main positive variances against budget to date include £4.5m lower than budget spend on salaries due to timing of vacancies being filled, £1.2m of deferred income through Residential Services and £1.2m lower than budget spend on consumables in relation to provisions and savings in dowries. It was noted that the delayed payments on dowries would impact expenditure through 2014-15 and 2015-16. Increased income and lower than budget spending was offset by research income £2.5m lower than budget at Period 9 across all Colleges.

The projected full year outlook variances against budget include a £3.7 under spend on salaries and £1.1m lower than budget spend on consumables. The full year outlook projects tuition fee income to be £2.6m down on budget and research income to be £3.5m adverse to budget.

### **CA/2012/81. Debtors Report at 30 April 2013**

Overall debt levels had improved year on year to £28m at April 2013 (£31.58m at April 2012).

Student and sponsor debt levels were lower in April 2013 in comparison to April 2012 with £5.6m outstanding against students and £3.2m against sponsors. Within the student debt, £3.1m is included in direct debit or payment plans agreements. Finance Committee noted that the student debt processes were significantly ahead of student debt processes at April 2012. The report highlighted a reduction in the number of accounts with outstanding debt (2221 at 22 May 2013 compared to 2370 at 25 May 2012) but a considerable reduction in the value of the outstanding accounts (£1.586m at 22 May 2013 compared to £3.807m at 25 May 2012). It was also noted that approximately 1286 accounts were queried or required adjustment in 2012 compared to 306 since January 2013. It was noted that 90% of the sponsor debt (£2.987m) was held by the top ten sponsors including £0.67m from the Student Award Agency Scotland.

Finance Committee noted that outstanding commercial debt stood at £16.6m in comparison to £16.5m at April 2012. The ageing of outstanding commercial debt had remained steady maintaining debtor days at 46.

*Prepared by: Gavin Lee*

*Last modified on: Monday 10 June 2013*

**University of Glasgow**  
**Finance Committee**  
**Minute of Meeting held on Monday, 3 June 2013**  
**in Melville Room, Gilbert Scott Building**

**Present:**

Mr Ken Brown (Convener), Mr Peter Daniels, Mr Robert Fraser, Mr James Harrison, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Mr David Ross.

**In attendance:**

Mrs Ann Allen, Prof Neal Juster, Mr Gavin Lee, Mr David Newall, Ms Carolyn Timar.

**In attendance for Item CA/2012/74:**

Professor Anne Anderson, Mrs Sharon McGregor

**Apologies:**

Prof Miles Padgett, Prof Adrienne Scullion, Mr Iain Stewart, Mr Kevin Sweeney.

**CA/2012/65. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 27 March 2013**

The minutes of Finance Committee held on Wednesday 27 March 2013 were approved with the following amendments:

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

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.

Amended to:

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

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

- Provision of equipment is not at the University expense
- Satisfactory comfort that University costs were capped
- Satisfactory agreement to split of costs (as assumed in business case)

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

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

Amended to:

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

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

**CA/2012/66. Conflicts of Interest**

No conflicts of interest were noted.

**CA/2012/67. Matters Arising**

**CA/2012/67.1 Euro Cash Balances (CA/2012/55)**

The Director of Finance provided an update to the Committee on the business process for managing Euro deposits. The Committee noted that increasing success in securing European contracts was leading to increased Euro cash balances which were held in Euros for the duration of the grant.

**CA/2012/68. Budget 2013-14 and Four Year Forecast (paper 5.1)**

Finance Committee received the proposed budget for 2013-14 and financial forecasts to 2016-17. The 2013-14 budget outlined a management accounting surplus of £2.9m on activity based in Glasgow, rising to £4.0m after net income from overseas income (SIT and UESTC collaborations) was included. The projected surplus was lower than the target surplus (of £10m per annum) due to various staffing costs; the impact of increased staffing for REF purposes, pension auto-enrolment, inflation and promotion and funding to support UGPS deficit. The £15.1m projected increase in staffing costs is partly offset by an expected £14.8m increase in tuition fee income from home, RUK and international students.

The financial forecasts project management accounting surpluses of £6.2m, £16.1m and £18.0m on activity based in Glasgow in 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 respectively. Projected surpluses rise to £8.2m, £18.1m and £20m after net income from overseas income is included.

The budget and financial forecasts are based on a number of assumptions and risks. Finance Committee noted that salary inflation costs were projected at 1% for 2013-14 and 2% for each subsequent year. In order to achieve the projected surpluses, tuition fee income from overseas students was expected to increase incrementally to £80m per annum (2016-17) from £52.2m in 2012-13. The Committee were reassured that international student targets had been thoroughly reviewed in a bottom-up and top-down method and Schools and Colleges and RIO were confident in their ability to reach their targets in student numbers and fee level. In particular further growth is projected in the business school and in medical and vet subjects.

Finance Committee recognised that these are demanding budgets and forecasts and agreed to recommend them to Court.

**CA/2012/69. Capital Plan (paper 5.2)**

The Vice Principal (Strategy and Resources) presented the Capital Plan to Finance Committee. The Committee noted that the capital plan was flexible and responsive and would be impacted significantly by the new Estates Strategy expected in June 2014. Projects in the Capital Plan were delineated into four categories: Authorised, Committed, Not Yet Approved, Future. These categories replace the previous 'priorities' and more accurately capture the stage and progress of each project. The Capital Plan forecast £222.4m of capital and revenue spending on estates development projects through to 2016-17 and an additional £78.2m on estates operations costs.

Finance Committee commended the revised Capital Plan and acknowledged the importance of the new Estates Strategy.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend the Capital Plan to Court.

**CA/2012/70. Data Centre Resilience (Kelvin Building) (paper 5.3.1)**

The Committee received a capital expenditure request for £0.705m to provide infrastructure resilience for two server rooms in the Kelvin Building which provide mission critical data processing for the University and external clients generating c. £8m income per annum. The facilities currently lack back-up support in the case of power failure or air conditioning failure.

Finance Committee approved the application.

**CA/2012/71. Gregory Building Labs (paper 5.3.2)**

Finance Committee considered an application from the College of Science and Engineering to support the continued learning and teaching infrastructure investment programme by refurbishment of laboratory space in the Gregory Building. The request outlined £1.05m of investment to refurbish the laboratories to support the increased student numbers and to provide learning and teaching space which compares to UK competitors. The investment will allow for improved digital imaging and data capture facilities, more flexible workspaces to allow didactic or small group working and improved research facilities.

Finance Committee approved the application.

**CA/2012/72. McCall Building Roof (paper 5.3.3)**

The Committee received a request to replace the asbestos roof of the McCall Building, the main administrative building for the Garscube Estate. The Committee noted that despite numerous temporary repairs the existing roof is heavily weathered and in poor condition permitting water ingress throughout several areas of the building.

Finance Committee approved the £0.66m capital expenditure request.

**CA/2012/73. South Glasgow Hospital Teaching and Learning and Facility with Innovation Centre (paper 5.3.4)**

Finance Committee received an updated paper in relation to the Learning and Teaching Facility development at the South Glasgow Hospital. Finance Committee approved the initial proposed development at its meeting on 27 March 2013 and sought assurances in relation to provision of equipment, cost splitting and cost capping. It was noted that these discussions were ongoing.

The revised capital expenditure application reflected the decision to develop a 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the building to accommodate the Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre. Finance Committee noted that the additional construction costs of £5.5m would be met by Scottish Government and Glasgow City Council funding.

Finance Committee approved the revised expenditure.

**CA/2012/74. Nankai Graduate School Development (paper 5.4)**

The Head of College and Head of College Finance for the College of Social Sciences attended Finance Committee to present proposals to develop a Joint Graduate School with Nankai University. The Joint Graduate School will deliver three taught postgraduate dual degree programmes in China in International Relations, Politics and Development, Urban Planning and Environmental Management. The University has a longstanding collaboration agreement with Nankai University involving teaching and research partnerships. The opportunity for brand development and raising the profile of the University in China was also anticipated to have a positive impact.

The Committee noted the level of fee that would be required to make the Graduate School arrangement financially sustainable and, subject to agreement on that fee level being achieved

with Nankai University, approved the development of a Joint Graduate School with Nankai University.

**CA/2012/75. Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) Return (paper 5.5)**

Finance Committee received the Annual TRAC Return for 2011-12 which was submitted to the Funding Council in January 2013. The TRAC Return requires the adaptation of management accounts to allocate costs to main business functions; research, teaching, other (commercial activities). To establish full economic costing, two economic cost adjustments are made to include the difference between historic cost-depreciation of capital assets and replacement costs (the 'infrastructure adjustment') and an element to ensure a small surplus to support continuing investment (the 'return on investment and finance'.)

Finance Committee approved the return.

**CA/2012/76. Expenses Policy (paper 5.6)**

Finance Committee received a revised University Expenses Policy for approval. It was noted that the introduction of Core Expenses, as part of the new HR system, necessitated a number of minor amendments to the policy. The paper highlighted six key changes.

Finance Committee approved the revised Expenses Policy.

**CA/2012/77. Endowments Investment Reports (paper 6.1)**

Finance Committee noted the endowment investment reports. It was noted that a discussion would be held in June with the investment managers to discuss the management of capital resource and yield maximisation.

**CA/2012/78. Draft Minutes of Student Finance Sub-committee 15 April 2013 (paper 6.2)**

Finance Committee received the minutes of Student Finance Sub-committee for information. The Committee noted that the University had received advice from Dundas and Wilson with regards to equality and diversity obligations in relation to the student bodies, following the equality issues at the Glasgow University Union (GUU). The Sub-committee had agreed to update the Code of Practice relation to student bodies to take consideration of equality obligations. In addition, the University was supporting the GUU in commissioning an independent review of its organisational culture.

