

Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 19 June 2013 in the Senate Room

Present:

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

In attendance:

Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Ian Black (Director of Human Resources), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate), Professor John Chapman (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor 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 Murray Pittock (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal), Dr Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary) (for item 48.1)

Apologies:

Members: Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP Rector, Cllr Matt Kerr Glasgow City Council Assessor, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Professor Miles Padgett Senate Member

Attendees: Professor Steve Beaumont (Vice-Principal Research & Enterprise), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal)

CRT/2012/44. Announcements

Court welcomed Jacquie Dowd, who was attending the Court meeting in place of Margaret Anne McParland, and the SRC President-elect Jess McGrellis, to the Court meeting.

James Harrison, Billy Martin, Alan Owen, Adrienne Scullion and Ian Black were attending their final meeting of Court. Court thanked them for their contributions to Court and wished them well in the future.

CRT/2012/45. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 10 April 2013

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2012/46. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2012/47. Strategic Plan Update/Key Performance Indicators and Budget 2013/14

Professor Neal Juster, Vice Principal Strategy and Resources, provided an update on progress against the University's Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the 12 months to June 2013. The KPIs were described in the University's strategic plan: *Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision*. Court noted the KPIs and related details.

Court received the annual update of the capital plan 2013-2023. The capital plan was flexible and responsive and would be impacted significantly by the new Estates Strategy expected in June 2014, where the Western Infirmary development would feature significantly. 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.

Court received a briefing on the 2013/14 University Budget and financial forecasts.

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 was 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 rose to £8.2m, £18.1m and £20m after net income from overseas income was included.

The budget and financial forecasts were based on a number of assumptions and risks. 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. International student targets had been thoroughly reviewed in a bottom-up and top-down method. In particular further growth was projected in the business school and in medical and vet subjects. The University was mindful of the need to have a balance of countries represented in its overseas student population and not to rely overly on a single market. It was noted that refinements were being made to student surveys to obtain more granulated data on the student experience to ensure that actions could be taken to address any issues. In addition, an analysis of staff:student ratios was being undertaken as part of a scheduled review of the strategic plan.

Court approved the 2013/14 Budget and four year financial forecasts, and the updated capital plan 2013-2023. Court thanked Professor Juster and his colleagues for their work on these areas.

CRT/2012/48. Report from the Principal

CRT/2012/48.1 Pensions Scheme

As Court had heard at previous meetings, the chair of the Trustees of the UGPS had 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 had commissioned an independent review of the strength of the University's financial covenant and a review of arrangements for funding the deficit. The Trustees had subsequently asked the University to increase substantially its financial commitment to the pension scheme. Court had 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 had had a series of discussions on this issue, including considering a number of options for the structure of a future scheme. SMG members had also briefed the relevant campus trade unions. Court had received a background briefing at the pre-Court meeting on 19 June. The recommendations to Court arising from the process had been circulated to Court. A letter from JULC and copies of minutes of consultative meetings with the unions had also been circulated.

The proposal being made to Court was to retain the current Defined Benefit (DB) scheme for existing members, with changes in the benefits structure to bring it in line with USS. These changes included increasing the retirement age in line with the state retirement age, increasing the employee contribution rate to 7.5% and sharing any future cost increases in an agreed ratio. This was seen as being the most equitable approach under the circumstances, and protected the generous benefits of existing members at an affordable cost. The scheme did however carry unacceptable levels of risk for the University and the proposal was that it would be closed to new entrants to be replaced by a Defined Contribution (DC) scheme with an employer contribution of 10% and an employee contribution of 5%. In addition, the future of the DB scheme would be tied to any future changes to USS such that all employees in existing schemes would be on comparable terms and conditions without further review being required. The details of the transition to this new set of benefits would be subject to consultation with employees, but some tapering of savings would be required. All current members would be given the option to switch into the new DC scheme and the auto-enrolment arrangements would not be affected. The changes would be implemented during 2014.

The chair of the working group, Ken Brown, noted that if Court was minded to agree the principles being recommended at the current meeting, then this would also have the advantage of addressing the scheme's deficit over time.

Dr Welch explained that the required consultation with staff representatives would take place over the summer months in the event that Court approved the recommendations of the working group. Were there to be significant matters raised during this consultative process, for example proposals for a radically different approach that had not been considered by the group, there was scope for some flexibility and Court might be further briefed in the autumn. Ian Black noted that the requirements were for consultation not negotiation. Jacquie Dowd commented that there had been no opportunity given during the process to date for staff to make counter-proposals and union members had not seen figures at consultative meetings and expressed concern that any ongoing consultation would be about implementation rather than providing an opportunity for any substantive changes to what was being proposed. Ken Brown commented that existing staff who were currently not in the scheme had had the opportunity to join the scheme but seemed unlikely to do so if they had not already acted; the proposals would affect new entrants and not such existing staff. Court was being asked to agree clear principles that would apply going forward, to new entrants. Margaret Morton and David Anderson expressed support for the process to date, for the depth of analysis undertaken and for the clear proposals that had been presented. Court noted that if substantive different proposals emerged over the summer that the SMG wished to consider then this was not precluded.

The recommendations from the working group, in summary that the benefits under the existing scheme should be brought into line with those under USS, and that the existing scheme should be continued for existing members but closed to new entrants and a new Defined Contribution Scheme offered to new entrants, were approved by Court and as such a consultation exercise with staff representatives would take place over the summer months. Existing scheme members, and potential members (eligible staff who were currently not enrolled) would be contacted to update them on proposed changes to the scheme.

Ken Brown and the Court working group were thanked for their work.

CRT/2012/48.2 SFC Grant Award

Details of the 2013/14 SFC grant award would be circulated to Court when full details were available, although meaningful comparisons with previous years' allocations were difficult given the different methodology used and the increased use of incentive schemes.

The main changes in SFC income included: 200 extra places to support widening participation (£1m), 122 new PGT funded places (£850k), and a £2.5m Global Excellence Grant to improve international research. This was partly offset by a reduction in the Knowledge Transfer Grant (£400k) and the removal of funding for the graduating cohort of RUK students.

CRT/2012/48.3 University Rankings

Court noted details of recent University rankings tables.

CRT/2012/48.4 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/2012/49. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2012/49.1 Governance Discussion Day 31 May

A report containing recommendations and proposed actions arising from the Court Governance discussion had been circulated. Court approved the recommendations in the document and noted that a large part of the actions would be taken forward over the coming months, with an update to the October meeting of Court. The working group which would look further at the composition of Court would report to October Court. Court agreed that the working group would comprise the senior Senate Assessor (Donald Spaeth), the SRC President (Jess McGrellis), an Employee Representative (Susan Ashworth) and three lay members of Court (David Ross (convener of working group), Alan Macfarlane, Margaret Morton).

CRT/2012/49.2 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. 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, 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 required universities to comply with principles of good governance, as determined by the SFC. The bill as drafted would also 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.

Court would receive a further update on the Bill, and on the progress of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, at the October meeting.

CRT/2012/49.3 Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching)

At the beginning of the meeting, Court approved a recommendation from the Principal that Professor Frank Coton's appointment as Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) be extended for a second term of four years, through until 31 December 2017.

CRT/2012/49.4 Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee had met in April, as there were a number of Court and Committee membership items for discussion. Court approved the following recommendations made on the Nominations Committee's behalf:

i) Co-opted members

In their absence from the meeting, Court approved a recommendation that Ken Brown's and Margaret Morton's terms on Court continue for a further 4 years from 1 January 2014.

Court also approved their continuation as (respectively) chair and member of the Finance and Estates Committees.

Peter Daniels and Robin Easton would end their second term on Court on 31 December 2013 and Michael Scott Morton would end his second term on Court on 31 March 2014. Court approved 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, would 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 would expire on 31 December 2013. Court noted that the Chancellor had invited him to serve for a second term of four years, and this had been accepted.

iii) Audit Committee

There was one current vacancy on the Audit Committee. Court agreed that an advertisement be placed to attract a qualified accountant onto the Audit Committee, to fill this existing vacancy.

iv) Estates Committee

In her absence from the meeting, Court approved a recommendation that Margaret Morton be appointed as Chair of the Estates Committee from 1 January 2014.

v) Remuneration Committee

Court had agreed as part of the recent governance discussions that this Committee should be further augmented by the appointment of an external lay member. Court agreed that the position should be advertised.

vi) Nominations Committee

The Lay Member vacancy that would arise from Robin Easton leaving Court in December 2013 would be filled once the new co-opted members of Court were appointed. Although not discussed by the Nominations Committee itself, Court had also 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 would be identified as soon as possible in discussion with Court members.

vii) Court Procedural Review Group

The CPRG would 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 would decide on Tier 2 cases without automatic reference to Court.

Court approved a recommendation for membership of this group 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 would be supplemented on each occasion by the relevant Head of College/Head of University Services.

CRT/2012/49.5 Court Convenership

In his absence from the meeting, Court approved a recommendation that David Ross be reappointed as Convener for the period 1 January 2014 to 31 July 2016.

CRT/2012/49.6 Introduction of 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 the end of August 2013. The University was required to be compliant with the Model Complaints Handling Procedure, which was now a condition of the SFC funding agreement.

Court approved the introduction of the new complaints procedure, to come into force on 12 August 2013, on publication of the University Calendar 2013-14.

CRT/2012/49.7 Glasgow University Union

GUU's officers were 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. The review panel was expected to report in August and details would be provided to Court in October.

CRT/2012/49.8 Senate Assessors on Court

The following had 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)

CRT/2012/49.9 SRC Elections

The following candidates had been successful in the Spring 2013 SRC elections and would 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

CRT/2012/49.10 Heads of School

The following appointments had 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 would serve on the appointing Committee for a Head of School where a vacancy was 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

CRT/2012/49.11 Resolutions

The following 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:

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

CRT/2012/50. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2012/50.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2012/50.1.1 Budget 2013/14 and four year forecast

Court had approved the 2013/14 Budget and four year financial forecasts, under item CRT/2012/47. *Strategic Plan Update/Key Performance Indicators and Budget 2013/14.*

CRT/2012/50.1.2 Building projects

Court noted Finance Committee's support of the refurbishment of laboratory space in the Gregory Building and of revised expenditure relating to the South Glasgow Hospital (Teaching & Learning Facility), reflecting a decision to develop a 4th floor of the building to accommodate the Stratified Medicine Innovation Centre.

CRT/2012/50.1.3 Joint Graduate School

Court noted Finance Committee's approval of the development of a Joint Graduate School with Nankai University, and noted that costings including contingencies had been examined thoroughly.

CRT/2012/50.1.4 Expenses Policy

Court noted Finance Committee's approval of revisions to the Expenses Policy.

CRT/2012/50.1.5 Financial reports

Court noted Finance Committee's receipt and noting of financial performance and debtors' reports, both at 30 April.

CRT/2012/50.2 Estates Committee

Court noted Estates Committee's approval of the capital plan, of a capital project relating to the South Glasgow Hospital (Teaching and Learning Facility), and of a number of Capital Expenditure applications, relating to Asset Maintenance - Provision of Data Centre Resilience in the sum of £705k; Refurbishment of Gregory Building Laboratories 306/308/209 in the sum of £1.05m; McCall Building Roof Replacement in the sum of £660k.

CRT/2012/50.3 Joint Meeting of Finance and Estates Committees

Court noted that the Finance and Estates Committees have recently held a joint meeting at which approval was given to the submission of a Heritage Lottery Fund bid, by Glasgow City Council, relating to the development of the Kelvin Hall. The initiative involves a 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. Court had been briefed on this business at its meeting on 10 April, and recalled that, if taken forward, the Kelvin Hall development would involve a substantial financial investment by the University, estimated at £11.4M. It was noted that this investment was dependent upon the commitment of other partners, and subject to satisfactory agreement of contractual terms with the City Council and Glasgow Life.

CRT/2012/50.4 Human Resources Committee

Court noted the report from the Human Resources Committee.

CRT/2012/50.5 Audit Committee

Court noted the report from the Audit Committee.

CRT/2012/50.6 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Court approved the broadcast of the Stress Management Policy and noted the report from the Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee.

CRT/2012/51. Report from the Rector

In the absence of the Rector, there was no report.

CRT/2012/52. Communications from Meeting of Senate 6 June 2013

Communications from the meeting of Senate held on 6 June were noted by Court. Senate had discussed constitutional and governance matters relating to its operation; and academic governance and decision-making following the Restructuring. It had received briefings on,

and had approved, the E-Learning strategy, the draft Transnational Education Strategy and the new University complaints procedure; it had also received updates on the University budget, the Estates Strategy, management of teaching space, and on Outcome Agreements.

Court's attention was drawn in particular to the request for nominations for honorary degrees in 2014.