It was noted that GUSA reported a small deficit of £1k (an improvement from a deficit of £10k in 2011-12), QMU returned a deficit of £27k (against a £77k forecast deficit), the GUU reported an operating surplus of £12k (versus a breakeven forecast) and the SRC reported a small operating deficit directly related to a one-off contribution to a refurbishment project.

Student Finance Sub-committee agreed to fund the following for 2013-14:

GUSA - £200k

QMU - £239.5k

GUU - £229.5k

SRC - £525.3k

**CA/2012/79. Revised KPI Schedule (paper 6.3)**

The Finance Office provided a revised KPI schedule comparing the University with Russell Group competitors of a similar size and nature to Glasgow. Finance Office was thanked for the very informative paper.

### **CA/2012/80. Overview of Performance at 30 April 2013 (paper 7.1)**

Finance Committee received an overview of performance in Period 9. Finance Committee noted that the Period 9 results were £7.0m ahead of budget at £18.5m. The full year outlook at period 9 was £10.4m, £5.0m higher than budget. The main positive variances against budget to date include £4.5m lower than budget spend on salaries due to timing of vacancies being filled, £1.2m of deferred income through Residential Services and £1.2m lower than budget spend on consumables in relation to provisions and savings in dowries. It was noted that the delayed payments on dowries would impact expenditure through 2014-15 and 2015-16. Increased income and lower than budget spending was offset by research income £2.5m lower than budget at Period 9 across all Colleges.

The projected full year outlook variances against budget include a £3.7 under spend on salaries and £1.1m lower than budget spend on consumables. The full year outlook projects tuition fee income to be £2.6m down on budget and research income to be £3.5m adverse to budget.

### **CA/2012/81. Debtors Report at 30 April 2013 (paper 7.2)**

The Director of Finance provided an overview of debtors as at 30 April 2013. Overall debt levels had improved year on year to £28m at April 2013 (£31.58m at April 2012).

Student and sponsor debt levels were lower in April 2013 in comparison to April 2012 with £5.6m outstanding against students and £3.2m against sponsors. Within the student debt, £3.1m is included in direct debit or payment plans agreements. Finance Committee noted that the student debt processes were significantly ahead of student debt processes at April 2012. The report highlighted a reduction in the number of accounts with outstanding debt (2221 at 22 May 2013 compared to 2370 at 25 May 2012) but a considerable reduction in the value of the outstanding accounts (£1.586m at 22 May 2013 compared to £3.807m at 25 May 2012). It was also noted that approximately 1286 accounts were queried or required adjustment in 2012 compared to 306 since January 2013. It was noted that 90% of the sponsor debt (£2.987m) was held by the top ten sponsors including £0.67m from the Student Award Agency Scotland.

Finance Committee noted that outstanding commercial debt stood at £16.6m, in comparison to £16.5m at April 2012. The ageing of outstanding commercial debt had remained steady maintaining debtor days at 46.

### **CA/2012/82. Dates of meetings 2013-14**

Wednesday, 4 September 2013, 2pm – Turnbull Room (chaired by Iain Stewart)  
Wednesday, 13 November 2013, 2pm – Melville Room  
Wednesday, 15 January 2014, 2pm – Melville Room  
Wednesday, 26 March 2014, 2pm – Melville Room  
Wednesday, 28 May 2014, 2pm – Melville Room

*Prepared by: Gavin Lee, Clerk to Committee, Gavin.Lee@glasgow.ac.uk  
Last modified on: Monday, 10 June 2013*





**Court – Wednesday 19 June 2013**

**Report from the Meeting of the Estates Committee held on 20 May 2013**

**Cover Sheet**

**Brief Description of Paper**

Minute of the Estates Committee meeting of 20 May 2013

**Action Requested**

Court is asked to:

**Note** Estates Committee's approval of the updated Capital Plan (EC/2012.27.1 refers);

**Note** Estates Committee's approval of Capital Projects:

South Glasgow Hospital (Teaching and Learning Facility (EC/2012/28.1 refers);

**Note** Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications in respect of:

Asset Maintenance – Provision of Data Centre Resilience in the sum of £705k (EC/2012/28.3.1 refers)

Refurbishment of Gregory Building Laboratories 306/308/209 in the sum of £1.05m (EC/2012/28.3.2 refers)

McCall Building Roof Replacement in the sum of £660k (EC/2012/28.3.3 refers)

**Note** the remainder of the minute.

Lynn Duncan  
Clerk to Estates Committee  
6 June 2013

**UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW**  
**Estates Committee**  
**Minute of the meeting held in the Estates and Buildings Conference Room on**  
**Monday 20 May 2013**

**Present:**

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

**In Attendance:**

Mr D Cox, Ms L McClure (Clerk), Ms Jess McGrellis, Mr R Kilpatrick, Mrs J Russell, Mr S Sutton,

**Apologies:**

Mrs L Duncan

**EC/2012/25 Minute of the meeting held on 18 March 2013**

The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

**EC/2012/26 Matters Arising**

*EC/2012/26.1 Chemistry Laboratories, Joseph Black Building (Liskamp)( EC/2012/21.5.2 refers)*

A report on the above would be provided to the next meeting on 2 September 2013.

*EC/2012/26.2 GLASS (EC/2012/21.8.4 refers)*

The Committee noted that a formal contract had now been entered into with the architects and that discussions were underway with structural, mechanical and electrical engineers who had requested additional fees to work with the new architect. A speedy conclusion to the matter was being sought.

*EC/2012/26.3 Library Cladding (/2012/21.8.2 refers)*

It was confirmed that the Telephone Mast on the Library has now been relocated.

**EC/2012/27 Strategies and Performance**

*EC/2012/27.1 Capital Plan*

The Committee noted the annual update of the Capital Plan and the attached spreadsheet which recognised the completion of projects over the last 12 months; any movement in the timing of projects caused by the design and construction process; and the projected availability of cash over the period.

It was noted that Heads of College had expressed a desire for co-location of Schools which would help rationalize their space and while this was not set out in the Plan it would be included in the developing Estates Strategy. In addition, members were pleased to note that negotiations on the purchase of Western Infirmary 'Site B' were on track to be finalised by the first week in June.

The Committee approved the Capital Plan and commended the clarity and thoroughness of the document.

## *EC/2012/27.2 Estates Strategy*

The Committee noted the suite of paperwork presented as part of the discussions of the Estates Strategy. A number of documents would routinely be shared with members as the Strategy developed. Where possible executive summaries would be prepared to cut down on the amount of reading. The Director of Estates reported that she would be happy to meet with any member who wished to discuss technical aspects of any of the papers.

### *EC/2012/27.2.1 Progress Report*

The Progress Report was noted. The Gate 0 Review had been undertaken and the report shared with the Campus Estates Advisory Board. A single designated Client Representative to provide the key interface with the professional team was not being taken forward as it had been agreed that the Advisory Board, which included key academic managers, service managers and the student president, currently filled this role effectively.

Some discussion followed on the College Business Plans and whether these should be sought sooner, rather than later, to help inform the strategy. It was evident that significant work was needed in the next six months before discussions could take place with the Colleges and it would be easier to engage with them once the work on the Strategy for Learning and Teaching and the Space Utilisation Model was complete. The Director of Estates would take Margaret Morton's points on board regarding business strategies and discuss with Robert Fraser and Neal Juster.

**Action: AA**

Borehole analysis of the Western Infirmary site, in order to supplement the substantial ground condition information that had been supplied by the NHS, was also agreed to be a key piece of work and agreed should not wait until building locations identified at an early stage

**Action: AA/SS**

As the Estates Strategy developed it was anticipated that Estates Committee meetings would focus on specific parts which would be highlighted through executive summaries. It was suggested that where there was a particular interest or where individual committee members were able to offer support using their particular expertise, that specific project meetings would be arranged outside of the normal committee meeting cycle.

### *EC/2012/27.2.2 Vision – Executive Summary*

The Director of Estates presented the Vision - Executive Summary and proposed that the Vision be communicated on-line and through a printed document. Possible use of videos was also being considered. The Committee approved the document but agreed that words should be included to highlight the heritage of the University, a suggestion being that the first sentence on Page 3 would now read '...to create a cohesive campus that respects our heritage...' The Director of Estates undertook to finalise the vision.

**Action: AA**

### *EC/2012/27.2.3 Building the Vision*

This document was noted as work in progress, setting out a methodology from the Vision to the physical consequences.

#### *EC/2012/27.2.4 Development Framework – Stage 1 Consultation*

The Committee received a document summarising the outcome of the first stage of Consultation, which would be submitted to Glasgow City Council to inform members of the Planning Committee. The Advisory Board had welcomed the contents of the report, and suggested some improvements to the presentation of the material in order to give more prominence to consultation outcomes (pp 18-19) and next steps. Estates Committee agreed with this, and noted also that some caution must be expressed in sharing consultation outcomes, given that, at this stage, there was uncertainty regarding the constraints on the campus development.

Members expressed some surprise that car parking had been given one of the lowest priorities during the public consultation process and agreed that this would be likely to provoke more debate at a later stage.

#### *EC/2012/27.2.5 Development Framework – Consultation Engagement Plan*

The Committee noted the Consultation Engagement Plan, which was subject to some minor amendments as proposed by the Advisory Board.

#### *EC/2012/27.2.6 Townscape Appraisal*

The Committee noted the Townscape Appraisal and suggested tailoring the language within the document for different audiences.

#### *EC/2012/27.2.7 Minute of the Advisory Board of 11 April 2013*

The Minute of the Advisory Board held on 11 April was noted. A further meeting had been held on the 18 May and a copy of these notes would be circulated as soon as possible.

#### *EC/2012/27.3 Minute of the Carbon Management Committee of 25 April 2013*

The Minute of the last meeting was noted. The University's funding bid to the SFC for the new campus CHP network was unsuccessful. Members discussed the merits of funding sources, but noted that the Green Investment Bank appeared to offer no advantage over other commercial lenders.