CRT/2012/53. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2012/54. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 9 October 2013 in the Senate Room

Court - Wednesday 9 October 2013

Principal's Report

Items A : For Discussion

1. Pension Schemes

As Court is aware, the UK's Pensions Regulator raised concerns last year about the UGPS deficit recovery plan. Since then and with a triennial Actuarial Valuation due on 1 April 2013 the deficit has increased significantly because of the low rate of return applying to Government bonds. The Trustees of the Scheme asked the University to increase substantially its financial commitment to the pension scheme. Court established an expert working group to review proposals for addressing the deficit, and to consider the future benefit structure of UGPS. The group's recommendations - that benefits under the existing scheme should be brought into line with those under USS, and that the existing scheme should be continued for existing members but closed to new entrants and a new Defined Contribution Scheme offered to new entrants - were approved by Court in June, following which a consultation exercise with staff representatives took place over the summer months. The current position is that staff representatives have suggested that the Defined Benefit scheme should remain open to all and that the volatility risk to the University is managed through cost-sharing with members. Recognising that cost-sharing may increase member contribution rates unreasonably, it was suggested that a reduced benefits scheme might be introduced rather than continuing to increase contribution rates. At the time of writing this report, the consultation has only just closed and the matter is currently being discussed within the Senior Management Group.

The addressing of the ongoing deficit within UGPS is a separate matter and is being discussed with the Trustees and their actuary, with a view to a shared set of assumptions on the discount rates and therefore the deficit level. A revised recovery plan will then be discussed to be in place by the Regulator's deadline of June 2014. Accordingly the expert working group will continue to exist, given that the matters above have not concluded.

There are also discussions ongoing nationally about the USS scheme and how its deficit might be addressed.

2. HE Funding and Outcome Agreements

When Court last met, the SFC had not issued its announcement of the annual grant to HEIs. Court was also advised that meaningful comparisons with previous years would be difficult because of the different methodology now used and greater use of incentive schemes.

The 2013/14 grant details have now been issued and are summarised as follows:

University of Glasgow	2013-14 £k	2012-13 £k	Diff £k	Diff %
Total Teaching Funding	86,429	85,432	997	1.2%
Research Excellence Grant	46,916	43,386	3,530	8.1%
Research Postgraduate Grant	6,411	6,294	117	1.8%
Knowledge Transfer Grant (General Funds)	70	70	0	0.0%
Total Research	53,397	49,750	3,647	7.3%
Total Teaching & Research	139,826	135,182	4,644	3.4%

Included is the ring-fenced funding for controlled subjects.
Excluded are the strategic element of the KTG and Nursing and midwifery pre-registration education.

The grant is provided to allow universities to deliver their Outcome Agreements and we are also required to comply with the terms of the Financial Memorandum with the SFC. As Court was advised last session, for the 2013/14 round, the SFC advised that a number of funding streams would be available in the HE budget and requested bids ahead of the indicative grant letter being issued in December 2012. The University prepared bids in priority areas identified by the SFC, where these aligned with our strategic plan. These included investment proposals for additional funded places, where under the Widening Participation strand we were successful in securing funding for additional places (over the next 4 years) for up to 800 students from low-income backgrounds; we were also awarded UG places for Articulation to courses at Dumfries and UG places in Life Sciences (aimed at skills demand), as well as 122 additional Taught Postgraduate places to meet skills needs of the Scottish economy. Later on and in line with additional SFC priority areas, we expanded the Outcome Agreement to include sections on our International Research Competitiveness and our strategy for Graduate Skills. We were awarded an additional £2.5m from the Global Excellence Initiative for both 2013/14 and 2014/15.

3. Internationalisation

Annex 1 provides an update on progress against the objectives set out in the Internationalisation Strategy, following on from the Mid-term Review in 2012, details of which were provided to Court at the time. The full update report will be made available electronically to Court members.

4. Glasgow University Union

As Court was advised at the last meeting, over the summer GUU's officers were to undertake 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. The review group, chaired by Professor Noreen Burrows of the Law School and also comprising Sandra White MSP and Prof Roddy Neilson (a member of the GUU Board), submitted its report to the GUU in August.

The University is currently waiting for the GUU's response to the report.

5. Student Admissions including RUK

Admissions to the University for 2013/14, for Undergraduate and Postgraduate (PGT/PGR) students, are summarised in **Annex 2**.

Items B: For Information

6. University Rankings and National Student Survey

In my June report to Court I provided an analysis of the latest UK league tables. Since then, the annual QS World Rankings have been published. The University has attained its highest ever world ranking, rising three places from 54th to 51st position. While we remain cautious about league tables, this is our best ever showing.

We have also received Sunday Times/Times University League Table 2014 which places us 25th. This merges two previously separate league tables. This represents a drop of 10 places against the Times and a 6 place drop against the Sunday Times from last year, which is disappointing. However, we retain 3rd place in Scotland once again (behind St Andrews and Edinburgh) and are 17th in the Russell Group. Interestingly we have increased our scores in 6 of the 8 metrics but have fallen in ranking in all of them, suggesting that Glasgow's pace of improvement in the metrics is not keeping pace with others. We are looking at ways in which we can optimise our position within UK league tables.

The latest National Students Survey shows 89% of final-year students are satisfied at Glasgow, the same figure as last year and above the UK average of 86%. The Survey, which is conducted by independent market research agency Ipsos MORI, covers all publicly-funded universities in the UK, offering final-year undergraduate students the opportunity to rate their academic experience. The response rate from Glasgow was 72%. The rating puts Glasgow at number three in Scotland and joint eighth in The Russell Group for student satisfaction. Some notable results from the survey include: 93% of students say staff are good at explaining things, 93% say their course is intellectually stimulating, 92% are happy with the resources and services offered by the library, 91% say that staff are enthusiastic about what they are teaching and 89% believe they have the contact with staff they require.

7. Key activities

Below is a summary of some of the main activities I have been involved in since the last meeting of Court, divided into 4 themes: Academic Development and Strategy; Internationalisation activities; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events. In order to cut the length of this report I have provided brief headings and can expand on any items of interest to Court.

7.1 Academic Development and Strategy

- Interview for Chair in Modern History (4 July)
- Continued visits to College Management groups with Director of RIO to promote importance of Internationalisation: College of MVLS (25 July)
- SMG Away day (1 & 2 October)
- Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee meeting (3 October)

7.2 International Activities

- Dinner and signing agreement with SunYat-Sen delegation (18 & 19 July)
- Visit of President, Vice President and delegation including a dance group *Art Troupe* from UESTC for two days culminating in a Lodging dinner (24 September)

7.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

Participation in Conferences/Symposiums

- Opened the Baryons 2013 Conference (24 June) and on the same day participated in the public launch of Policy Scotland
- Alastair Darling Lecture (11 July): another in the sequence of public lectures around the constitutional debate
- Attended Stanford Photonics Research Centre (SPRC) 2013 Symposium in Stanford giving the welcome address, visited donors, and hosted a Stanford Alumni Event the next evening (17 September)

Participation in HE organisations

- SFC Board meetings on 28 June and 2 September
- Russell Group: roundtable with David Willetts (1 July) on international strategy for UK universities
- CASE: attended the CASE conference in Manchester (27-28 August) and participated as panel member in discussion 'Are the days of traditional Higher Education numbered?' and chaired a session.
- Chairing USS Group meetings (18 July & 23 September)
- UUK Board Meeting and UUK Annual Conference (10 & 11 September)
- Universities Scotland: Round table discussion Mike Russell (2 October)

Scottish Government: General

- Scottish Leaders Forum: Welcome and address by John Swinney (3 & 4 October)
- Attended Scottish Government BRIC Tourism Group meeting (26 August)

Scottish Government: GU

- Meeting with Mike Russell at the University (2 July)
- Meeting at the University with Stuart Maxwell, Convener of Education & Culture Committee (23 July)
- Meeting at the University with Dr Rebekah Widdowfield, Deputy Director and Head of Higher Education and Learner Support, Scottish Government (26 July)
- Meeting with Mike Russell and Alex Neil and Professor Dominiczak in Edinburgh re Medical Education (12 September)

Key stakeholders

- Participated in MRC visit to MVLS (23 July)

Other University events

- Attended University of St Andrews 600th Anniversary celebrations (Lunch and graduation ceremony) (13 September)

External Events

- CBI: Attended the CBI dinner (5 September)
- Attended the new 'Inspiring City Awards 2013' (11 September)

7.4. Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

- General Council half yearly meeting (22 June)
- Met with International officers (3 July)
- Welcomed new, mainly international staff and their families at an event and new initiative sponsored by HR, aimed at developing networks of support (26 September)
- Participated with SMG colleagues in Glasgow Conversation – a new approach to encourage cross University communication (27 September)
- Open Day Welcome: gave 3 welcome sessions on the Open day held on 4 September.
- Launch of Phase 2 of Pebble Appeal - Pioneering Cancer Research – and the conferring of the Honorary Degree on Sir Alex Ferguson (12 September)
- Hunterian Stakeholders dinner (8 October)

8. Senior Management Group business

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

SMG Meeting of 17 June 2013

- MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses)
- Fee Setting for 2014/15
- Communications Plan
- Update on Commonwealth Games Group

SMG Meeting of 17 July 2013

- Media Activity Report

SMG Meeting of 21 August 2013

- ELIR
- Risk List
- NSS
- Update on ECDP
- People & Organisational Development Strategy

SMG Meeting of September

- Potential TNE Project involving Glasgow
- Licensing of Curriculum – Discussion Paper
- Incentivisation of Head of School/Director of Research Institute

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide Senate and Court with an update on progress against the objectives set out in the University's Internationalisation Strategy, and to gain feedback from the community of staff and students to ensure the robustness and continuing relevance of our ongoing work. A detailed Mid-term Review of the Strategy was produced in February 2012. Within the framework for progress set out in the Mid-term Review, this report updates for the 2012/13 period, by identifying for each of the key themes set out in the Mid-term Review:

- Key developments for 2012/13
- Challenges going forward

The University of Glasgow Internationalisation Strategy was agreed by Senate and Court in 2009/10, with the aim of highlighting Glasgow's international ambition, and providing a framework for the development of international activity. The key themes of the Internationalisation Strategy are: Student Experience, Research & Knowledge Transfer, Partnerships, Staff, Alumni, Local Engagement, and the Internal Communication of Internationalisation.

The set of indicators described below were adopted by SMG in February 2010, to enable measurement of progress and performance in meeting our objectives.

- Number and % of international students relative to total intake.
- Number of students undertaking international placements for academic study, work experience or volunteering.
- Number of students studying on transnational (TN) programmes and number of TN programmes.
- International student satisfaction and willingness to recommend the University to others.
- Research earnings generated from international sources and as a % of total research earnings.
- New international income (non-Glasgow student fee and research income).
- Number and % of staff from non-UK background.

Highlights and challenges going forward

2012/13 Highlights

Going Global – GU organised a high profile session on outbound student mobility at British Council's Going Global Conference in Dubai.
SCIES Strategy agreed: The strategy sets a route map for increasing international experiences for students. In 2011/12, 1,683 students had an international learning experience (+13%).
Continued growth in International (non-EU) student numbers: The University target of 3,436 international students for 12/13 was exceeded with a total of 3,489 (+ 7% of the previous year).
Substantial increase in EU research earnings: number of new EU awards trebled over last three years – total EU earnings up from 6.6 million in 2009 to 14 million for 2012 applications.
Glasgow-Columbia Scholarships: Eight PhDs/postdocs will travel to Columbia and three will come to Glasgow from Columbia as part of new exchange scholarship programme.
Joint Graduate School: Major progress towards establishing a Joint Graduate School with Nankai University.
Cooperation agreement with Sun Yat-sen: agreement signed which will see the development of jointly-delivered Masters programmes, a new student exchange summer school, and a new research symposium.
International Partnership Development Fund: fully allocated; 35 applications across all colleges funded with a range of concrete outcomes.
Transnational Education Strategy approved by Senate and Court: the number of TNE programmes

has risen from zero in 2010 to five in 2012 – due to increase to at least eight in 2013
Glasgow leading U21 activity: UoG-led report on P&DR published; funds secured for work on Academic Workforce Planning; UoG held first U21 event on International Student Integration.
International staff: number of international staff continues to rise – currently at circa. 17.1% of the total staff population, up from 13.2% in 2009/10.
Launch of the staff mobility programme: just completed the third round in providing or committing funding to the value of £27K.
Global Regional Activity Briefing (GRAB): six lunches have been delivered since September 2012, with a further two scheduled to take place by the end of the 2012/13 academic session.
Science without Borders: the University welcomed the first Brazilian students sponsored by the Brazilian government's Science without Borders programme.

Challenges

Recruitment targets: Achieving international student recruitment target for 2013/14 and growth to 5,000 by 2017/18, achieving growth across all Colleges.
Balancing international student intake: Consolidation of intake of students from China and growth from other regions to enhance diversification of PG student cohorts into the Business School.
Outbound mobility: implementing the SCIES strategy and addressing the imbalance between outward and inward Erasmus and International Exchange mobility (currently sitting at 729 students incoming and 324 ¹ outgoing).
Embedding partnership working more broadly across the university.
Transnational education: Maximising the benefits and opportunities that our agreed TNE models can offer; development of infrastructure to support e-learning for delivery of the TNE programmes currently on offer, and to enable the development of more distance learning programmes.
Universitas 21: embed and exploit the benefits of U21 membership across the University.
International staff: Continue to achieve growth in international staff population with goal of achieving 20% of total staff population by 2014/15.
Local engagement: To develop a sustainable framework to ensure the City and the University are maximising opportunities for mutual benefit from international activity.
Development of a University-wide data repository/register of international links, partnerships and collaborations.
Summer Schools Framework – development and implementation of a framework to support a more flexible approach to international recruitment and partnership development.

Key indicators

International Indicators	Baseline 2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	Target 2012/13	Actual 2012/13
International (non-EU) Students (%Total Student Population)	2,495 ² (11%)	3,010 (FTE) (13%)	3,257 (FTE) (15%)	3,436 (FTE)	3,489 (FTE) (15%)
Student Mobility	1,270	1,485	1,683	1800	Not yet available

¹Calculation made using 2011/12 statistics for Erasmus (study) and international exchange
²headcount

TNE Student Numbers	15	15	110	360	355
Int. Student Satisfaction	92%	89%	89%	90%	89.5%
Int. Student Recommendation	86%	82%	85%	85%	85%
Int. Research Earnings	£10.7M	£11.7M	£15.1M	Year-on-year increase	£17.9M
Other International Income (DAO)	£316,650	£210,350	£191,997	Year-on-year increase	£350,070*
International Staff (non-UK) (% of total staff)	819 (13.2%)	824 (13.8%)	930 (15.4%)	Year-on-year increase	1094* (17.1%)

*as at May 13

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW STUDENT RECRUITMENT 2013/14

1.0 UNDERGRADUATE

1.1 Non-RUK (Scottish and EU) Admissions

	2013 Registrations	2013 SFC Fundable Target	Difference
University	3,585	3,588	-3

1.2 RUK Admissions (England, Northern Ireland and Wales Fee Paying Students)

	2013 Registrations	2013 SFC Fundable Target	Difference
University	879	554	325

1.3 International

	2013 Registrations	2012 Actual	Difference
University	370	333	+11%

2.0 POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT

2.1 Home

	2013 Predicted Registrations	2013 Forecast	Difference
University	2,052	n/a	n/a

2.2 International

	2013 Predicted	2013 Forecast	Difference
University	2,303	2,259	44

3.0 POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH

3.1 Home

	2013 Predicted Registrations	2013 Forecast	Difference
University	1,381	n/a	n/a

3.2 International

	2013 Predicted	2013 Forecast	Difference
University	529	494	+35

4.0 Summary of International Admissions

	2013 Predicted	2012 Actual	Difference
Undergraduate	370	333	+11%
PGT	2,303	1,923	+20%
PGR	529	494	+7%
University	3,202	2,750	+16%



Court - Wednesday 9 October 2013

Report from the Secretary of Court

SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Court Strategy Day

Annex 1 is a brief report on the key points arising from the Strategy Day held on 25 September. Court's further views on future pricing strategy for RUK fees will be sought later this session, with further information provided at that time. Updates on the Campus Estates Strategy will be brought to Court throughout this coming year; either as part of the standard agenda, or through a pre-Court briefing or, if required, through a special meeting. At this stage it is anticipated that there will be a substantial update to Court in April 2014, with a draft Campus Estates Strategy then being presented for consideration in June, and for final approval in October.

A.2 Review of Governance Arrangements

At its June meeting, Court received and approved a report containing recommendations and proposed actions arising from the Court Governance discussion day held on 31 May. The discussion day itself had covered a range of matters raised by the Lauwerys Report and the draft Scottish Code on HE Governance. Court was advised that a large part of the actions from the discussion day would be taken forward over the following months, with an update to the October Court meeting. That update, which uses the original June report as its starting point, with annotations, is at **Annex 2. There is one suggestion (see section 14 on page 10) on which Court's view is sought.**

A.3 Court Governance Working Group

As part of its review of governance arrangements, Court agreed in June that a Working Group should look further at the composition of Court and report to October Court. The Group's report, which contains two points for Court's further consideration, is at **Annex 3. Court's approval of the group's recommendation to proceed with the Ordinance relating to Court's Composition is requested. Subject to this approval, Court's view is also sought on options for transitional arrangements, as proposed in Annex 3 (page 12/13).**

A.4 *Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill*

As Court heard in June, the amended Bill required universities to comply with principles of good governance, as determined by the SFC. The Bill was passed into law by the Parliament in June. The Scottish Code of Good HE Governance was published by the Committee of Scottish Chairs in July 2013, and all Scottish universities are now reviewing their governance arrangements in the light of the new Code. At this stage, the Scottish Funding Council has made no formal statement regarding its position on the new Code. At the time of writing (29 September) SFC is about to appoint a new Chair, with the appointment of a new Chief Executive to follow shortly thereafter.

A.5 *Nominations Committee Business*

i) Court and Committee members

At the June meeting, Court approved 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; Court also agreed to advertise to fill a vacancy on the Audit Committee. The closing date for all these positions was 20 September. Nominations Committee will take forward a shortlisting and interviewing process and report any recommendations for appointment to Court. Rather than await the December meeting of Court, it is intended to seek Court members' approval of these recommendations by email.

ii) Remuneration Committee

Court agreed in June that a vacant position on the Remuneration Committee should be filled as soon as possible. Nominations Committee therefore recommends to Court that Brian McBride becomes a member of the Remuneration Committee. Brian has previous remuneration committee experience and is willing to serve if invited to. **Court's approval of this recommendation is sought.**

As an additional item, the new Code of Good HE Governance, in its Supporting Guidelines, indicates that the Chair of Court should no longer convene the Remuneration Committee. Nominations Committee therefore recommends to Court that David Anderson becomes a Chair of the Remuneration Committee, with effect from the Committee's next meeting (on 10 October). David is willing to take on the chairmanship if invited to. **Court's approval of this recommendation is sought.**

Finally, Court agreed as part of the governance discussion day that Remuneration Committee should be further augmented by the appointment of an external lay member. It is hoped that a suitable recruit might be drawn from those currently applying for the Court vacancies.

iii) Nominations Committee

As previously advised, the Lay Member vacancy that will arise from Robin Easton leaving Court in December 2013, together with the additional lay members position agreed by Court in June 2013, will be filled once the new co-opted members of Court are appointed.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 *Court Business 2013/14*

[Standing Orders for Court; Statement of Primary Responsibilities; Schedule of Court Business for the coming year - items are available on the Court website at <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/courtoffice/universitycourtandcourtmeetings/>]

The website has also been updated to include links to web-based resources for Court members. Suggestions for amendments or additional material would be welcome.

The attendance lists for meetings of Court and its committees for 2012/13 have been reviewed; there are no outstanding issues to report in connection with this.

B.2 *Glasgow City Council Representative*

Councillor Pauline McKeever has been selected as the Glasgow City Council representative on Court, replacing Councillor Matt Kerr. Councillor McKeever represents the Hillhead ward on the City Council.

B.3 *Senate Assessors on Court*

As previously advised in June, the following have been elected to Court until 31 July 2017 (from 1 August 2013):

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)

B.4 *Honorary Degree Nominations*

In line with the previously agreed arrangement with Senate to allow members of Court to submit observations on nominations for honorary degrees, Don Spaeth (on behalf of the Clerk of Senate, who is not able to attend the Court meeting) will advise Court of the 2013/2014 nominations on a confidential basis. Members of Court should contact the Clerk of Senate should they have observations to make.

B.5 *Heads of School Appointments*

The following appointments have been made:

College of Social Sciences

Head of School of Social and Political Sciences

Professor Christopher Carman from 1 August 2013 for a period of 2 years, replacing Professor Mike French.

College of MVLS

Head of School of Medicine

Professor Alan Jardine as Acting Head of the School of Medicine from 1 November 2013 and for a period of three months, replacing Professor Massimo Pignatelli, who is leaving the University to take up another post.

B.6 *Committee of University Chairs*

Court members will be aware of the UK-wide Code of Governance Practice that was issued by the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) in 2004 and updated in 2009. CUC has now embarked on a further updating of its code, with the intention of publishing a new version in March 2014. CUC has been advised by the Chair of the Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) that the Scottish universities will now comply with the Scottish Code, and that they cannot commit also to comply with a new UK-code.

B.7 *Equality & Diversity Strategy*

In preparing the University's submission for this session's Enhancement Led Institutional Review, it has come to light that the University's 2012 Equality & Diversity Strategy document was not brought to Court for approval. The Strategy can be found at:

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

This document was approved by the University's Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee in February 2012. While it was not brought at that time to Court for approval, Court did, in April 2013, approve the University's E&D Strategy Action Plan, which derives from the E&D Strategy.

Court is asked to confirm its endorsement of the E&D Strategy, as approved by EDSC in February 2012, and as reflected in the E&D Strategy Action Plan approved by Court in April 2013.

Court Strategy Discussion Day, 25 September 2013

Background

The purpose of the strategy day was for Court to be briefed on, and to provide its early contributions to, student recruitment strategy including fees pricing, possible scenarios for the University in the event of an independence vote, and the further development of the Campus Estates Strategy.

1. Student Recruitment Strategy

Rachel Sandison, Director of the Recruitment and International Office (RIO), briefed Court on the University's student recruitment strategy and performance, and on pricing, ahead of future pricing decisions being formally considered later in the session. Court received details on the University's strong performance in student recruitment for the 2013/14 session, particularly in relation to RUK; and on the student recruitment strategy for Scotland, RUK, the EU and International, together with forecasts for future years. Court noted details about priority markets and key recruitment channels including partnerships and Trans-national education. University activities in the areas of new academic product development, use of electronic media, conversion activity, customer relations management and alumni engagement were also noted.

Court had previously agreed on, and reiterated, the importance of diversification of markets to ensure that the University is not overly-reliant on specific markets for its international student population. Court heard that measures are in hand with regard to this. Court also heard that the PGR recruitment strategy is being further developed, together with more robust comparative data for the area.

Court was reminded of the pricing policy/scholarships levels for RUK students, agreed in 2011. These areas will be reviewed during the 2013/14 session. Court agreed that further market analysis and information was needed ahead of it making a decision.

2. Independence

The University has not adopted a position on the constitutional debate in Scotland, and there is no intention that it should do so. As a charitable body, whose mission is to undertake Teaching and Research, it would not be proper for the University to adopt a political position. Nevertheless, there are major areas of University activity that would be affected if there were to be a 'yes' vote in September 2014.

Court therefore considered a number of issues relating to the work of the University that could be impacted by the outcome of the independence referendum, in the event of an independence vote. These related to Fees levels for RUK students, Scotland/EU students (non-RUK) and for International students, where Court agreed there could be a potential loss of income from RUK and additional pressure on UG places, with a strong, sustainable, income model being essential; Research funding and collaboration, where key points raised were the need for early clarity on the level and methodology of Research funding, the possible need to engage in greater collaboration, for optimal marketing of Scotland as a knowledge economy with excellent opportunities for R&D, and the opportunities that might arise in relation to facilitating international staff recruitment; to Quality Assurance in teaching and research and in professional standards, where it was agreed that comparative methods and data would need to be maintained; to global reach and reputation where it was agreed that Scotland must seek to exploit to the full its key selling points; to

administrative structures, where it was noted that the future of UK-wide structures such as UCAS, UCEA and USS would need to be addressed, with early clarification needed in particular on the implications of cross-border pension schemes for pensions liabilities and funding; and to Scottish taxation powers, which would open up important questions in relation to how taxation policy would impact on research and development, commercialisation of intellectual property, and philanthropic giving. Court agreed that there were many opportunities, as well as potential challenges, that would arise. The importance of early interaction by the sector with the government was stressed, to establish the priority the government would afford to sustaining a strong and distinctive Scottish higher education sector, and to clarify its policy intentions in the key areas identified above.

3. Campus Estates Strategy

Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice Principal, Ann Allen, Director of Estates & Buildings and Robert Fraser, Director of Finance, briefed Court on the development to date of the Campus Estates Strategy, including the consultations that had taken place, and on the ongoing timescales. In the context of the estate being an enabler of the University's ambition, an early discussion was also held with Court members on the possible scales of investment in the Campus, with consideration being given to the condition of the current estate, the opportunities presented by the Western site and the level of ambition and investment that Court might consider appropriate. Broad options for change were provided, with possible financing models and sources, affordability levels, and options for the pace and ambition of change.