#### *EC/2012/27.4 Key Performance Indicators*

The Committee noted the development of the KPIs to measure performance of the Estate and of Estates and Buildings. The Committee was supportive of the approach being taken and the use of the balanced score card.

The President of the SRC queried the use of the word 'customers' in the document and it was suggested that this was changed to either 'clients' or 'users'. The Director of Estates would discuss the use of student friendly language with the President after the meeting.

**Action: AA**

## **EC/2012/28 Projects for approval**

### *EC/2012/28.1 South Glasgow Hospital (Teaching and Learning Facility)*

The Committee approved the above Project. Discussions would continue with Glasgow City Council to ensure the funding was in place to cover the cost of the additional floor.

### *EC/2012/28.2 Steam Main Replacement*

This item would be deferred to the September meeting.

### *EC/2012/28.3 Capex Applications*

#### *EC/2012/28.3.1 Provision of Data Centre Resilience*

The Capex application for Data Centre Resilience was approved subject to timings and milestones being added.

#### *EC/2012/28.3.2 Gregory Building Labs*

The Committee approved the refurbishment of the Gregory Building Labs.

#### *EC/2012/28.3.3 McCall building Roof Replacement*

The Committee approved the roof replacement.

### *EC/2012/28.4 Approved Projects Status (RAG)*

The Committee noted the Approved Projects Status Report.

## **EC/2012/29 Estates Committee Operating Matters**

### *EC/2011/29.1 Critical Path*

The Committee noted the Critical Path.

## **EC/2012/30 Any Other Business**

### *EC/2011/30.1 Car Parking Charges*

Paper 7.1 was removed from the Agenda and not discussed.

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

The schedule of meetings for session 2013-14 was noted. The Kevin Hall Business Case would be discussed at a special joint meeting of the Estates Committee and Finance Committee on 3 June 2013 at 5pm in the Melville Room.



**Court – Wednesday 19 June 2013**

**Report from the Joint Meeting of Estates Committee and Finance  
Committee held on 3 June 2013**

**Brief description of the paper**

Report of Joint Meeting of Estates Committee and Finance Committee to consider Kelvin Hall Development. Court was briefed on this matter at its April meeting.

**Action Requested: Report for noting**

**ECFC/2012/01. Kelvin Hall Development**

Estates Committee and Finance Committee convened a joint meeting to consider the proposed partnership between the University of Glasgow and Glasgow Life to jointly develop the Kelvin Hall as a world-class centre for collections, research, teaching and public engagement with a unique University-city-industry partnership.

The documentation outlined two phases of the development. Phase 1 would facilitate the co-location of the University's Hunterian collection – currently dispersed over eight sites – and would allow for the development of a range of new taught programmes and research opportunities more fully realising the benefits of the collection. The Phase 1 development would require an £11.4m capital investment and annual operating costs of £0.5m. Phase 2 of the development would further increase the collections and display space and allow for the unification of the School of Culture and Creative Arts at Kelvin Hall.

The joint meeting of Estates and Finance Committee were asked to consider Phase 1 as a standalone proposal.

The Committee noted that the development was dependent upon the commitment of other partners and the successful outcome of a bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund. The HLF bid would be submitted by Glasgow City Council and would contain an activity plan outlining the partnership, partners' responsibilities and the benefits realisation plan. The deadline for the submission of the HLF bid was 13 June 2013.

The Joint Committee were invited to approve the draft Heads of Terms, the submission to the Heritage Lottery Fund and to permit further discussion with Glasgow Life in relation to Phase 2.

The Joint Committee strongly supported the academic case and the highly desirable opportunity to develop a cross-sector facility.

The Committee approved the request to submit the Heritage Lottery Fund bid. The Committee indicated willingness to approve capital expenditure of £11.4m subject to satisfactory agreement of the Heads of Terms. It was agreed that Estates Committee would agree the documentation following completion of negotiations.

*Prepared by: Gavin Lee*

*Last modified on: Monday 10 June 2013*



University  
of Glasgow

**Court – Wednesday 19 June 2013**

**Report from Meeting of the Audit Committee held on  
22 May 2013**

**Cover Sheet**

**Brief description of the paper**

The paper contains Audit Committee minutes from a meeting held on 22 May 2013, for information. There are no items for decision by Court.

*Prepared by Deborah Maddern*

*10.6.13*

# UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

## Audit Committee

### Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 22 May 2013 in the Melville Room

**Present:**

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

**In attendance:**

Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young), Ms Gillian Connal (Deloitte LLP), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Mrs Carolyn Timar (Financial Accountant), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk)

**Apologies:**

Mr Jo Elliot, Mr Jim Bishop (Ernst & Young), Mr Colin Gibson (Deloitte LLP), Mr Paul McGinty (Deloitte LLP)

**AUDIT/2012/24. Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2013**

The Minutes were approved.

**AUDIT/2012/25. Matters Arising**

*.2 HE Governance Review (Audit 2011/32,37.5 and 2012/3.6,18.5)*

A draft Scottish Code of Good HE Governance had been issued in April. Its contents seemed largely acceptable from the University's perspective but the final version of code would be dependent on the Government's response to it.

*.3 Pension Fund (Audit 2012/11.1,18.7)*

At the last meeting, Mr Fraser had advised the Committee 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 and the future structure of the scheme. Recommendations would be made to Court in June.

*.4 Review of Consultancy Policy (Audit 2012/20)*

The audit review relating to the College of MVLS had recommended a review of the policy, which was in fact a University level policy that Mr Newall informed the Committee would be reviewed by March 2014.

*.5 IT Review*

Line management recommendations arising from the review of IT would be discussed at SMG. The Committee would be kept informed.

*.6 MyCampus*

Load balancing had been undertaken and the Project Board was confident that appropriate steps had been taken ahead of the 2013 registration cycle. Staff were also more familiar with processes, although roles and skills sets were being looked at to ensure that the system's functionality could be used to maximum effect.



## **AUDIT/2012/26. Internal Audit Update**

Seven reviews had been completed since the last Audit Committee, with five further projects at draft report stage, and fieldwork complete on one other.

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

### *Review of Estates Procurement and Expenditure*

Overall, the conclusion was that the procurement processes employed by the University of Glasgow Estates and Buildings team were sufficient to meet the needs of the organisation and were in line with legislation and guidance. There had been a significant improvement in the use of contract suppliers, and the creation of framework agreements. The use of Public Contracts Scotland assisted in complying with legislation and in the retention of documentation.

### *Review of Ethics Approval Process*

There were a number of issues with the current processes in place for ethical approval, including a Priority 1 finding within the disclosure check process. Some of the issues identified would be remedied through the implementation of the new Online Application System.

### *Review of Remuneration Committee*

The overall assessment was that the governance structure in relation to the operation of the Remuneration Committee was operating effectively.

### *Review of Fee Payments*

Although this area of the University's activities was of a relatively low value, significant control weaknesses had been identified including controls regarding approval and monitoring of research consultancy; and some instances of non-compliance. The review of the consultancy policy and the implementation of the research system were expected to address a number of the matters. The Committee expressed concern that the issues identified had been raised previously and needed to be addressed.

### *Review of College Management (Social Sciences)*

The review had shown that the governance, process and procedures developed within the new College structure were adequate and the core financial and administrative processes in place within the University were generally being followed. The Committee nevertheless expressed ongoing concerns about the reported level of non-compliance relating to expenses claims, albeit that a number of these were technical breaches including claims outwith the usual 3 month timescale. Mr Newall advised that the matter in general had gone to SMG for discussion, as previously requested by the Committee, and that Heads of Colleges had engaged with staff with regard to the importance of the terms of the expenses policy. The Committee agreed that further action was necessary, and to this end a sample of expense claims University-wide over a period of time would be analysed, to include details of those approving claims as well as those making them. Further details would be brought to a future meeting.

## **ACTION RF**

### *Review of Freedom of Information Act Compliance*

Overall, the current arrangements employed by the University's FOI office to process requests for information in line with the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were operating adequately.

*Review of Student Accommodation*

Findings reflected required improvements in localised procedures such as maintenance of risk registers and logging repair timescales. In relation to some processes, the use of manual processes increased the risk of error and inefficiency.

**AUDIT/2012/27. Implementation of Outstanding Priority 1 and 2 Recommendations**

The Committee was updated on the degree of implementation of the audit recommendations.

*Finance Office*

Since the last meeting, 6 actions against audit reports had been completed, 7 had been partially implemented and 21 were being progressed, 13 of which would be addressed by the rollout of the new Research Management System, which was expected early in 2014. With respect to the Travel and Expenses review, outstanding recommendations related to revision of the expenses policy which would be addressed by the vacant Financial Controller position and the rollout of expenses module in the Core system. Further roll out of the expenses module would start after testing of a new upgrade release, expected to be completed late summer. The Committee asked that this area be progressed despite the vacancy and that a further report be made at the next meeting.

**ACTION CT**

*Departments other than the Finance Office*

Mr Newall updated the Committee on the key points to note from audit reports, as follows:

**Audit Reports 2005-10**

*Business Continuity Management*

Five outstanding recommendations were in this area, 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.

*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, with a completion date of December 2013.

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 2014/15. One recommendation on estates maintenance awaited the development of an interface between the estates management information service EMIS and Agresso.

**Audit reports 2010-11**

Of the recommendations not fully implemented, of which there were no outstanding Priority 1 recommendations, two from the Portfolio Management Audit would be addressed by June 2013; one from the Student Retention audit would be addressed by June 2013; and one recommendation from the Estates Acquisitions & Disposals 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 these 6 recommendations, led by the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) and the Head of the Learning & Teaching Centre (L&TC).

College of MVLS (3 recommendations): Areas still requiring to be fully addressed were: Review of finance duties currently performed by administrative staff (date tbc); Review of University Consultancy Policy (planned for March 2014); School/Institute Fixed Asset Registers (to be completed by July 2013).

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**

There had been reviews of HR/Payroll System Implementation; of Intellectual Property and Spin-Out Management; and of IT Security. The main items outstanding related to the IT Security audit of January 2013, of which there were two Priority 1 Recommendations, which would be implemented by IT Services by July 2013; and five Priority 2 Recommendations which would be addressed by July or September 2013 through the Information Policy and Strategy Committee, by IT Services, or in one case by MVLS.

### **AUDIT/2012/28. Risk Management**

The Committee noted a Deloitte's report on a Corporate Risk Workshop, which had been held in March. Six of the University's top 12 strategic risks appeared in the workshop's top 12. However, their relative significance had altered, with two risks that were not previously in the top five now being ranked 1st and 2nd. These reflected the importance of the pensions deficit and international student recruitment. In addition, a new risk relating to sustaining the University's infrastructure had been ranked third, demonstrating the importance of the underlying infrastructure in the achievement of a number of the University's objectives.

It was agreed that the format of the Risk Workshop would be reviewed so as to provide a better focus for those attending, including the Audit Committee members, and to reduce the numbers attending to a number and level of seniority for more meaningful engagement.

#### **ACTION AM/RF/DN**

The Committee noted the closed-off Risk Register for 2013. Mr Fraser advised the Committee that the draft register for 2014, which had been circulated for the meeting, had been developed and refined from the recent Workshop outcomes and from SMG discussions, to list 12 institutional risks. Some items from the previous year's list had now been removed from the register. Mr Fraser highlighted the entries relating to the pensions deficit, which had become the top risk; to the potential for increased investment ahead of the REF not producing sustained increases in productivity, which was a new addition to the list; and to the potential for a suboptimal organisational footprint and resource allocation arising from a failure to redesign and standardise key business processes.

The Committee had no comments on the draft, which Mr Fraser would provide in a more detailed format for the 2013/14 meetings of the Committee.

**ACTION RF**

It was noted that although the Colleges' Risk Registers had formed part of the current budget process, further liaison with Colleges would occur to ensure that Colleges' Registers were regularly reviewed and maintained in a similar way to the institutional Register.

**ACTION RF**

### **AUDIT/2012/29. Audit Planning Report**

External Audit's approach for the year to 31 July 2013 would be to review the accounts of the University, Subsidiaries and Trust and to state whether they gave a true and fair view of the financial situation, whether (where applicable) they had been prepared in accordance with relevant Companies and Charities Acts, and whether funds had been used for the purposes for which they were intended. The approach was based on knowledge of the University and the sector, discussions with management and internal audit, and reviewing developments in the Statement of Recommended Practice as well as any changes to accounting standards or auditing standards and their impact on the audit. Potential changes in SORPs might result in greater fluctuations in operational surpluses as classifications of restricted and unrestricted funds altered. Discussions would be held with Finance Committee and senior managers regarding the narrative in the accounts, for example in relation to any impact thereon arising from Outcome Agreements.

The key areas of emphasis would include: Pension obligations and related legal actions; Medical Research Council business combination; Student accounts receivable and bad debt provision; Cash management; Accounting for research balances; Capital expenditure projects; and Accounting for severance costs.

The Committee approved the External Auditor's proposed approach to the audit of the University's accounts, as set out in their report.

### **AUDIT/2012/30. Any Other Business**

Gillian Connal, who was leaving Deloitte, was thanked for her work relating to internal audit and for her contributions to the Committee's business.

### **AUDIT/2012/31. Date of Next Meeting**

Monday 16 September 2013 at 10am in the Melville Room

Other dates for 2013/14 session:

Tuesday 5 November 2013                      2pm Room 251 Gilbert Scott Building

Monday 17 February 2014                      10am in the Melville Room

Tuesday 20 May 2014                              10am in the Melville Room



**Court – Wednesday 19 June 2013**

**Report from the Meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on  
Wednesday 29 May 2013**

**Cover Sheet**

**Brief description of the paper**

- HR Committee Minute – 29 May 2013.

**Action required**

- Court is asked to note the HR Committee Minute – 29 May 2013. There are no significant items for Court's attention.

# UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

## Human Resources Committee

### Minute of Meeting held in the Principal's Meeting Room on 29 May 2013

**Present:** Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), The Principal (AM), Mrs A Allen (AAL), Mr I Black (IHB), Mrs H Durndell (HD), Professor C Forde (CF), Mr A Macfarlane (AMcF), Mr S McCafferty (SMcC), Mr D Newall (DN), Dr A Owen (AO), Dr D Spaeth (DS), Mr G Scott (GS) (Secretary).

**In attendance:** Mr M Boyle (MB) (for item 50), Mr P Aitchison (PA) (for item 51 ), Mr P Taylor (PT) (for item 51), Professor S Beaumont (SB) (for items 52 and 53), Ms G Shaw (GSh)(for item 53).

**Apologies:** Professor A Anderson (AA), Professor E Cameron (EC)

#### **HR/12/46 Minute of the previous meeting**

The minute of the previous meeting held on the 27 March 2013 was agreed.

#### **HR/12/47 Matters arising**

Public Sector Equality Duty:- GS advised that the PSED action plan had been updated to take account of comments made at the previous HR Committee and the final version was now available on the EDU website. Mhairi Taylor had also met the Head of Procurement to discuss equality requirements for contractors.

#### **HR/12/48 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 advised that a final pay offer of 1% had been made on the 21<sup>st</sup> of May: the Unions had expressed disappointment with this offer and were likely to invoke the disputes procedures. The living wage had also been raised as part of the pay negotiations. IHB advised that currently all employees within the University are paid at a rate above the current living wage.

IHB advised that Pensions Auto Enrolment had now been successfully implemented and that the number of staff opting out of pensions schemes to date was lower than had been anticipated.

The review of the UGPS pension scheme was discussed and DA explained that a sub-committee of Court had been set up to work with Senior Management Group on future proposals for the scheme. It is anticipated that this group will report to Court in June. IHB advised that the Trade Unions had been briefed on the proposed changes and that there would be a 60 day consultation period on future proposals.

IHB explained that in order to meet the UK Borders Agency requirement to report unauthorised absences of more than 10 days a decision has been taken by Principal's Advisory Group that all absences for Tier 2 and 5 staff will be recorded on the HR system and that this will be communicated in writing to all relevant staff and their managers. In the future this requirement will be added to contracts of employment for relevant staff.

Performance and Development Review Cycle has been launched for 2012-13 and reviews will be carried out between May and September. The key change is that

moderation will be carried out for grade 9 roles at School level as well as the existing moderation of grade 10 staff. Statistical analysis and sampling of documentation will also be undertaken across all staff to ensure consistency.

IHB advised that the University had been awarded the Athena Swan Bronze Award. The HR Committee acknowledged the significant amount of work that had been undertaken to achieve this and congratulated those involved.

IHB advised that Sandy Wilkie had been appointed to the post of Head of Organisational Development and would start with the University on the 1 July 2013.

#### **HR/12/49 KPI's Sickness Absence Management**

IHB gave an overview of the KPI data for sickness absence and highlighted that overall absence levels were down. It was noted that, in common with many universities, sickness absence was probably under reported, in particular for academics.

There was a discussion surrounding the KPI. DS commented that it would be useful to get analysis of the median length of absence in case the average number of days lost was skewed by long term absence. DN advised that he would be scrutinising the operational staff group where there had been an increase in absence levels. AA outlined action that was being taken to address short term absence within her area. GS advised that training was currently being piloted with the College of Arts.

It was agreed that the Committee would like further analysis of the sickness absence statistics including a breakdown of long and short term absences at the next HR Committee.

**Action : IHB**

#### **HR/12/50 University Strategy: Update and progress report**

MB provided an overview of progress against the University level KPI's and advised that these would be reported to the June Court. He outlined performance against targets over the last 12 months in relation to research, teaching, internationalisation, staff, finance and estates. There was discussion regarding the KPI's and links to HR initiatives currently being undertaken. The Committee agreed that they would like to continue to receive this update on an annual basis.

#### **HR/12/51 Internal Communications Strategy**

PA introduced the presentation and highlighted the importance of the Internal Communications within the University. PT gave a brief presentation reiterating the need to get internal communications right in order to engage staff, the need for buy in across the University and the importance of having appropriate information, technology platforms and architecture to allow staff to easily access information. He also highlighted some of the challenges that would be involved in successfully delivering the Strategy.

Following discussion the HR Committee indicated that they were supportive of the work that was being undertaken and endorsed the draft strategy. The Principal outlined that the Strategy would now be taken to the Senior Management Group for approval along with an action plan. DA suggested that an update could be provided to the HR Committee next session and in the longer term an update could be provided to the University Court.

**HR/12/52      Researcher Development Committee**

SB provided an update on the work of the Researcher Development Committee and its key themes and priorities for 2012-13. He outlined work that was being undertaken across the University including support for researchers to understand the research landscape and action being undertaken to implement the concordat and researcher development framework. He also highlighted other initiatives including the research staff conference, crucible events and a range of programmes to develop future research leaders.

DA noted the significant progress that had been made in this area on behalf of the Committee.

**HR/12/53      Academic Workload Model**

SB and GSh provided an overview of the project being undertaken to implement a common academic workload model across the University. SB explained the aims and objectives of the project including the development of workload models for each of the Colleges and the procurement of a workable online system to support a consistent approach across the University. SB outlined progress to date and explained that the University was currently going through a tender process to procure a system.

GSh advised that consultation had taken place within each of the Colleges and with the Trade Unions. The Unions have indicated that they are supportive of the project. There was discussion in relation to the allocation of time for research and scholarship and clear guidance relating to this. SB advised that they hoped to have the central system in place by the autumn. It was agreed that it would be useful to have a further update at a future Committee meeting.

**HR/12/54      EDSC Committee Minutes**

It was agreed that future EDSC minutes would be circulated to the Committee for noting between meetings. Should any member of the HR Committee wish to discuss any of the items this should be raised with GS in order to allow this to be scheduled for the next HR Committee meeting.