Court heard that a reconfigured estate would provide opportunities to drive efficiencies, for example by co-location and with regard to energy provision/use, and to enhance reputation with modern, fit-for-purpose infrastructure. The additional space would relatively quickly provide opportunities to redevelop existing parts of the campus, contemporaneously, because of the possibility of decanting areas of activity to some parts of the new site.

In discussion, Court's early views were provided on priority areas to enable delivery of the next phase of the strategy, relating to: resilience; potential efficiencies within Colleges and University Services; research infrastructure (including sharing of capital equipment, collaborative lab space and adaptable space); and Teaching & Learning space. Court also put forward initial views given the background of the HE environment being uncertain in the coming few years, in relation to maintaining flexibility of approach; the rate of spend; the appetite for borrowing; and generation of future income, all within the framework of the University's strong ambitions.

Court's views on more detailed proposals will be sought as the Estates Strategy process progresses.

Review of Governance Arrangements

Background

Court met on 31 May 2013 to discuss a range of Governance issues that were raised by the Lauwerys Report and by the Draft Scottish Code on HE Governance. A series of recommendations arose from that discussion and were agreed by Court in June 2013; these appear below, together with an update on each, showing how matters have been taken forward.

A Court Working Group was established to consider further the future composition of Court - their report and recommendations are provided separately.

Recommendations following Court discussion day 31 May, and Updates

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

October 2013 update: a separate report is provided to Court – see Annex 3.

- 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.

October 2013 update: this will occur at the relevant time (summer 2015).

- 3 Four years should be established as the standard term of office for all members of Court, with the exception of the student members. [note added October 2013: Rector's term also excepted, since legislation refers to 3-year term; and City Council representative's term is determined by Council election timing].

October 2013 update: actioned. Next staff representative nomination/election exercise will be for posts of 4 years.

- 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).

October 2013 update: this appointment will take place when new Court members are identified.

- 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.

October 2013 update: see recommendation above from Nominations Committee to Court. The external lay member will be identified as indicated in the same Nominations Committee section.

- 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.

October 2013 update: October meeting papers and format of presentations have been amended, with the aim of reducing volume/time and focusing on key issues. For possible further refinement/views from Court following the October meeting.

- 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.

October 2013 update: actioned for October Court, including cover sheets for Court committee papers being revised.

- 8 Court should experiment with different timings for its meetings, to establish whether there is a more convenient time than Wednesday afternoons.

October 2013 update: mixed views were expressed when this matter was discussed on 31 May; the point will be revisited when new members are appointed.

- 9 The annual induction session should run in November each year.

October 2013 update: induction session arranged for 11 October. The Court Office website is also being developed to include a 'Resources for Court members' section, which includes links to key University information and policies, and will include ad hoc links to topical issues and documents.

- 10 The Secretary should provide October Court with an update on action taken in respect of each of the Lauwerys Recommendations

*October 2013 update: the June Court papers included the full Lauwerys recommendations, with an update on each. A large number of these recommendations had already been translated into recommendations arising from the May discussion day, for which updates are provided in this document. A number of other Lauwerys recommendations were not accepted, by Court's agreement, and are no longer included here. The remainder are updated as follows (**in bold**):*

*10.1 There should be an annual review of the Statement of Primary Responsibilities and Scheme of Delegated Authorities: **the Statement of Primary Responsibilities appears as Annex 5 of this report, with tracked changes, for Court's consideration/approval. The Scheme of Delegated Authorities will be taken to Finance Committee for discussion and later submission to Court if amendments are proposed.***

*10.2 Development of a set of 'super' KPIs: **Court felt current KPIs were suitable, but invited SMG's view, which was that although an update on admissions is***

normally given to Court in October, this will now be formalised annually, as will an update on the Research 'order book' at the appropriate time annually.

*10.3 The General Council Business Committee should be formally designated as the appointing body for the General Council posts on the Court: **This matter will be discussed with the GCBC which, if it supports the suggestion, will submit a formal request for Court to draft a new ordinance.***

*10.4 Court Standing Orders should be revised in light of the recommendations which may be adopted arising from this [Lauwerys] Review: **Amended Orders are attached for Court's approval, as Annex 4 to this report.** The Quorum provisions should specify the lay proportion of the membership which should be present to make a meeting quorate: **given that Court's quorum is set at 7 by primary legislation, changing this is impractical, and specifying a subset of 7 as needing to be 'lay' is not considered necessary, given the likelihood of Court being postponed if such low numbers were to attend.***

*10.5 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: **This is being addressed by the H, S & W Committee.***

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.

October 2013 update: this has been actioned in the recent recruitment advertisements or will be taken forward at the appropriate time when relevant vacancies arise.

- 12 The Selection Panel for the future appointment of a Principal should include the SRC President as a full member.

October 2013 update: this will occur at the relevant time.

- 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.

October 2013 update: this will occur at the relevant time.

- 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.

October 2013 update: the Nominations Committee (minus the Convener of Court who is a member) would be an appropriate forum to agree who might undertake this annually. Court's view is sought on this suggestion.

- 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.

October 2013 update: the final version of the new Scottish Code of Good HE Governance refers to 5-yearly reviews, which will be implemented.

- 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.

October 2013 update: already implemented for current members; advertisements for new members have included details.

- 17 Court members' Register of Interests should in future be published on the Court Office webpages.

October 2013 update: being implemented October 2013.

- 18 The SRC President should be added to the membership of the Nominations Committee.

October 2013 update: implemented.

Court Governance Working Group – Summary of meeting 2 August 2013

Background

Court agreed at its governance discussion day in May, and confirmed at its June 2013 meeting, that it would task a Court Governance Working group to look at aspects relating to the composition of Court. The group, comprising David Ross (chair), Susan Ashworth, Alan Macfarlane, Jess McGrellis, Margaret Morton and Don Spaeth, met on 2 August with the following remit:

To consider 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 appendix to this report gives background detail on the 2011 Draft Ordinance on Court membership, namely an October 2010 paper from a working group on governance, made to Court. The conclusions of the paper were accepted by Court, following which there was a mandatory consultation period on the Draft Ordinance, with subsequent agreement to it by the General Council Business Committee, but concerns expressed by Senate about the proposed number of Senate Assessors. Court agreed an amended draft in 2011; further details appear below (point 6).

Working Group Discussion

The group considered the following 6 proposals, the first 5 of which had previously been agreed at the discussion day. The group endorsed these proposals, with additional discussion recorded below:

1. That Court should have a clear lay majority.
2. That the size of Court should not grow.
3. That the number of General Council members should be reduced from 5 to 2.
4. That the post of Chancellor's Assessor should be abolished and replaced by an additional Co-opted position.
5. That the post of Convener should be established as a separately identified post on Court to be occupied by a lay member.

With regard to points 4. and 5. above, the group agreed that these matters should be addressed without amendments to the draft Ordinance on Court membership, which does not refer to the abolition of the post of Chancellor's Assessor. In the interests of Court's pressing need for the specialist expertise of additional Co-opted members, particularly in light of the Western Infirmary

development, and to alleviate the heavy workload for existing lay members, it was agreed that to amend the Ordinance further, risking more delay, was not desirable. The Ordinance has already been 'on hold' at the Privy Council for 2 years, following its formal submission in March 2011: the University was advised by the Privy Council that the Ordinance would not proceed while the Government Review of HE Governance (Von Prondzynski) was under way. The group agreed that a practical arrangement should be possible whereby the Convener of Court, drawn from the Co-opted members, would be given the (in effect additional) title of Chancellor's Assessor, following discussion with the Chancellor and subject to his agreement. Subject to the agreement also of the current Chancellor's Assessor, such a change might take effect on 31 July 2014 with David Ross resigning as a General Council and becoming Chancellor's Assessor, and Murdoch MacLennan becoming a Co-opted member of Court.

6. The group considered the appropriate number of Senate Assessors on Court and agreed that, in line with the majority view of Court on 31 May, the number should be reduced from 7 to 5. This is also in line with the number proposed in the draft Ordinance submitted to the Privy Council in March 2011. The draft Ordinance had originally proposed 4 Senate Assessors, but the figure was amended to 5 at the February 2011 Court meeting, following receipt of Senate's views. Senate has been concerned at the reduction in the number of Senate Assessors, and asked whether the clear lay majority that was sought could be achieved through increasing the number of Court members, rather than by reducing the number of Senate Assessors. When Court reconsidered this matter in February 2011, it agreed, in response to the consultation, to modify the ordinance such that the number of Senate Assessors would reduce from 7 to 5, rather than from 7 to 4.

The group therefore agreed to recommend to Court that the Scottish Government be contacted as soon as possible to request that the Ordinance proceed in its current form.

The group also considered the requirements placed on Senate Assessors by the University. It noted that the presence of Senate Assessors on academic appointing committees, which had been very onerous, was no longer required; this has been the case since the 2010 Court Effectiveness Review. This has alleviated some of the time burden for the Assessors. They are still required to sit on promotions panels, Boards of Review and Periodic Subject Reviews, as well as on Court Committees. However the group noted that there was scope for the 2 employee representatives on Court to cover some staff positions on Court Committees, such as the Finance and Estates Committees, but not HR, thereby avoiding increasing Senate Assessor commitments on Court Committees as a result of the reduction in the number of Senate Assessors.

The group noted that the *Scottish Code of Good HE Governance* has now been issued in final form, although it is still subject to the approval of the SFC which it was assumed would be discussed at its October/or September meeting. The group agreed that the above proposals would be in accordance with the requirements of the Code.

Action Requested of Court

Court's approval of the group's recommendation to proceed with the Ordinance is requested. Subject to this approval, Court also needs to consider how, if the Ordinance is approved by the Privy Council, the changeover between Senate Assessor and Co-opted members will be effected.

2 General Council members, Kevin Sweeney and Alan Macfarlane, will demit office on 31 July 2014 following the end of their two 4-year terms. These posts would be replaced by Co-opted members, with adverts to be placed to recruit them in the early spring of 2014, to ensure no gap.

As indicated above, a third General Council vacancy may occur on 31 July 2014 in the event that David Ross demits office as a General Council Assessor and becomes instead a Co-opted member and Chancellor's Assessor. In such a case the reduction of General Council Assessors from 5 to 2 would be complete at this point. If this does not take place, the next General Council vacancies after that (2 vacancies) will occur in July 2016, therefore one of these would be replaced by a Co-opted position, advertised accordingly. The other vacancy would be filled via the usual process of General Council nomination. 2 Senate Assessors will demit office in July 2015. These 2 posts could be replaced with Co-opted positions from August 2015, with adverts to be placed in the early spring of 2015, to ensure no gap. Alternatively, Court could run with a temporary membership of 27 up to that point, recruiting 2 additional Co-opted members as soon as the Ordinance is granted, which is likely to be before July 2015. Court's membership would revert to 25 from August 2015, in such a case, or earlier if vacancies in the number of Senate Assessors arose earlier. **Court's view is sought on this matter.**

Annex 3 Appendix (Paper to Court October 2010)

Working Group on Governance

Introduction

As the attached paper explains, it is the outcome of meetings involving a number of Lay Members and Senate Assessors ably assisted by David Newall and Dorothy Welch.

The CUC Guidance that Courts should review their effectiveness at least once every five years meant that it was timely to undertake this Governance review. However this particular process started as a result of a number of discussions which I had had with some of the members of Court over the past 9 months in which they raised aspects which might be improved in order to make Court more effective. As a result I drew together a number of matters which I thought required to be addressed. These included the composition of Court which was, I believe, last reviewed almost 20 years ago and then only to reflect the demise of Strathclyde Regional Council.

As the attached paper records we do not actually comply with the CUC Governance Code of Practice because we do not have a majority of Lay Members who are both external and independent of the University. This we must do. However my initial thought that we needed to look at the composition of Court reflected also my belief that if we are to properly fulfil the ultimate responsibilities of Court we need to recruit onto Court more Lay Members with a wider range of skills and experience than at present. This of course is not a reflection on the contribution of existing Lay Members but rather a reflection of the fact that we have too few of them to provide, in sufficient depth, all the skills and experience that the governing body of the University really requires nowadays.

It seemed to the Lay and Senate Members who met to discuss these issues that enlarging Court was certainly not the way to achieve this aim and so we had to look at changing its composition. Our recommendation is that the number of General Council, and Senate Assessors should each be reduced by 3, leaving 2 General Council and 4 Senate Assessors. I believe that this change, enabling us to increase the number of Co-opted members who can be recruited through a focused and public process, will contribute importantly to improving the way in which Court operates.

These changes to the composition of Court will not however happen overnight. If Court approves these proposals, the Senate and the General Council will be consulted and any proposed new Ordinance will then have to go to the Privy Council for approval - which we know is not a speedy process. It is likely therefore that the changes cannot start to be implemented until 2012. In parallel with that process however we can consider how the changes will affect the composition of the Court Committees and the spread of governance duties among the members of Court.

The paper also recommends quite a number of other changes which by and large could be implemented forthwith and I recommend these changes to you on the basis that they will also contribute to improving our effectiveness.

David Ross, Senior Lay Member of Court

Review of University Court Governance arrangements: Report of Court Working Group

INTRODUCTION

The Governance Code of Practice, published by the Committee of University Chairs (CUC), recommends that a University governing body should review its own effectiveness at least once every five years. Accordingly, a group was established which met on two occasions to consider how the operation of Court may be improved. In preparation, the arrangements at other Scottish universities were reviewed (see Appendix 1), and a recent internal audit report on governance was considered. This appears as Appendix 2, and Appendix 2a provides a summary of the response to the report's recommendations. Membership of the group is included in Appendix 3. (*Appendices not included in this version October 2013*).

Discussion covered two areas: Membership and Attendance; and Management of Court Business (*the latter not included in this version October 2013*).

MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE

Court has 25 members. Of these 12 are staff and students of the University and 13 are lay members, drawn from outside the staff and student population. The current membership is as follows:

Staff and Student members

7 Senate Assessors

2 Staff representatives

2 SRC representatives

Principal

Lay Members

5 General Council Assessors

5 Co-opted members

Rector

Chancellor's Assessor

Glasgow CC representative

Members nominated by particular constituencies are not representatives in that they should not act as if delegated by that constituency; rather, they are required to act as Governors, in the best interests of the University. The following issues were discussed by the Working Group:

.1 Balance of internal and lay members

A principle reflected in the CUC's Governance Code of Practice is that the governing body should have a majority of lay members, who should be '*both external and independent of the institution*'. On paper, the University appears to comply with this guidance - just. But, as the Rector is elected by the University's students, and since one lay member is also a student of the University, it is arguable that we do not in fact have a lay majority that is '*both external and independent*'. As Appendix 1 shows, the other 'ancient' Scottish universities, whose constitutional arrangements are similar to Glasgow's, have a clear lay majority on their governing bodies; at Aberdeen, the balance is 16:11, at Edinburgh 14:8, and at St Andrews 14:9. The Working Group strongly supported the need to increase the proportion of external

members, recognising the value of securing a strong skills mix. With only 5 Co-opted places currently available, vacancies for which are advertised widely, limited opportunities exist to select members with skills and experience relevant to the University.

.2 *Expectations of Lay members*

Lay members are non-remunerated and some are in active employment, but the University places a large workload on this group. This arises from participation on Court and its committees, and on University panels and tribunals. A larger pool of lay members would help spread this burden and would facilitate succession planning. At present the University relies too heavily on the commitment and expertise of a small number of lay members.

.3 *General Council Assessors and Co-opted members*

Our ordinances require that, in the event of more than one nomination being received to a vacant position, a General Council Assessor will be elected by the 120,000 graduates whose addresses the University holds. An election of this sort would be extravagant and there is therefore a tendency, when a vacancy occurs, for informal approaches to be taken to arrive at a single nomination. By contrast, vacancies of Co-opted members are advertised openly, and a selection process operated through the Nominations Committee. When these posts have been advertised in recent times, many of the applicants have been graduates of the University, and the Nominations Committee has been able to recommend appointments from a strong field, and having regard to the skillsets that would be most valuable to Court. Currently, Glasgow has 5 General Council Assessors and 5 Co-opted members. Aberdeen, Edinburgh and St Andrews have, respectively, 4, 3 and 2 General Council members, and each appoints up to 8 Co-opted members.

.4 *Senate Assessors*

Glasgow currently has 7 Senate Assessors (Aberdeen has 6, Edinburgh 4, St Andrews 4). Bearing in mind the need to ensure a clear lay majority on Court, this number might be revisited (the alternative approach to strengthening the lay majority would be to increase the size of a body that already has 25 members: the Working Group did not support such a move). A reduction in Senate Assessor members would help address the lay majority concern, and could also help match Senate representation more closely to the University's new academic structure. The Working Group also considered the duties Senate Assessors are expected to perform: as well as contributing to the University's governance through participation on Court and its committees, Senate Assessors at Glasgow have come to fulfil a substantial HR Management function. It was acknowledged that several Senate Assessors have found this burdensome; it may also have discouraged members of academic staff who would otherwise have sought nomination to membership of Court.

.5 *Attendance of executive managers*

Court has just one executive member, the Principal, but it benefits from the advice of senior academic and professional managers whose input is often essential if Court is to perform its role in an informed way. Under the former University structure, Vice-Principals attended Court, but Deans of Faculties (of whom there were 9) did not. The Group was supportive of the four Heads of College (who also have the status of Vice-Principals and are responsible for major budgets) attending Court meetings.

.6 'Assessors'

The term 'Assessor' comes from the Universities Scotland Act 1966 and is now rather dated. The Group was supportive of it being replaced by a more modern equivalent; 'Member' or 'Representative'.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE

The Working Group **recommends:**

.1 that the *membership of Court should be revisited*, such as to:

- *increase the number of Co-opted Members from 5 to 11;*
- *reduce the number of General Council Assessors from 5 to 2; and*
reduce the number of Senate Assessors from 7 to 4.

(the above recommendation was unanimous, with the exception of one member of the group who would have preferred 5 Senate Assessors and 10 Co-opted Members)

.2 that the role of **Senate Assessor should no longer carry a portfolio of HR management responsibilities.**

.3 that all **Vice-Principals, including Heads of College, **should be invited to attend meetings of Court**, allowing Court to communicate more directly with senior executives. It is recognised that there may on occasion be a need for the agenda to include items of reserved business, which would be discussed by Court members only.**

.4 that **positions on Court should be re-styled as follows:**

- ~~General Council Assessor~~ General Council Member
- ~~Senate Assessor~~ Senate Member
- ~~SRC Assessor~~ SRC Member
- ~~Chancellor's Assessor~~ Chancellor's representative

It should be noted that changes to Court membership require consultation with Senate and the General Council, thereafter the Privy Council must approve changes to the ordinance.

University of Glasgow

STANDING ORDERS FOR COURT AND COURT COMMITTEES

- 1 The quorum for Court shall be seven (as determined by the Universities (Scotland) Act 1889) and for its committees shall be one third of members.
- 2 ~~The lay Court members shall elect a~~On the occurrence of a vacancy, a senior lay member ('the Convener') shall be appointed following an open recruitment process, approximately a year ahead of the vacancy occurring. The Convener shall undergo an annual appraisal involving a consultation with all members of Court from among their number.
- 3 The Rector shall be the Ordinary President of the Court and shall chair such parts of the Court meetings as the Court may from time to time decide.
- 4 The Convener shall chair those parts of the Court meetings not chaired by the Rector, and shall undertake all the other responsibilities expected of a chairman.
- 5 If a vote is necessary, the motion will be passed if a majority of those present vote in favour of it, provided that the meeting is quorate. The person chairing the meeting shall have a deliberative and a casting vote.
- 6 The Court shall commission an effectiveness review of its operation every 3 years, alternating between light touch and extensive in scope, always with the assistance of an external facilitator, who shall be different on each occasion.
- 7 The Court shall review the remits and membership of all its Committees ~~every three years~~ annually.
- ~~7—The Court shall review the membership of its Committees annually.~~
- 8 With the exception of ex-officio members:
 - members should normally be appointed to Committees for terms of four years;
 - no member of a Committee should normally serve for more than two terms consecutively;
 - a Committee shall have the right to remove as a member of the Committee persons who do not attend meetings on a regular basis (less than 60% attendance), provided that the person whose membership is proposed for termination shall have the right to be heard in his/her own defence by the Committee.
- 9 The Nominations Committee shall recommend to Court individuals to be co-opted on to Court; it may also recommend other individuals for Court to appoint as members of its Committees. Committees may, subject to Court approval, co-opt individuals with specific expertise as members in order to deal with specialist items of business. Nominations Committee will promote equality and diversity considerations in its recruitment activities for Court and its committees.
- 10 If a Committee establishes a working group, it should clearly define its remit and the timescale within which it should work. The working group should be wound up when its function has been fulfilled.

- 11 Court has given authority to the Conveners of Committees to take urgent action on behalf of their Committees, when necessary, between meetings. If such delegated authority is exercised, the nature of and reason for the action should be reported to the next meeting of the committee.
- 12 Court has given authority to the Secretary of Court to act on its behalf between meetings on matters of routine business. The Secretary of Court shall be answerable to Court for any action which he/she takes on its behalf and a written report shall be made to the next meeting of Court detailing any such action taken for endorsement by Court.
- 13 – Court has given authority to the Convener, the Principal and the Secretary of Court to act together on behalf of Court between meetings on matters of other than routine business. These persons shall be answerable to Court for any action they take on its behalf and a written report shall be made to the next meeting of Court detailing any such action taken for endorsement by Court.
- 14 Committees should determine and publicise at the start of an academic year their schedule of meetings; thereafter changes to dates/times should be kept to a minimum.
- 15 The agenda and papers for meetings of Court and its Committees should normally be circulated not less than 7 days in advance of the meeting. ~~Where Court must consider a particularly lengthy paper, this should be circulated at an earlier date wherever possible. Papers for Court will focus on key issues requiring Court's consideration and, where applicable, will be accompanied by a summary; if necessary, background papers will be made available on-line for reference.~~ Papers should only be tabled in exceptional circumstances.
- 16 If Court believes there may be good reason to remove an individual from membership of Court, it shall delegate the matter to the Nominations Committee, which shall consider the case, hear the member's defence and make a recommendation to Court. Criteria for removal from membership of Court shall include persistent absenteeism, medical incapacity, legal impediment and breaches of the Code of Conduct for Members of Court. (Appendix A).
- 17 Should Court members have concerns about the way Court is operating, they should in the first place raise these concerns with the Convener. The Senior Senate Assessor and the Chancellor's Assessor have joint responsibility for receiving any concern felt by a Court member about the conduct of Court business, where the member does not wish to raise this directly with the Convener, for identifying any concerns among Court members about the conduct of Court business, and for raising these with the Convener.
- 18 Court shall hold 5 regular meetings plus one Strategy Day and one Induction Day in each academic year and, if business requires it, a special meeting may be called from time to time. In addition, briefing sessions may be arranged on matters of importance. Appendix B is a schedule of meetings of Court and of its Committees in 2013/14.
- 19 Court members are encouraged to consider attendance at suitable training events, which will be brought to members' attention by the Court Office ~~on an annual basis~~. Court members are also encouraged to observe committees where they would be interested in knowing what business the committees discuss and how the meetings are conducted.

October 2013

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF COURT

This Code of Conduct applies equally to all members of Court. The Court endorses the seven principles of public life as defined by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (see following page). In practical terms, these principles require that the Court and its members should observe the highest standards of integrity, objectivity and honesty in the transaction of all its business.

Members of Court should:-

- make all reasonable efforts to attend every meeting of Court. In the event of unavoidable absence, a member should inform the Secretary of Court prior to the meeting;
- read the papers to be considered by Court (normally circulated to members on the Tuesday prior to each meeting), consider their contents and seek any additional information or necessary clarification from the Secretary of Court, the convener of the committee concerned or the author of the paper;
- ensure, through the Chairperson, that their views relevant to an item under discussion are heard by Court;
- always bear in mind the best interests of the University;
- declare any personal or business interests which may conflict with their responsibilities to the University; leave the meeting and not participate in the decision-making process if there is a conflict of interest;
- participate in ensuring that discussions are held and decisions taken in an honest, open and objective manner and that taking sectional positions is avoided;
- when a consensus decision cannot be reached, vote objectively and dispassionately. If a member votes against a motion which is carried by the majority of those present, he/she should subsequently support the decision or, exceptionally, ask that his/her dissent is recorded. In extreme circumstances, for example if the matter is felt to be one of conscience or principle, a member may resign from the Court; and
- bring the same qualities of honesty, openness and objectivity to any work they have agreed to undertake on Court Committees or on working parties established by Court.

SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC LIFE

Selflessness

Holders of public office should take decisions solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends.

Integrity

Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might influence them in the performance of their official duties.

Objectivity

In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.

Openness

Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

Honesty

Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.