**HR/12/55      HR Committee Annual Review**

DA outlined that the Committee had been asked to consider its remit and the draft schedule for the next year. The Committee confirmed that they were content with the existing remit of the Committee.

AMc commented on the range of issues that had been considered by the Committee and indicated that he felt that it was working up to capacity. There was discussion about the format of presentations and it was suggested that it was useful for the Committee to have papers for consideration in advance of the meeting to make effective use of Committee time and that links to the HR and University Strategy should be explicitly made.

The HR Committee confirmed that they were content with the suggested schedule for the next session. DS suggested that an item relating to person specifications for academic posts could potentially be considered. It was agreed this would be discussed with GS. DA asked that any other items for future agendas should be raised with GS.



**Action: DS**

DA thanked Human Resources and the HR Committee for their contributions over the last year and acknowledged the wide range of issues that had been addressed.

**HR/12/56 Any other business**

There was no other business raised.

**HR/12/57 Date of next meeting**

The next meeting of the HR Committee will take place on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2013 at 10am in the Carnegie Room.



University  
of Glasgow

**Court – Wednesday 19 June 2013**

**Report from the Meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee  
held on Wednesday 22 May 2013**

## **Cover Sheet**

### **Brief description of the paper**

- Draft Minute of the meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee held on Wednesday 22 May 2013

### **Action required**

- Court's approval is sought to broadcast the Management of Stress in the Workplace Policy, as referred to in minute *HSWC/2012/41.2 Management of Stress in the Workplace draft Policy*
- The rest of the minute is for noting. There are no significant items for Court's attention.

*Author's Name: Debbie Beales  
Title: Clerk to HSW Committee  
Date 29.05.13*

## University of Glasgow

### Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

#### Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 22 May 2013 at 10:00 AM in the Melville Room

Present:

Mrs Ann Allen, Mr Ian Black, Ms Mae Boyd, Dr Gordon Duckett, Mr James Gray, Ms Joanne Mcfadden, Mr David Mclean, Mr John F Malcolm, Dr Catherine Martin, Mr David Newall, Dr John O'Dowd, Ms Julie Ommer, Mr Paul Phillips, Mr Deric Robinson, Mr David Somerville, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Selina Woolcott, Dr Robin Easton, Ms Jessica McGrellis

In Attendance:

Miss Debbie Beales

Apologies:

None

HSWC/2012/40 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 13 March 2013

The Minute of the meeting of 13 March 2013 was approved.

#### **HSWC/2012/41 Matters arising**

##### *HSWC/2012/41.1 Safety Auditing (verbal update DMcL)*

Mr McLean **informed** the Committee that there were 2 elements to the audit. For the Marsh audit, 10 of the 19 sections audited by Marsh had now completed all of their actions. In the remaining areas, actions were either complete or on hold awaiting internal restructuring or operational change. Particular progress had been made within the School of Chemistry where there had been major work in clearing, cataloguing and preparing waste for disposal. The in-house audit was ongoing with future audits including the Library in June and the Project Section of Estates & Buildings in October. Five other University Services had already been completed and the School of Medicine and the College of Social Sciences would also be audited internally. This was deemed necessary as the College level audits conducted by Marsh had been at too high a level to be meaningful. The Committee **thanked** SEPS for all the work that had been done on this matter.

##### *HSWC/2012/41.2 Management of Stress in the Workplace draft Policy (Paper 1)*

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that all comments received via extensive consultations had now been incorporated into the draft Policy. The Committee agreed to **endorse** the Policy but noted that there might be a need to revisit the text of appendix 4, the guidance on general risk assessment for work related stress. Ms Woolcott **assured** the Committee that, as this was an appendix to the Policy rather than the Policy itself, this could be amended at a later date without resubmitting the entire Policy for review. She also stated that she would be happy to provide support and training on this matter as required. The Committee **agreed** that Court's authority should be sought to broadcast the Policy. Ms Woolcott **thanked** everyone who contributed to the Policy.

### *HSWC/2012/41.3 Health & Safety Risk Register (Paper 2)*

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **highlighted** minor changes since the previous version. Mr McLean **informed** the Committee that although it was too soon to review the risk rating on fire safety at this time, risk assessments were taking place which could reduce the rating in the future. A new Fire Officer had been appointed, Mr Andy Kerr, who would assist in these. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that she planned to revisit the risk register, inviting College/US reps to submit new items prior to the September meeting with changes agreed at the December meeting. This time scale was necessary in order to feed into the strategic review in January 2014.

### **HSWC/2012/42 Draft Defibrillator Policy (Paper 3)**

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that she had been gathering information on the location of defibrillators and there were 9 or 10 on the University campus. The Committee **discussed** the need for appropriate maintenance/replacement regimes, suitable locations for defibrillators and liability issues. Once she had defined the locations of these defibrillators Ms Woolcott would forward that information, along with the Policy, to the College Management Groups and USMG.

### **HSWC/2012/43 Accident Statistics (Paper 4)**

The Committee **noted** the paper that was circulated. Mr McLean **informed** the committee that there were no significant findings to report and that there were no trends emerging. He stated that total reportable incidents were falling as a result of changes in reporting (from 3 days to 7 days) as required by HSE.

### **HSWC/2012/44 OH Report (Paper 5)**

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart **informed** the Committee that the stats had recorded a rise in both management and self referrals in the School of Arts from previous quarters. University wide, the main reason for self referrals was mental health issues (both work related and other.) On the student front vaccinations had increased significantly due to mantoux and BCG clinics held for medical/dental/vet/nursing students. This would continue to rise as BCG's were no longer given to children at school. Ms Stewart also provided UCEA sickness absence comparisons in the form of a handout. She **informed** the Committee that OH had been working with HR to compare the stats with those of other universities. The report looked across 84 institutes and the average number of University of Glasgow days lost per category was lower than other institutes for academic staff and higher than other institutes for manual staff. Other categories were comparable. The main reason for absence was "anxiety/stress/depression/other psychiatric illness". Ms Stewart **informed** the Committee that she was working with HR to bring more detailed sick absence analysis to future committee meetings.

### **HSWC/2012/45 Employee Assistance Programme (EAP) Stats (Paper 6)**

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that this quarter marked the start of the second year of the EAP contract which meant that comparisons could be made with the same quarter last year. Uptake of

the service had increased by 17%, with face to face counselling increasing by 23% and telephone counselling by 12%. Utilisation of on-line fact sheets was dramatically lower but this was to be expected as this period last year marked the launch of the service. Another publicity campaign had taken place with an article in e-campus bulletin and re-issued leaflets to Schools. The Committee **agreed** that customer feedback would be important in the review of the service which was due in September and Ms Woolcott would liaise with PPC to get this information.

#### **HSWC/2012/46 Any Other Business**

There was no additional committee business.

#### **HSWC/2012/47 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Friday 20 September 2013 at 10am in the Senate Room.

*Created by: Miss Debbie Beales*

## **University of Glasgow**

### **University Court – Wednesday 19 June 2013**

#### **Communications to Court from the meetings of Senate held on 18 April and 6 June 2013**

##### **1. Senate Assessors on Court**

Professor Scullion, Professor Martin and Dr Owen were scheduled to demit office as Senate Assessors on Court on 31 July.

Senate endorsed the appointments of Professor Nicholas Jonsson, Professor Karen Lury and Dr Duncan Ross as their successors for the period 1 August 2013 – 31 July 2017.

##### **2. Consideration of establishment of a ‘Council’ of Senate**

Senate received a report from its Operations Working Group. The Working Group had been established with the primary task was to address the fact that few meetings of Senate are quorate and to make recommendations accordingly. The Group had also provided recommendations of an operational nature intended to improve Senate’s effectiveness.

The quorum of Senate was established in the 1858 Universities (Scotland) Act as one third of the membership. The current membership is c. 520, giving a quorum of c. 173. Typically, around 100 members attend meetings. Primary legislation would be required to change the quorum.

While in practice there was voting at Senate only rarely and no challenges had been made to decisions taken by inquorate meetings, the University’s senior academic body remained in a vulnerable position, particularly in the event that controversial proposals came before it.

The Working Group report also addressed the associated matter of the size of the current Senate, which was arguably too large to act as an effective decision-making body.

Senate had previously agreed some draft Ordinances (the instruments necessary to update its composition) following the restructuring of the University and to address the key concern that, as currently constituted, students were not included in the membership of Senate. However, changes to University Ordinances required approval by the Privy Council, and the Privy Council Office had indicated it did not wish to consider intramural change at Glasgow when there was the possibility of new legislation affecting the Scottish sector. However, Senate was also advised that the legislative change needed to change the quorum was not imminent. Government had expressed the desire to introduce change through a single Act covering all Scottish Higher Education. However, there were significant obstacles to this, including dealing with the terms of the Charters that established some institutions: these could not easily be amended.

Other developments had also been taken into consideration. The Scottish Government had published its Bill for legislation on post-16 education in November 2012 and, in tandem with the Bill, at the Cabinet Secretary's request, the Committee of Chairs of Scottish HEIs had also established a group to produce a new Scottish Code of Governance. It was expected that the Code of Governance would take into consideration the review of Higher Education governance commissioned by the Scottish Government and convened by Professor von Prondzynski, Principal of The Robert Gordon University (the 'Prondzynski Report'). The Operations Working Group had taken the Prondzynski recommendations and the response to the Prondzynski Report prepared by Senate in 2012 into consideration in its deliberations.

The Working Group's view was that there were three main alternatives:

- A:** to retain **the status quo** and take steps to try to promote attendance so that a quorum is reached at meetings, or
- B:** to **establish a committee (suggested title: 'Council') of Senate** with a smaller membership and appropriate quorum to fulfil the functions the full Senate presently carries out and with Council decisions ratified at periodic (annual) meetings of the full Senate, or
- C:** to **establish a Council of Senate, with Council meetings open to all members of the full Senate**. It is the view of the Working Group that this approach would add to the authoritativeness of Council discussion and decisions and enhance academic governance.