Leadership

Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

These principles were set out by the Committee on Standards in Public Life

Schedule of Meetings of Court and its Committees 2013/2014

Court

Wednesday 9 October 2013
Wednesday 11 December 2013
Wednesday 12 February 2014
Wednesday 16 April 2014
Wednesday 25 June 2014

Audit Committee

Monday 16 September 2013
Tuesday 5 November 2013
Monday 17 February 2014
Tuesday 10 May 2014

Estates Committee

Monday 2 September 2013
Monday 4 November 2013
Monday 6 January 2014
Monday 17 March 2014
Monday 19 May 2014

Finance Committee

Wednesday 4 September 2013
Wednesday 13 November 2013
Wednesday 15 January 2014
Wednesday 26 March 2014
Wednesday 28 May 2014

Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Friday 20 September 2013
Thursday 12 December 2013
Wednesday 5 March 2014
Wednesday 28 May 2014

Human Resources Committee

Monday 16 September 2013
Friday 22 November 2013
Tuesday 21 January 2014
Tuesday 25 March 2014
Tuesday 3 June 2014

Nominations Committee

To meet as required

Remuneration Committee

To meet as required

University of Glasgow

STATEMENT OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

The primary responsibilities of the University Court, as the governing body of the University, are:

General

To be satisfied that appropriate mechanisms are in place:

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

Strategic Planning

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

Exercise of Controls

13. to make clear and to review regularly the executive authority and other powers delegated to the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, to other senior officers and to other bodies of the University including the Senate and Committees of Court, such authority and powers to be set out in a Schedule of Delegated Authorities;
14. to ensure the proper use of public funds awarded to the University, ~~and~~ observance of the terms of the Financial Memorandum between the University and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and compliance with the University's Outcome Agreement with the SFC;
15. to establish and monitor effective systems of internal control and accountability throughout the University;
16. to oversee the University's arrangements for internal and external audit and to approve the University's annual financial statements;
17. to ensure that arrangements are in place for the proper management of health and safety in respect of students, staff and other persons affected by University operations;
18. to be the University's legal authority and, as such, to ensure that systems are in place for meeting all the University's legal obligations, including those arising from contracts and other legal commitments made in the University's name.

Effectiveness and Transparency

19. to ensure, through the appointment of co-opted lay persons in accordance with the Statutes, and through liaison with the University's General Council with regard to its Assessors, a balance of skills and experience amongst the membership of the Court sufficient to meet its primary responsibilities;
20. to ensure that the proceedings of the Court are conducted in accordance with best practice in higher education corporate governance and with the principles of public life drawn up by the Committee on Standards in Public Life;
21. to ensure that procedures are in place in the University for dealing with internal grievances, conflicts of interest and public interest disclosure;
22. to monitor its own performance and that of its Committees, with a formal evaluation of effectiveness undertaken not less than every five years.

Adopted by the University Court: ~~18 April 2007~~ October 2013

ANNUAL SCHEDULE OF COURT BUSINESS

- (September/October)*
- October**
- *Strategy Discussion Day)*
 - Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
 - Report on any action taken under delegated powers over summer
 - Report on Strategy Discussion Day
 - Standing Orders, Code of Conduct, Committee remits and dates
 - Statement of Primary Responsibilities
 - Scheme of Delegated Authorities
 - Schedule of Court business for forthcoming year
 - Report on previous year's attendance of Court and Committees
 - Learning & Teaching update and KPIs from Vice Principal
 - Glasgow International College update from Vice Principal
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
 - Nominations Committee recommendations for forthcoming year
 - Annual report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review of Teaching Quality (ELIR)
 - Honorary Degree nominations
- (November)*
- December**
- *(Half day briefing on Governance/Funding/HE Policy)(if required)*
 - Report from Head of University Services (pre-Court briefing)
 - Audited Accounts/Financial Statements for previous year (including subsidiaries' financial statements and GU Trust statements)
 - Report on Investments (Finance Committee)
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
 - Audit Committee annual report
 - Human Resources KPIs
- February**
- Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
 - SRC annual report
 - Draft Outcome Agreement for next year from Vice Principal
 - Finance KPIs
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
- April**
- Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
 - Research update and KPIs from Vice Principal
 - SFC Main Grant Allocations for forthcoming year
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
- (May/June)*
- June**
- *(Half day briefing on University Finances)*
 - Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
 - Strategic Plan (annual update) including KPIs
 - Capital Programme (annual update for approval)
 - Budget Overview for forthcoming year/Financial Forecasts
 - Report on Investments (Finance Committee)
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
 - Estates KPIs



Court - Wednesday 9 October 2013

Report from Finance Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Finance Committee held on Wednesday 4 September 2013 are attached. There are no specific matters requiring Court's approval or decision. Court's attention is drawn to the following items:

UGPS Additional Pension Contribution

Finance Committee agreed the discontinuation of the recent annual additional payments to the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme. A revised deficit recovery plan will be discussed with the Pension Scheme Trustees and the Pensions Regulator, informed by the triennial valuation currently being prepared.

Steam Main

Finance Committee has approved a capital expenditure application for £15.9M for immediate replacement of the current steam system for the provision of heating and hot water. The option approved will open up a further opportunity to add a combined heating and power (CHP) installation to generate electricity whilst reclaiming heat to provide hot water as the heating medium for the new system, and improve the University's position on carbon reduction, while also allowing future links to the Western Infirmary site.

Treasury Policy

Finance Committee reviewed and agreed a change to part of the Treasury Policy as it relates to the investment of cash balances, which could previously be invested in temporary cash deposits for a maximum of three months per deposit. A number of banks offer higher interest rates for cash deposits if deposits are held for 95 days, and the Committee agreed that three months could be defined as 95 days.

EEIG Proposal: Evimalar project

Finance Committee approved a proposal to establish a European Economic Interest Group (EEIG), an unincorporated association created by Council Regulation of the European Community, as an independent legal entity recognised in all EU jurisdictions. The University is the lead participant in the European Virtual Institute of Malaria Research (Evimalar) Network of Excellence, funded by the European Commission. A key condition of this funding is a commitment to the European Commission to the formation of a representative legal entity which will assume certain management and administrative functions of the Evimalar Network.

The Committee considered the main features of an EEIG and the risks which should be considered in establishing such a vehicle. The MVLS Dean of Research will have

oversight of the project and that the allocation of funding will be controlled by the contractual arrangements in place among the partners. The role of the EEIG will be to provide a structure to facilitate the administration of the network. It will not receive grant funding in its name or directly employ staff.

Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2013

A summary is attached as **Annex 1**. The University achieved an operating management surplus of £12m, which was £5.5m ahead of budget. The movements which contributed to the improved surplus included tuition fees at £2.8m ahead of budget and salary savings of £3.9m.

Debtors Report as at 31 July 2013

Debt stood at £23m, representing a decrease on year-on-year comparisons from £27m at July 2012. There was a reduction in both student and sponsor debt, as well as commercial debt.

University of Glasgow
Finance Committee
Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 4 September 2013
in Principal's Meeting Room, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:

Mr Peter Daniels, Mr Robert Fraser, Mr Nick Holland, Ms Jessica McGrellis, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Prof Duncan Ross, Mr Iain Stewart (acting Convenor)

In attendance:

Mrs Ann Allen, Prof Neal Juster, Mr David Newall, Ms Fiona Quinn

Mr David Ross joined the meeting via teleconference

Apologies:

Mr Ken Brown, Prof Miles Padgett, Mr Kevin Sweeney, Ms Carolyn Timar

The Convenor welcomed Mr Nick Holland, Group Financial Controller; Ms Jessica McGrellis, SRC President; Ms Fiona Quinn, Clerk; and Prof Duncan Ross, Senate Assessor to their first meeting of Finance Committee.

CA/2013/01. Minutes of the meetings held on Monday 3 June 2013

The minutes of Finance Committee and of the joint meeting of the Estates and Finance Committees held on Monday 3 June 2013 were approved.

CA/2013/02. Matters arising

CA/2013/02.1 South Glasgow Hospital Learning and Teaching Facility (CA/2012/49)

The Secretary of Court confirmed that the outstanding issues highlighted at the previous meeting had been resolved.

Finance Committee confirmed its approval of the application.

CA/2013/03. Conflicts of Interest

The Committee noted that Mr Newall and Prof Juster were trustees of the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme.

CA/2013/04. UGPS Additional Pension Contribution (paper 5.1)

Finance Committee received a paper requesting approval for the discontinuation of the recent annual additional payments to the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme (UGPS). From 2009–2012, annual payments of £850k had been agreed in order to reduce the deficit in the fund. It was noted that a new triennial valuation effective April 2013 was being prepared by the Scheme actuary. This would reveal the size of the current deficit as at 1 April 2013 and a revised recovery plan would then be discussed with the Pension Scheme Trustees and the Pensions Regulator.

Finance Committee agreed that no additional payment should be made given that the funding of the scheme would be changing.

CA/2013/05. Endowments Change of Use (paper 5.2)

The University had received approval from the Privy Council to change the use of dormant endowments so as to bring them into use. In practice, this had involved an annual internal review of endowment funds which had lain dormant for five years or more, with Court being asked to approve their being used in future to support scholarships. Finance Committee was invited to approve the transfer of one endowment totalling £7,934 in capital to the Postgraduate Scholarship Fund, the revenue from which is used to provide scholarships and bursaries to postgraduate taught and research students. This supports the University's strategy of expanding postgraduate numbers, which is a major element of both the funding body's criteria and various league table measurements. It was confirmed that the endowment had not been utilised for five years and the relevant School or College had approved the transfer of the endowment to the general Postgraduate Scholarship Fund. It was noted that endowments which had lain dormant for four years were flagged to the relevant School or College in order to allow them time to consider suitable uses for the funds before they were incorporated into the Postgraduate Scholarship Fund. The committee also noted that endowments would not be transferred if there was a reasonable judgement that they could be used in future.

The Director of Finance would check which School or College the endowment was attached to and report back to the Committee.

Finance Committee approved the change of use.

CA/2013/06. Fire Refuge Areas (paper 5.3(i))

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for £750k for adaptations designed to ensure safe egress for disabled persons from University buildings in emergency situations. It was noted that the project was concerned with forming refuge areas, installation of signage and installation of wireless Emergency Voice Communications equipment. The work was required in order to allow the University to comply with Statutory Requirements contained within the Fire Scotland Act (2005).

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2013/07. Main Building Bell Tower and Spire (paper 5.3(ii))

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for £820k for stonework repairs to the fabric of the Main Building bell tower and spire, major repair works to the cast iron spire access stair and rot repair works to the bell tower flat roof.

The Committee agreed that the works were clearly necessary and noted that care would be taken with the programming of the works to avoid having unsightly scaffolding covering the tower during the Commonwealth Games.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2013/08. Steam Main (paper 5.3(iii))

The Director of Estates and Buildings presented a capital expenditure application for £15.9M for immediate replacement of the current steam system for the provision of heating and hot water with a new Low Temperature Hot Water (LTHW) system. The application outlined 6 options for taking forward the replacement of the steam main. Option 6 was recommended as this would open up a further opportunity to add a combined heating and power (CHP) installation to generate electricity whilst reclaiming heat to provide hot water as the heating medium for the new LTHW system and improve the University's position on carbon reduction.

The Committee noted that the recommended option would achieve full carbon savings and would future proof the scheme to link to the Western Infirmary site, and open up the potential to link with a future Sustainable Glasgow larger heating network.

The Committee noted that the current system is not fit for purpose and the University is currently running a major risk in the potential failure of the steam main.

Finance Committee approved the application, specifically option 6.

CA/2013/09. Treasury Policy Confirmation (paper 5.4)

Finance Committee was invited to review a paper considering an extract of Treasury Policy as it relates to the investment of cash balances. The Policy states that “The non endowment cash balances of the University can be invested in temporary cash deposits with the major UK clearing banks, building societies and UK registered money market funds up to a maximum of thirty five million pounds with any one institution ... **This is for a maximum of three months per deposit.**” A number of banks offer higher interest rates for cash deposits if deposits are held for 95 days, and the Committee were asked to confirm that three months could be defined as 95 days.

The committee approved the proposal, noting that this amounted to a change in policy.

It was noted that a future review of treasury policy may be desirable. The Director of Finance confirmed that a report would be brought forward to Audit Committee with recommendations for a more detailed policy.

CA/2013/10. EEIG Proposal: Evimalar project (paper 5.5)

The Committee received a paper proposing the establishment of a European Economic Interest Group (EEIG).

The University of Glasgow is the lead participant in the European Virtual Institute of Malaria Research (Evimalar) Network of Excellence, funded by the European Commission. A key condition of this funding was a commitment to the European Commission to the formation of a representative legal entity which will assume certain management and administrative functions of the Evimalar Network.

The options to discharge this obligation were considered by the University (as lead applicant) and 22 of the current network member institutions. The preference of that review was the establishment of a European Economic Interest Group (EEIG). An EEIG is an unincorporated association created by Council Regulation of the European Community. It is an independent legal entity and is recognised in all EU jurisdictions.