The Working Group recommended that Senate adopted Model C.

It was decided on 18 April that Model B would **not** be considered. The Working Group was requested to prepare detailed recommendations concerning the composition of the Council for the June meeting of Senate. Total membership would be c. 124, including 12 students and with a majority of c. 2:1 in favour of elected members. This is very much in line with the recommendations of the Prondzynski report. The elected members would be elected from the membership of the full Senate. The ex officio membership would comprise:

- Principal (Convener)
- Clerk of senate
- Vice-Principals
- Heads of Schools
- Directors of Research Institutes
- Secretary of Court

Discussion also centred on the size of the contingents that would be elected from the Colleges and it was agreed that further refinement of the details of the Council's constitution should be taken forward prior to an electronic ballot of Senate to decide whether to retain the status quo or establish the Council. This would also be subject to obtaining further detailed legal advice on the legality and any necessary restrictions on the authority of the proposed Council.

### **3. Academic Governance and Decision-Making Post-Restructuring**

At its meeting in April, Senate received documents concerning academic governance and decision-making in the University since the University restructuring of August 2010. The first of these documents was the Staff Engagement Development Plan, which provided an update on activity commissioned following the Year One Review of Restructuring under seven identified themes. Senate also received a report on decision-making arrangements and other aspects of academic governance carried out under the terms of the Staff engagement Plan and in accordance with Senate request - the latter on the recommendation of the former Senate Communications Working Group. Also provided were information concerning the availability of committee papers across the Colleges, details of the operations of College, School and Research Institute (RI) committees, and a report on a consultation exercise carried out to obtain staff and student views concerning academic governance. The paper on academic governance contained a number of recommendations for Senate to consider. In view of the correspondence between the two main documents, they were discussed together. The papers were introduced by Professor Nolan, Senior Vice-Principal, and Dr Aitken, Director of the Senate Office.

The main issues discussed at Senate concerned ensuring meaningful consultation of staff in academic matters, the importance of plenary fora in Schools and RIs, elaboration of the description of decision-making processes and support for members of the 'functional' committees – that is, committees for research and knowledge transfer, learning and teaching, graduate Studies, boards of studies, etc.

Professor Munck wished to acknowledge that the consideration of academic matters was in some respects inextricable from that of associated resources. However, they were in other respects separate, and Professor Munck wished to argue for the broader involvement of staff in academic decision-making and closer restriction of the authority of College Management Groups in particular to financial matters. Insofar as their purpose was related to resources, College Management Groups should not have a veto on academic proposals. The University's reliance on the functional committee structure was logical, but transparency was critical, and it was vital that there was accountability of management to staff as well as vice-versa. It was important that there were meaningful sounding boards on academic matters within the Colleges such as College and School and RI Councils as well as Senate itself. Professor Hanson argued that the College Councils as they presently operated were democratically weak. The lack of decision-making authority meant there was little point in staff participating. This made for fundamentally poor governance, contributed to a sense of disenfranchisement and dampened morale. Professor Wheeler suggested that there should be provision for all members of plenary groups to propose agendas items as well as Management Groups. For a number of those who spoke, the size of the College Councils worked to limit their effectiveness. A further factor was the complexity of a structure that combined constituent Research institutes as well as Schools.

With respect to the relative positions of the resource and academic aspects of issues, it was noted that some proposals – for instance, the establishment of a new academic discipline could not be approved without it being confirmed that funding was available to support the initiative. There was, consequently, need for Management Groups (members of which bore personal responsibility for College functions) to retain the power to overrule proposals. It was suggested that College Management Groups could provide explanatory reports for College Councils in such circumstances; this would increase transparency. Professor Nolan disagreed that governance in the Colleges was weak and argued that the majority of staff were largely content with the arrangements in place. The functional committee system was very effective. The role



of the College Councils in particular was intended to be more strategic than had in some instances been the case to date. However, the volume of activity, particularly in the immediate wake of restructuring, had been such as to slow progress in this regard. She urged staff to lend time and support to the Councils to help foster their effectiveness. Others agreed that work was required for the Councils to become better fora for true dialogue.

Professor Martin recognised both of the main positions members had expressed, but put the view that matters were now improving as staff and academic units became familiar with the detailed structures and processes of the new University structure. He argued that it was a necessity of introducing far-reaching change that some measures had to be imposed 'top-down' initially, until new ways of working became established.

Professor Clark also held the view that the new structure remained a work-in-progress, but that the new structure provided the highly opportunity for an integrated approach to the consideration of the financial and academic dimensions of issues. This was a more sophisticated and strategic approach, and it was essential for institutional progress that it was adopted and the associated complexities not shirked.

Professor Godfrey put the view that a key part of the issue was that the matters of the relationship between the academic and managerial perspectives and responsibility for decision-making had been expressed in an overly black-and-white manner. It was important that staff participated appropriately in the process of making decisions and that there was provision and encouragement to do so, but not such that referenda were held to consider every issue. He also argued that links should exist between Colleges and Senate and Schools/RIs to ensure information was disseminated on important issues.

The paper submitted to Senate included the recommendation that, where they do not already exist, Councils should be established in the Schools and RIs along the lines of the College Councils. This proposal was endorsed by all who referred to the matter at Senate. While the College Councils were vital, the size and simpler structure of the Schools and RIs were seen to facilitate consultation and discussion more readily than could be achieved at a College-level plenary meeting. School/RI Councils were seen to have the potential to make significant contributions to democratic decision-making and the reduction of disenfranchisement felt by staff. It was also thought that reports to these bodies from the respective School or RI Executive would assist, in the same way as had been argued for at College level. There was agreement that there should be some latitude in the nomenclature for such bodies, although it was argued that 'staff meetings', while having the benefit of simplicity, implied the exclusion of students. It was agreed that further detail should be produced on arrangements for such fora.

One of the recommendations (No. 10) concerned the responsibilities of members of functional committees in consulting with colleagues in order to ensure committee discussions were fully informed, and with respect to the dissemination of committee decisions after meetings. It was agreed that mechanisms to support functional committee members in this regard would be added to the paper.

Recommendation 6 proposed that, in line with the approach taken by the College of Arts, papers for College Management Groups, Learning & Teaching, Research & Knowledge Transfer committees, Graduate School Boards and Councils should be made available to all

staff and student representatives, subject to FOI/DPA provisions. It was confirmed at Senate that this would include the minutes of these bodies.

It was agreed that the paper on academic governance should be revised in light of the discussion and re-circulated for comment.

#### **4. E-Learning Strategy**

Professor Coton, Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching, introduced the proposed Strategy for E-Learning. Professor Coton explained that the Strategy set out a vision for the future learning environment at the University of Glasgow and outlined how e-learning could support this vision. It identified specific strategic priorities for the coming years and the enablers that would allow the delivery of these priorities. Information was also provided putting the strategy in context, identifying both the factors that were driving change in the learning environment and the challenges that the University faced in moving forward.

Key measures of success would be developed, as would a detailed action plan. Specific timescales would be set for particular actions. The overall timeframe of the strategy was 2013-2020.

Senate heard that School and College Learning & Teaching Committees, the University Learning & Teaching Committee and the Education Policy & Strategy Committee (EdPSC) and other groups had been consulted during the drafting stages. Input had also been received via a plenary discussion at the Learning and Teaching Conference in April. Professor Coton expressed his thanks to the many individuals and groups that had contributed to the shaping of the Strategy.

There was strong appetite for the Strategy. The ubiquitous nature and robustness of communications technology and the internet also meant that this was an opportune time for the Strategy's introduction. The Strategy was intended to enhance students' learning experience. It did not, however, seek to dictate the way staff taught and students learned, but to empower. The growth in transnational education and distance learning provision would also be facilitated by the new Strategy. The Strategy would shape investment and the provision of support for staff.

In discussion, Dr Ross warmly welcomed the draft Strategy, and endorsed in particular its ambition to provide a personalised learning experience. Professor Coton explained that the absence of reference to and appreciation of face-to-face teaching did not signify any deprecation of more traditional teaching methods: commitment in that regard was a key feature of the main Learning & Teaching Strategy. The E-Learning Strategy would, rather, sit alongside and augment the Learning & Teaching Strategy which was predicated on the commitment to excellence and flexibility.

Senate approved the E-Learning Strategy.

#### **5. Transnational Education Strategy**

Senate received for consideration and approval the draft University Transnational Education Strategy. The paper was introduced by Professor Jon Cooper, International Dean for East Asia.

Professor Cooper explained that Transnational Education (TNE) was defined as: An award for credit bearing undergraduate or postgraduate study which is delivered by the University outside the UK. The University was proceeding through the establishment of partnerships with key overseas institutions. This differed from the approach adopted by other UK universities, which had set up campuses in other countries. The University Court had determined that the University would not pursue a strategy of establishing campuses overseas.

The aim of the Strategy was designed to contribute to the fulfillment of the University's Strategic Plan:

To grow delivery of sustainable, high quality learning opportunities and learning environments with a small number of international partners as a platform for:

- Enhancing our global reach and reputation;
- Growing and diversifying our student community; and
- Improving our research capability and extending our research capacity.

The associated objectives were:

- Consolidate our achievements in establishing TNE partnerships in East and South East Asia and the Middle East;
- Using the TNE provision in existence, to grow our international postgraduate student population;
- Develop new TNE provision for collaborative delivery of programmes in differing international, geographic and academic contexts;
- Develop high quality distance learning initiatives where there are good educational drivers supported by a viable business case;
- Support TNE growth through targeted strategic investment;
- Deliver student support services, quality assurance, planning, change management and project management.

It was intended that the Strategy would assist the University to:

- Deliver a presence and standing in key areas;
- Provide opportunities to expand our international undergraduate and postgraduate community;
- Attract talented staff & students;
- Provide mobility opportunities for staff and students;
- Increase our research capacity / capability; and
- Provide sustainable growth and diversification to our staff and student community

Progress in developing TNE was advancing quickly and was marked by significant achievements. Professor Cooper drew attention to University TNE activity in Singapore, where the University presently had 340 students. This would rise to 650 in steady-state, across three partner institutions. In Oman, there was provision in English Language Studies and Organisational Leadership, with an emphasis on distance delivery. In China, partnerships were being pursued with Nankai University, Sun-Yat Sen University and the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC) in Chengdu. At UESTC, over 120 students would

commence study in 2013, rising to an expected 960 in steady-state. Consideration had been given to the global regions where effort would be concentrated. It had been decided India would not be a focus. The approach to Brazil was under consideration.

The University's approach to TNE was underpinned by recognition of the need to deliver a student experience equivalent to that at Glasgow, and with levels of student satisfaction consistent with Glasgow-based students. Central to this were the delivery of:

- Support and feedback mechanisms;
- Quality of staff;
- Learning and teaching resources;
- Quality assurance;
- Monitoring of academic standards; and
- Flexibility in exchange.

It was also essential that risk was effectively managed. The exercise of due diligence in establishing agreements was vital and crucial to the maintaining of the university's reputation. Valuable experience had been acquired in understanding key features of robust financial models and of legal aspects of partnerships. It was necessary to take account of other countries' academic cultures and approaches to matters such as resourcing. There was also need to be able to manage changes in the external governmental policy framework affecting partners. Account had also to be taken of logistical factors.

Professor Cooper indicated the large scale and continuing expansion of TNE provision by UK universities. There were now more students studying for UK university awards overseas than there were international students in the UK itself. Much of this was being provided by post-1992 institutions. However, many Russell Group universities had significant undertakings overseas, and the University would need to progress to achieve parity.

Remaining target number details would be added to the Strategy over the next three months.

Commending the draft Strategy, Professor Cooper noted that it had been discussed and had been supported in a number of fora, including Court.

In discussion, it was noted that the draft Strategy and presentation by Professor Cooper made no mention of Africa, despite its great needs. Professor Briggs, who is International Dean for Africa reported that, while there were no immediate plans for TNE, the University's activities in Africa were extensive. In the present year, joint research with African partners to the value of £18M was being undertaken. This involved c. 90 staff. Student mobility represented another key area of activity. The expertise the University had developed was being further built upon. The University occupied a leading position with respect to its African-related activities that it wished strongly to retain.

It was also asked whether the primary reason for embarking on the TNE strategy was financial. The Principal commented that the main return experienced by universities that had established campuses overseas were likely to have been reputational rather than financial. The internationalisation of a wide range of University activities was seen as crucial to its progress. Professor Cooper noted that, in developing partnerships and as was required of UK universities,

the focus of concern was to ensure that collaborations did not result in losses. Sector experience was that surpluses were rarely very significant.

The investment the University had made in recruiting students to the Adam Smith Business School and in supporting provision in the School was noted, and discussion addressed the question whether there was a risk that it could inadvertently begin to compete with itself through its overseas TNE activities. While the situation would continue to be monitored, it was reported that the success of the Business School had been such that constraints on recruitment were under consideration.

It was reported that the TNE activity of the School of Engineering in Singapore and China had placed staff in Glasgow under pressure. Professor Chapman, Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Science and Engineering, reported that, now that the Singapore activity was established, means of increasing resource to the School were under consideration.

In response to a question, the Principal explained that careful consideration was given to the selection of potential partners and their geographical locations. For example, a factor in the selection of Singapore as a base for the University was that Singapore was rapidly emerging as an important regional hub for higher education. As such, it would be attractive to potential students from neighbouring countries as well as Singapore itself.

The proposed Transnational Education Strategy was approved.

## **7. Glasgow University Union Conduct Hearing**

At the meeting on 6 June, the Clerk of Senate referred to a report in the Herald that day regarding a Senate Conduct Committee hearing. The case concerned events at a debate in the GUU on 2 March. The publishing of the report meant that the confidentiality that governs Student Conduct proceedings had been breached. So far as was known, the breach of confidentiality to the press had not been made by any member of the Conduct Committee or any member of University staff. Senate also heard that the Herald article contained a number of substantial inaccuracies. Due to confidentiality, comment could only be made on procedural aspects and not the details of the case itself.

It was also reported that a separate inquiry into the culture of the Glasgow University Union was taking place. This inquiry was being established by the GUU and would involve a panel of external and independent individuals and was due to report by August 2013. The Principal, Secretary of Court and Clerk of Senate had met with senior student officials of the GUU, and were satisfied with the independent nature of the membership of the inquiry panel and with the terms of reference of the inquiry. It was anticipated that GUU would be making a formal announcement shortly.

## **8. Budget & Financial Forecast**

Senate received a presentation on the University budget and financial forecast for 2012/13 – 2016/67 from Professor Juster, Vice-Principal for Strategy and Resources.

It was explained that the budget had been endorsed by the Finance Committee and would be submitted to Court on 19 June for final approval.

Professor Juster began with a summary of the University's progress against its KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) in strategic areas: Research; the Student Experience; Internationalisation; Staffing; Finance; and Estates. Performance was rated for the last 12 months and against Russell Group averages. Comparison with Russell Group peers was affected by the recent increase in the number of institutions in the Group. This meant, for instance, that the increase in the University's international student population did not appear as positive as it would have previously. Key points included the increase in Staff:Student Ratios as a result in the increase in fees-only student numbers. Performance in research and learning & teaching compared well with Russell Group peers.

The overall surplus the University expected to return in 2012/13 (£10.4M) was higher than had been expected. Factors contributing to this were slower than anticipated recruitment of academic staff for the REF and funding had been reserved for legal liabilities that had not been needed. The surpluses forecast in the coming years were now lower than had been estimated in 2012. This was because Senior Management Group had decided to increase the funds available for staff recruitment and it was expected that more would be required to support pensions.

In the coming year, it was expected that salary costs would increase by £18.5M. A significant allowance had also been made for consumables – this reflected expenditure on items such as laboratories for recently recruited staff. Fees for international students were expected to increase well; this was the effect of increased fees in some areas as well as higher recruitment levels.

It was expected that, if no action were taken, the surplus would increase to c. £20M in 2016/17. In the judgement of SMG, this was too high and this would be addressed. Account had also to be taken of risks. Key risks included reliance on overseas student income and the outcome of the UK Government's 2014/15 comprehensive spending review. The outcome of the latter would be known by the end of June 2013 for the UK as a whole; it would be later in the year before the effects on the Scottish budget were known. Following the introduction by Government of auto-enrolment in pension schemes, it had been decided to budget on the basis that no staff would exercise the right to opt out. The consequence was that outgoings would likely be lower, since it was expected that some staff would opt out.

In response to a question, Professor Juster reported that it was expected that overseas and Rest of UK student fee income would increase by c. £24.5M between 2012/13 and 2016/17. This would, however, only bring the University up to the Russell Group average and was still markedly lower than figures for the University of Edinburgh.

Professor Juster was thanked for his presentation.

## **9. Estates Strategy**

Senate received a presentation on the Estates Strategy from Mrs Allen, Director of Estates & Buildings.

The context for Mrs Allen's presentation was provided by the University's purchase of the Western Infirmary site. Ten acres had already been acquired and the purchase of the remaining four acres was expected to be completed later in June 2013. The University was scheduled to assume ownership of the site in 2015, following the completion of the new Southern General Hospital. This provided a valuable opportunity to plan carefully. Mrs Allen explained that it was essential that the approach taken was in the form of a whole Campus Strategy, including links with Garscube Campus, rather than a narrower, simpler plan for building on the new site. Acquisition of the Western site represented a development comparable to the move of the University from the city centre in the nineteenth century and its associated opportunities and challenges. It was extremely rare that a city-located university had the opportunity for expansion on a major site adjacent to its main campus. Accordingly, the University's asset strategy was very important in helping to determine which buildings should be retained and invested in. Despite on-going investment, the proportion of accommodation in the top A and B categories was reducing. Infrastructural development was also important. The Estates Strategy needed also to be long-term, predicated on sustainability factors and based on a careful assessment of the needs and wants of the University. Organisational needs would determine property requirements.

A key theme was connectivity. It was intended that the development of the Campus would build on research and teaching links. Knowledge Exchange was also a priority; development would provide opportunities for the enhancement of community engagement, for example. Development should also reflect the outward-facing nature of the University.

However, it was not intended that the Campus would be filled with buildings. Green space was also a rare feature of a city-based campus, and its retention would contribute to the development of a strong and unique sense of place. The importance of flexibility was also fully recognised. It was important that building development could be adapted as far as possible to meet changing needs in the future.

The results of Stage 1 of consultation on the Strategy were informing the vision for the Campus. This had been considered by the Estates Committee. Mrs Allen stressed the importance of further consultation. Academic input was vital. In addition to broad consultation initiatives, the Estates Committee included Senate Assessors, the Clerk of Senate was a member of the Advisory Board for the overall project and the Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching was leading on aspects of teaching space planning. In the immediate future, substantial technical work would take place over the summer and the results of this activity would be shared in the autumn, prior to a further consultation round. Promulgation of the Strategy was scheduled to commence in early 2014. Final approval was expected by the end of 2013/14, with expenditure beginning thereafter.

In discussion, it was reported that architects were already beginning to advise on developments, and there was agreement that the architecture of the future Campus should be of the highest quality. It was hoped that the scale and importance of the project would attract leading architects. Good expertise had also been developed through a number of recent building projects.

It was noted that, at present, the location of some academic units did not reflect the new University structure, and it was asked whether this could be addressed ahead of the main Campus development project. Responding, the Principal and Mrs Allen recognized the

importance of co-location of academic units and this would be worked on, alongside moves to co-locate service departments. A further key factor was the changing nature of the student population, and it was fully intended that this was reflected in the development of accommodation.