The Committee considered the main features of an EEIG and the risks which should be considered in establishing such a vehicle, and reviewed other options available to discharge the commitment made to the European Commission. The significant disadvantage of an EEIG is the joint and several unlimited liability of all of its members. However, in order to mitigate this risk, the Committee noted that the proposed EEIG would **not** receive grant funding in its name or directly employ staff. Any grant funding awarded under the banner of the EEIG would contractually be awarded to one of the member institutions and funding would be allocated to partners under the processes normally used for collaborative grant arrangements.

The Director of Finance assured the Committee that the MVLS Dean of Research would have oversight of the project and that the allocation of funding would be controlled by the contractual arrangements in place among the partners. The role of the EEIG would be merely to provide a structure to facilitate the administration of the network.

Finance Committee approved the proposal.

CA/2013/11. Finance Committee Remit (paper 5.6)

Finance Committee was informed that each Court committee is required formally to review and approve the committee's remit annually. Finance Committee approved the remit without amendment.

CA/2013/12. Insurance Renewal 2013/14 (paper 6.1)

The Committee received a report on insurance activity including a note of the premium costs for the coming year. Most of the University's main policies (e.g. Property, Employers Liability, and Public Liability) were put out to tender last year and Long Term Agreements (LTAs) subsequently entered into with the successful insurers. Therefore the 2013/14 renewal was primarily concerned with providing the insurers with up-to-date information and the insurers using this data to calculate the premiums for the new year using the existing rates. The University's brokers sought the best deals from the market for those remaining policies that were not subject to an existing LTA. As many of the policies are within an LTA, the ratings applied by the insurers have remained unchanged. The increases in premiums have therefore been due to an increase in the level of business activity.

The total premium costs for 2013/14 were £1.43m, an increase of almost £69k.

The brokers' fee (which is negotiated later in September) had still to be included in this total however the estimated cost for the year was comfortably within the insurance budget for 2013/14. The Committee noted that, as always, the final position against budget would depend on the incidence of uninsured losses occurring throughout the year.

It was noted that the Property premium had risen by £15k (+4.34%) primarily as a result of the purchase of the remainder of the Western Infirmary site which added some £82M to the University's property schedule.

The Committee noted the 14 outstanding insurance claims which had been made against the University including 12 in relation to employment and 2 in respect of injury to third parties.

CA/2013/13. Endowment Investment Reports (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee noted the endowment investment reports.

CA/2013/14. Minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee 10 May 2013 (paper 6.3(i))

Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee from 10 May 2013.

CA/2013/15. Minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee 13 June 2013 (paper 6.3(ii))

Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee from 13 June 2013. The Committee noted that pressure would be maintained to aim to deliver growth of capital in real terms, and that the IAC would continue to review performance.

CA/2013/16. Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2013

The Director of Finance provided a verbal report on the overview of performance to 31 July 2013. The Committee noted that the University achieved an operating management surplus of £12m which was £5.5m ahead of budget. The movements which contributed to the improved surplus included tuition fees at £2.8m ahead of budget and salary savings of £3.9m. There was movement of £1m in the surplus from P11, relating largely to decreased research contribution (£0.3m) and increased commercial contribution (£1.3m). The Committee noted that the £12m management accounting surplus equated to a statutory accounting surplus of circa £11.4m after adjusting for pensions, endowments and contribution from subsidiaries.

At year end the University had £149.3m cash in bank which was £9.3m higher than the full year outlook, primarily due to the timing of payments and receipts.

CA/2013/17. Debtors Report as at 31 July 2013 (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 July 2013. The Director of Finance reported that total debt stood at £23m representing a decrease on year-on-year comparisons from £27m at July 2012.

The level of student and sponsor debt was significantly lower in July 2013 (£3.7m) than July 2012 (£5.9m). It was noted that significant progress had been made in collecting student and sponsor debt and that the introduction of a more structured approach to collection had been beneficial.

The Committee noted a reduction year-on-year in overall commercial debt (£17.1m as compared to £19.4m in 2012). There had been a substantial improvement with regard to aged debt, with only £300k older than 90 days.

The Veterinary and Small Animal Hospital debt balance increased to £1.49m at July 2013 with 84% of total debts (£1.24m) insured. In an attempt to improve performance in relation to amounts outstanding over 60 days, the Head of School had implemented a new policy requiring non-insured clients to settle invoices immediately.

CA/2013/18. AOB

The Senior Vice Principal noted that a paper would be circulated to the Committee for information, outlining progress with the Clinical Research Facility at South Glasgow Hospital.

CA/2013/19. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 13 November 2013, 2pm.



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday 9 October 2013

Report from Audit Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on Monday 16 September 2013 are attached for information. There are no specific matters requiring Court's approval or decision. Areas of note for Court's information are:

At the Committee's request, an analysis of all expense claims made across the University in April 2013 was provided, showing a low level of non-compliance, with many of those instances being of claims outside the normal time period. This area will be kept under review by the Committee.

An internal audit review of UK Bribery Act 2010 compliance has indicated there are some areas where improved controls are required to cover the areas that the University identified in 2011 in order to be able to demonstrate compliance with the Act. Awareness-raising will be augmented, risk assessment relating to this area will be undertaken, to include a review of agency relationships, and anti-bribery training is being developed.

An internal audit review of the partnership arrangements involving the Singapore Institute of Technology has been undertaken, concluding that the net partnership contribution is providing a good return on investment, that there are good relationships and communication links in place, and that there is overall effective operation of controls and governance arrangements.

The Committee has agreed that while risk management is well developed for major University activity such as large capital and IT projects, it is not well embedded at all levels of the institution. As such the College Risk Registers will be reviewed by the internal auditors, with a view to adding more detail.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Audit Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Monday 16 September 2013 in the Melville Room

Present:

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

In attendance:

Mr Jim Bishop (Ernst & Young), Ms Karen Campbell (Deloitte LLP), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Mr Nick Holland (Group Financial Controller), Mr Paul McGinty (Deloitte LLP), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Mrs Carolyn Timar (Financial Accountant), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk)

Apologies:

Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal)

AUDIT/2013/1. Minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 2013

The Minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2013/2. Matters Arising

.1 Pension Fund – update

Mr Fraser had previously advised the Committee that 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 had been made to Court in June with regard to the structure, since which there had been a consultation with staff, with suggested options to be considered further. Separately, the University was continuing to consider approaches to addressing the fund's deficit.

.2 IT Review - update

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

ACTION DN

.3 Expense Claims analysis

An analysis of all claims made across the University in April 2013 had been undertaken and a report on claims outwith policy provided to the Committee, showing a low level of non-compliance, with many of those instances being of claims outside the normal time period. The Committee was advised that the University community had been contacted by heads of Colleges and the head of University Services, earlier in 2013, reminding staff about the expenses policy. The area would be kept under review and the Committee would be provided with an update in 6 months.

ACTION RF/CT

.4 Risk Workshops

The format of the workshops would be discussed further once the new contract for internal audit services was in place.

AUDIT/2013/3. Internal Audit Update

The Committee noted that the number of actual days vs. budget for audit reviews was 325/400 and not 294/400 as indicated in the report. Some audits had been deferred for reasons such as University systems/processes not being fully implemented or being under review.

It was agreed that, as a general point, the update report needed to contain information on what action was being taken, and when, by management to address recommendations.

Four reviews had been completed since the last Audit Committee, with three further projects at draft report stage, and fieldwork in progress for one other.

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

Review of UK Bribery Act 2010 Compliance

Senior management had identified high risk areas where improved controls were required and had the foundations of a number of controls already implemented, but further work was required by the University to ensure there were adequate procedures in place, to progress the actions identified and to cover the six areas the University had identified in 2011 in order to be able to demonstrate compliance. The Committee noted that awareness-raising would be augmented, risk assessment relating to this area would be undertaken, to include a review of agency relationships, and that anti-bribery training was being developed. Audit Committee would be kept updated through the Secretary's regular report.

ACTION DN

Review of External Relationship Management

Although there were a number of central departments whose remits included external relationship management, overall external relationship management procedures and communication channels were dispersed across the University and the auditors considered that there was an opportunity for a more collaborative approach. Mr Newall would consider the points raised, particularly given that any potential changes would need demonstrably to add value to the University's operation, and discuss the matter further at SMG, keeping the Committee updated.

ACTION DN

Review of Joint Degree Programme Management

Overall, policies and procedures on joint degree management were available to staff, with further guidance currently being produced as the number and importance of partnerships increased, although there was an opportunity to improve the audit trail and secure storage of documentation relating to joint degrees and to further strengthen guidance regarding risk assessments, due diligence and Court approval.

Review of Partnership Arrangements - Singapore Institute of Technology

The overall outlook was positive, with the net partnership contribution providing a good return on investment. There were good relationships and communication links in place, in addition to visits to SIT by senior staff. Overall the controls and governance arrangements that existed to govern the partnership arrangements, which it was confirmed included a Board, were operating effectively.

AUDIT/2013/4. 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, 5 had been partially implemented and 16 were being progressed, 13 of which would be addressed by the rollout of the new Research Management System. 6 actions not yet commenced related to a recent audit review of Fee payments.

Departments other than the Finance Office

Mr Newall referred to key points to note from audit reports, as follows:

Audit Reports 2005-11

Business Continuity Management

Five outstanding recommendations were in this area, and were all linked to the establishment of business continuity plans, which had now been piloted with three schools.

Other outstanding recommendations

Two recommendations were in the process of being addressed through the development of Data Handling policies and training in service departments. Two, relating to the Staff Development audit, awaited new functionality on the HR/Payroll System. The final recommendation, from the Estates Maintenance audit, awaited an interface between EMIS and Agresso, which was not planned at present.

Audit reports 2011-12

Audits with Priority 2 recommendations not yet fully implemented included:

Virtual Learning (3 recommendations): work was ongoing on each of these recommendations, led by the Vice-Principal, Learning & Teaching and the Head of the Learning & Teaching Centre (L&TC). They were: Communicate to staff the archiving and back-up options available on Moodle (October 2013 implementation); Review the structure of L&TC's communication with Colleges (December 2013); and Introduce new feedback mechanism for e-learning materials (ongoing).

College Management MVLS (2 recommendations): Areas still requiring to be fully addressed were: Review of finance duties currently performed by administrative staff (date to be confirmed, with an update to be provided to the Audit Committee at its next meeting); and Review of University Consultancy Policy (planned for March 2014).

ACTION DN

Value for Money (2 recommendations): The remaining two areas were: Revised commercial pricing policy; and Development of a College Workload Model. There had been a delay in addressing the first of these because of staffing changes. Work had begun on the College Workload Model.

College Management - Science & Engineering (1 recommendation): The outstanding recommendation, which had been partially addressed, was to review the structure of support staff in the College, which was ongoing.

Application Handling (1 recommendation): Development of a Customer Relationship Management enquiry system was being led by the Director, Recruitment & International Office, with implementation planned for March 2014.

Audit reports 2012-13

Items not yet fully implemented were:

IT Security (5 recommendations): work was ongoing on each of the 5 outstanding recommendations, led by the Director of IT Services, and full implementation should be delivered for December 2013.

Student Accommodation (3 recommendations): Implementation was being led by the Director of Campus Services; two recommendations were not yet implemented, relating to a service level agreement for repair works and establishment of a Risk Register for Residential Accommodation, the latter of which involved (by December 2013) putting in place regular reporting of aged debt.

College Management Social Sciences (2 recommendations): these were partially implemented, both scheduled for full implementation by December 2013, to introduce a new system for assessing School risks and to complete a review of the College communications strategy.

Ethics Approval Process (2 recommendations): these were partially implemented, both scheduled for completion by December 2013, to introduce more robust training arrangements for staff involved in Ethical Review and to clarify the terms of reference of the College Ethics Committees on relevant web pages.

AUDIT/2013/5. Risk Management

The updated register for 2013, which included details of the senior staff who would take individual matters forward, and progress on these matters, had been provided. SMG would be considering 2 areas in detail at each of its meetings over the coming session and updates would be provided to the Audit Committee via the regular report.

The Committee agreed that while risk management was well developed for major University activity such as large capital and IT projects, it was not well embedded at all levels of the institution and required to be better formalised, with more action taken to change the culture relating to local risk management. The College Risk Registers required additional detail. This would be an ongoing action point for the internal auditors to review in discussion with College Management.

AUDIT/2013/6. Corporate Structure

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

AUDIT/2013/7. Accounting Policy Change

The change to the policy, reflecting MRC equipment donation, was noted.

AUDIT/2013/8. Allegations of Research Misconduct 2012/13

A report on two research misconduct cases from 2012/13 had been provided. The report had been brought to the Committee's attention as a Research Council requirement. The committee noted that resources were in place to investigate such matters on the rare occasions that they occurred. The report was noted.