In response to a question, it was explained that it was not yet possible to quantify costs with accuracy. A rough estimate of £400M had been made. Comparison was made with the recent announcement by Imperial College of the development of a new campus in East London, with an estimated cost of £1B. The financial position would be clearer by the end of 2013. It was important to avoid incurring debt. It was also noted that plans could include the disposal of buildings on the present campus. The University was spending £35 – 50M p.a. on maintenance. However, even if a building was no longer worth further investment, it might be decided to retain the associated land for future development.

Professor Mason noted that other Russell Group universities were developing 'entrepreneurial campuses' and he requested that provision was made for business incubator facilities, etc.

It was also confirmed that reference to sustainability factors encompassed environmental sustainability.

Mrs Allen was thanked for her presentation and would be invited to attend Senate at appropriate points as the Strategy was developed.

## **10. Nursing & Healthcare Update**

At the meeting of Senate on 18 April, an update report was received on Nursing and Health Care. This had been provided for Court at its meeting on 10 April. The report was accompanied by the final report of the Nursing and Health Care Working Group established at the request of Court by the College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences (MVLS) and by a copy of a report from the Joint University of Glasgow and Glasgow Caledonian University Nursing Working Group.

Mrs Sneddon, Head of the School of Nursing and Health Care, welcomed the submission of the reports to Senate. She reported that the context for Nursing in Scotland had developed, in that, rather than the reductions in the numbers of students entering universities Government had previously signalled, numbers had increased. Mrs Sneddon was concerned that the update report might mislead Court and should be corrected. The issue was that the update report noted that it would be expected that research carried out by the School would be benchmarked against the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) set for Research Institutes (RIs). This was out of keeping with the statement in the minutes of the meeting of Court on 12 October 2011 cited in the Working Group report. There, it was stated that, in the setting of appropriate targets for research for the school, the 'baseline would not need to be high'. Responding, Professor Dominiczak, Vice-Principal and Head of the College of MVLS, noted that the primary focus of the disciplines within the School of Medicine, which included Nursing and Health Care, was teaching. Research within the School of Medicine was carried out in conjunction with the appropriate Research Institute. This was why RI level KPIs would be appropriate. However, for Nursing and Health Care, there was no cognate RI. Professor Cogdell, Deputy Head of College, added that it was expected that all teaching would be research-led, and this was also expected for teaching in Nursing and Health Care despite the absence of a cognate RI. While



the quality of teaching in the School was excellent, the concern regarded the quality and volume of research. Ms Moriarty noted that staff in RIs made a considerable input to teaching on the BN degree. However, Professor Dominiczak argued that the excellent scholarship underpinning teaching had to be distinguished from research. She and the Principal noted that the changes in the external environment had the potential to change the circumstances for Nursing at the University. This included the Government's request that the universities developed opportunities for collaboration between education providers, which had led to very positive discussions with Glasgow Caledonian University. Professor Dominiczak affirmed that discussions would continue within the College.

## **11. Introduction of new University Complaints Procedure**

The Clerk of Senate drew the attention of Senate to the new University Complaints Procedure.

The Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO) required the University, along with all other Scottish HE Institutions, to introduce a new Complaints Procedure by August 2013. Senate received and endorsed the paper outlining the new Procedure, which would be submitted to Court on June for final approval.

## **12. Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill**

In June, Senate heard that the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill had now passed Stage 2 of the approval process. There were positive indications that sector concerns regarding the power of Government to intervene in institutions' affairs had been addressed. In parallel with the draft legislation, the new Code of Governance was being developed and was now being consulted upon. It was possible that compliance with the Code would be required in the final version of the Bill as a condition of grant.

## **13. Management of Teaching Space**

At the meeting on 18 April, the Secretary of Court, Mr Newall, provided an update on the allocation of teaching space for 2013-14. The Central Timetabling Team had been expanded. In 2012-13, there had been an increase for demand for large teaching spaces. The Hunter Halls would provide two additional large venues and the gymnasium of the St Andrews Building was also being converted for this purpose. The Bute Hall would provide a fallback venue. In May, allocations based on School/RI submissions would be issued for checking and the position confirmed at the end of June. Members were urged to notify School/RI timetabling staff of any changes to expected needs.

In response to a question, Mr Newall agreed that the adaptation of the spaces currently being undertaken was not an ideal solution. It was confirmed that the Campus Vision being developed in the context of the Western Infirmary development was informed by consideration of teaching space needs. Other more urgent improvements were also being considered. Mr Newall also acknowledged that traditional allocations had not been rolled-over from 2011-12 to the present session. Members were encouraged to communicate preferences in this regard to School timetablers.

#### **14. Research Planning & Strategy Committee: Open Access Pilot**

To enable the University to develop appropriate policies and to assess the resources needed to meet recent Open Access requirements, a pilot exercise had been carried out, funded by an award of £360,000 from the Department for Business Innovation & Skills (BIS). RPSC had noted a report on the outcome of the pilot exercise and commended Library Colleagues on the level of service they have provided.

During the pilot, all staff acting as a lead UoG author had been asked to provide the Library with details of all journal articles or conference proceedings in the publication pipeline between December 2012 and 31 March 2013 but not yet published online. All papers submitted during the pilot and linked to Research Council funding had been allocated funds for Article Processing Charges (APCs). All other papers had been assessed using a flowchart approved by RPSC to determine whether payment of an APC was appropriate or whether a version of the paper could be deposited into Enlighten and be compliant with research funder requirements.

RPSC had noted a table outlining the number of papers received, numbers of APCs paid, papers deposited into Enlighten via the Green route and the distribution of funding by College. Concerns had been raised by RPSC about the limited level of academic engagement in the Open Access pilot in some areas. Whilst the majority of the BIS funds had been committed to the payment of APCs, some of the remaining funds had been used in other ways. For example, a portion of the funding (£40k) had been spent on staffing costs until 31 December 2013 to support work required to comply with Open Access requirements. Funds had also been lodged with several publishers to prepay APCs for the coming year. The funds lodged with Biomed Central to cover the costs of publishing in their journals had also been increased.

The funding bodies were proposing to introduce a requirement that all outputs submitted to the post-2014 REF were published on an Open Access basis, where this was reasonably achievable and where, given the medium in which the output is presented, the concept of 'Open Access' applied.

From 1 April 2013, the Research Councils were introducing a new funding mechanism whereby HEIs would receive block grants from RCUK to cover the cost of article processing charges. The RCUK policy supported both 'Gold' and 'Green' routes towards Open Access, although RCUK had a preference for immediate Open Access with the maximum opportunity for re-use. Final guidelines from RCUK on their requirements were expected to be issued in early April 2013.

RPSC had agreed that academics should continue to be asked to notify the Library of imminent publications. Library colleagues would continue to screen these publications and ensure they were made Open Access as far as possible. With regard to the RCUK block grant fund, RPSC had agreed that Green Open Access should continue to be the University's preferred route (in situations where Gold Open Access was not mandatory). Expenditure in relation to this fund would be kept under review.

Despite the limited engagement in some areas in the Open Access Pilot, it would be essential in the future for academic colleagues to engage with the University's Open Access policies and procedures to ensure compliance with funder and post-2014 REF Open Access requirements.

At Senate, it was reported that some of the most important journals for History were objecting to Open Access on the basis that the embargo period for the Green route was too short. There was agreement that the overriding consideration was the academic judgement of the importance of the publication. In response to a question, Professor Beaumont confirmed that the amount allocated by BIS to the University was insufficient. This was the collective experience of the sector and would be reported as such. All parties involved in the initiative expected that the position would continue to evolve for some time to come.

#### **15. Honorary Degree awards in 2014**

Senate noted that, with the holding of the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow in 2014, it might be particularly appropriate to recognise athletes and individuals who had made significant contributions to Commonwealth affairs through the conferring of Honorary Degrees.

***Court members are also warmly invited to submit nominations for Honorary Degrees.***

#### **16. Outcome Agreements Update**

At the April meeting of senate, the Principal noted that, with the introduction of Outcome Agreements, the publication of the traditional Main Grant letter in March had stopped. This meant that comparison of settlements for other universities would not be possible until the individual Outcome Agreements were published in May. However, the University had done well, having been awarded probably the largest allocation of funded postgraduate places. The indicative letter issued to the University at the end of 2012 had set the total grants to the University at £83.5M. In fact, the grant would be £86.M, plus the funding for postgraduate taught places and additional funds for Widening Access places. The sole disappointment had been the reduction of £406K in the University's Knowledge Transfer Grant, caused by a relative movement in the KTG formula metrics across the Scottish HEIs.

#### **17. UK Spending Review**

In April, Senate heard of the considerable misgivings in the English HE sector concerning the current Spending Review. The Government commitment to protect the Schools, Overseas Development and Health Budgets meant that substantial cuts in the BIS Budget were likely. Reductions of up to 7% were feared. The effects on Scotland would be indirect, given the use of the Barnett formula to calculate the Scottish Block Grant, but cuts to the HE Budget in 2015/16 were possible. Such cuts required to be opposed in order to protect the Scottish sector.

#### **18. Intimations**

*Emeritus Professor Archie Roy*

The death in December 2012 of Emeritus Professor Archie Roy has been reported. After graduating from the University BSc in 1950 and PhD in 1954, Archie Roy joined the then Department of Astronomy at Glasgow in 1958, becoming Senior Lecturer 1966 and Reader in 1976. He was appointed Professor of Astronomy in 1977. Professor Roy served the University

with great distinction, and he had a diverse range of academic interests. The 30 books he published include six novels as well as 70 scientific papers.

*Emeritus Professor Agnes Jarvis*

Staff and former students recently attended the funeral of Emeritus Professor Agnes Jarvis. Professor Jarvis was appointed titular Professor of Nursing Studies in 1985 and pioneered the BN undergraduate programme and the part-time Master's degree. She was Head of the Department of Nursing until 1988.