AUDIT/2013/9. Any Other Business

The Committee noted that the peak use time for MyCampus with respect to the Direct Admissions function, whose implementation had been deferred from last year, was later in the autumn and the system was expected to run well. Not all the functionality

of the system was being used within the Colleges, however. It was agreed that the audit review of the system should remain in the audit schedule.

AUDIT/2013/10. Dates of Next Meetings

Tuesday 5 November 2013	2pm in the Melville Room (change to venue)
Monday 17 February 2014	10am in the Melville Room
Tuesday 20 May 2014	10am in the Melville Room

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



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday 9 October 2013

Report from Human Resources Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Monday 16 September 2013 are attached for information. There are no specific matters requiring Court's approval or decision.

The Committee considered an early draft of the People and Organisational Development Strategy. The associated delivery plan and Key Performance Indicators to complete the plan are currently under development. The final version of the strategy will be reviewed at the next meeting of the Committee prior to presentation to Court in December.

The Committee reviewed sickness absence trends in accordance with its regular KPI schedule and an action plan will be agreed to facilitate improvement in emerging trends. A review of University policy is planned regarding Atypical Workers/Zero Hours contractual and casualisation arrangements. The Committee received an update on the campus wide consultation exercise that has taken place over the summer months with regard to the proposed changes to the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Human Resources Committee

Minute of meeting held in the Carnegie Room on 16 September 2013

Present: Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), Mrs A Allen (AAL), Mrs Christine Barr (CB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Mrs H Durndell (HD), Professor C Forde (CF), Professor N Jonsson (NJ), Mr A Macfarlane (AMcF), Mr D Newall (DN), Dr D Spaeth (DS), Mr G Scott (GS) (Secretary).

In attendance: Mr S Wilkie (SW) (for item 06), Mrs A Hastings (AH) (for item 7).

Apologies: The Principal (AM), Professor A Anderson (AA), Mr S McCafferty (SMcC).

HR/13/01 Introduction

DA opened the meeting and welcomed Professor Nick Jonsson to his first HR Committee and Mrs Christine Barr in her role as Acting Director of Human Resources. DA noted that Mr Ian Black had retired since the last meeting and wished him a long and happy retirement on behalf of the Committee. He also noted thanks to Dr Alan Owen for his contribution to the Committee as a Senate Assessor.

HR/13/02 Minute of the previous meeting

The minute of the previous meeting held on the 29 May 2013 was agreed.

HR/13/03 Matters arising

Sickness Absence:- CB provided a brief overview of the detailed sickness absence statistics that had been provided following the previous HR Committee. There was discussion of the analysis and it was noted that the high proportion of long term sickness absence was in part due to under reporting of short term absences in particular in relation to research and teaching staff. This reflected trends across the sector. It was agreed that the next time absence was reported to the Committee it would be helpful to have a further breakdown of the reasons for absence.

CB confirmed that absence statistics would be provided on a College basis and would be discussed at one of the regular HR manager meetings. CB agree that an action plan would be developed to look at improving the recording of sickness absence and consideration would be given to support mechanisms for staff with mental health related absence as this accounted for 17% of the total absence recorded.

Action: CB

HR/13/04 Acting HR Director's Report

CB gave an overview of her Acting HR Director's report and highlighted a number of areas. Formal notification of strike ballot had been received from UCU and Unison in relation to the proposed pay award. UCU will also be balloting on action short of a strike. Unite had not yet decided whether or not to ballot.

CB reported that there had been significant press coverage on casualisation and the use of zero hour's contracts and that the University had received a number of related freedom of information requests. CB advised that the University had a policy in place relating to the use of zero hour contracts and atypical workers and

that the University had agreed to work with the Unions to review application of this policy.

CB advised that a number of roadshow events had been held as part of the consultation process with staff regarding changes to the University of Glasgow Pension Scheme. The reaction of staff had been mixed with some nervous about the changes. CB advised that payroll had been doing a lot to explain the implications of the proposed changes to staff to alleviate fears and they had also developed a frequently asked questions section on the website.

The changes to the pension scheme are due to take effect in April 2014. As part of the consultation process the University has been asked to consider as an alternative the implication of maintaining the current contribution levels with reduced benefits. CB clarified that if changes were made to the proposals as a result of the consultation process these would go back to Court for approval. It was agreed that a general pensions overview would be organised for a future HR Committee.

Action: GS

CB outlined that the overall gender pay gap was 25.7% when pay was compared across all grades. The gap is in part due to occupational segregation. The University has large numbers of part time cleaners at grade one that tend to be female and a higher proportion of male Professors. CB highlighted that it was important to note that within grades the gap was less than 3% except for the Professorial staff group. There was discussion regarding the overall gender pay gap and it was noted that this was a sector wide issue. AAL noted that where Universities have outsourced cleaning services the gap would be less pronounced and it was important to be aware of this when comparing with other Universities. CB agreed to provide a gender pay analysis by grade to the next Committee.

Action: CB

HR/13/05 People and Organisational Development Strategy

CB provided a brief overview of the draft People and Organisational Development Strategy, outlining the key themes and explaining the link to the University Strategy. She explained that the draft strategy had been discussed at the Senior Management Group and the Joint Union Consultative Committee. An action plan and KPI's were currently being developed and these would be brought to a future Committee. Comments on the draft were welcomed from the HR Committee

There was discussion of the draft strategy and there was broad support from the Committee. CF welcomed the inclusion of succession planning and leadership. AAL noted the importance of the staff engagement theme and linking this strategy with the estates strategy to facilitate cultural transformation. DS highlighted the importance of staff development and CB reassured him that this was embedded within the strategy. NJ observed that there were limited actions for retention in the section on attracting and retaining staff. GS explained that many of the elements that related to retention were included under other themes such as pay and reward. DN highlighted the importance of senior management ownership of the action plan to ensure success.

DA thanked the Committee for their comments and noted that it was important that Court should have the opportunity to discuss and approve the final version of the Strategy. It was agreed that the Strategy incorporating the action plan and KPI's would be considered at the next HR Committee. This would subsequently go to Court.

Action: CB

HR/13/06 OD Framework

SM gave a presentation providing an update on progress with the implementation of the Organisational Development Framework since HR Committee were last updated in September 2012. He outlined the themes within the framework, progress to date and future plans for the next year. There was discussion regarding the extent of coverage of the framework and the resources to deliver it. DN noted that there would be a need to demonstrate added value as a result of investment made into the programme. CB clarified that the OD framework had been integrated into the wider People and Organisational Development Strategy. DN advised that further action was to be taken in relation to organisational development support for the Senior Management Group and agreed to raise this with the Principal

Action: DN

HR/13/07 HR Payroll Project

AH provided an update on progress with the implementation of the HR payroll system. She highlighted that recent problems with an upgrade had resulted in Core reviewing its approach to software releases. The new approach would result in a delay to the implementation of the second phase of the project. The HR Committee noted the change to the implementation timescales.

HR/13/08 Any other business

There was no other business raised.

HR/13/09 Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the HR Committee will take place on Friday 22 November 2013 at 10am in Room 251, main building.



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday 9 October 2013

Report from Estates Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Estates Committee held on Monday 2 September 2013 are attached.

Court's attention is drawn to the following items for noting:

Estates Committee approved the Steam Main Replacement Project in the sum of £15.9m

Estates Committee approved CapEx applications in respect of: Repair works to the University Bell Tower and Spire, £820k; and Fire Management Works, £750k.

Tenders have been returned for the GUU/Stevenson Project in excess of the approved budget. The matter is being reviewed.

UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW
Estates Committee
Minute of the meeting held in the Estates and Buildings Conference Room on
Monday 2 September 2013

Present:

Mrs A Allen, Mr P Daniels (Convener), Mr R Fraser, Dr M Freel, Dr S Inch, Professor N Juster, Professor K Lury, Ms Jess McGrellis, Mr D Milloy, Ms M Morton, Professor A Muscatelli, Mr D Newall

In Attendance:

Mrs L Duncan, Mr R Kilpatrick, Mr J Stevenson (Observer), Mr S Sutton

Apologies:

No apologies were received.

EC/2013/1 Minute of the meeting held on 20 May 2013

The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

EC/2013/2 Matters Arising

EC/2013/2.1 Chemistry Laboratories, Joseph Black Building (EC/2012/26.1 refers)

The Committee noted that a user group comprising of Estates and Buildings and user representatives had been established. A draft Chemistry Strategy was being finalised within the College and would be provided to Estates and Buildings in due course. It was agreed that a further update be provided to the next scheduled Committee meeting.

EC/2013/2.2 GLaSS (EC/2012/26.2 refers)

The Committee noted that the new Architect had concluded their due diligence processes and that a new Mechanical Engineer had been appointed. The Design Team had also concluded its full due diligence process and the Stage E report was being prepared.

EC/2013/3 Strategies and Performance

EC/2013/3.1 Estates Strategy Progress Report

The Committee noted the update report and its appendices.

It noted that there had originally been six work streams but that as the project has developed this had increased to eleven: Vision; Consultation and Communication; Development Framework; Constraints, Site Investigations and Infrastructure; Organisational Space Types and Styles; Asset Strategy; Funding and Costs; Western Infirmary Transfer and Future Management; College Plans and Demands; Business Case; Delivery and Implementation Plans.

The Committee noted that Stage 2 consultation was scheduled to start in late September 2013 and that this would focus on the feedback received during Stage 1.

The Committee agreed that a half day detailed briefing would be beneficial for members.

Noted.

EC/2013/4 Projects

EC/2013/4.1 Kelvin Hall Update

The Committee noted that the outcome of the HLF submission was expected by 20 September 2013 with a consequent expectation that tenders would be issued in October 2013.

Legal negotiations were ongoing and it was anticipated that these would be concluded within six weeks with a full report being provided to Estates Committee on the full terms agreed.

EC/2013/4.2 Steam Main Replacement

The Committee noted that the original CHP proposal had been developed as part of a bid for SFC funding and that this had been unsuccessful. It agreed however that a further approach could be made in line with the revised proposal.

The Committee noted the risks outlined in the paper: costs were based on current prices; modelling information had been based on assumed heat load profiles; costs assume new heat mains can be run under the public highway; carbon savings were based on Carbon Trust carbon factors for natural gas and grid electricity; assumption that there are no additional costs for diversion of existing services, archaeological finds and north site building heating plant rooms; and receipt of local authority Planning Permission for demolition of the existing chimney and installation of a replacement.

The Committee considered the case presented and approved: the immediate replacement of the current steam system with a new Low Temperature Hot Water (LTHW) system; that Estates and Buildings explore the opportunity to add a combined heating and power (CHP) installation to generate electricity to provide hot water as the heating medium for the new LTHW system and improve the University's carbon position; the extension of the scope of the district heating network across the entire Gilmorehill Campus including some initial capacity for the acquired Western Infirmary site; and proceeding with option 6 as detailed in the report in the sum of £15.9m over two years.

The Committee agreed that a comprehensive communications campaign would be critical in advance of the commencement of works to ensure the University community and our residential and commercial neighbours had a full awareness and understanding of the need for the project and the eventual benefits to University life and the environmental benefit.

EC/2013/4.3 Proposed Lease of Premises at 200 Renfield Street, Glasgow

Estates Committee noted that The Social and Public Health Services Unit (SPHSU) were part of the Medical Research Council (MRC) and had leased University premises at 4 – 7 Lilybank Gardens for over 20 years although MRC considered this space to be unsuitable and there was a requirement to relocate the unit for the short to medium term with costs being met by MRC until 2020.

Following analysis suitable premises had been identified at 200 Renfield Street, Glasgow.

The Committee approved the proposal and authorised the Secretary of Court, after consultation with the Convener, to enter into a lease of premises for SPHSU once acceptable terms had been negotiated.

EC/2013/4.5 CapEx Applications

EC/2013/4.5.1 Gilbert Scott Building Bell Tower and Spire Repairs

Estates Committee noted the University's statutory obligation to maintain its Grade A listed buildings in good order and Estates and Buildings concern about the current poor condition of the Bell Tower and Spire.

It noted that there was evidence of deterioration of existing stonework with open joints visible and spalling, significant corrosion to the wrought iron spire staircase and wet rot to structural timber of the Bell Tower roof.

The Committee approved the CapEx application for full repairs in the sum of £820k, subject to careful programme planning to avoid scaffolding being in place during the 2014 Commonwealth Games.

EC/2013/4.5.2 Fire Refuge Areas

The Committee noted that works were required to ensure the University's compliance with the statutory requirements of the Fire Scotland Act (2005). It therefore approved the CapEx application in the sum of £750k for the purposes of undertaking fire management and risk improvement and alteration works to form refuge areas, installation of signage and installation of wireless Emergency Voice Communications equipment.

EC/2013/4.6 Approved Projects Status (RAG)

The Committee noted the Approved Projects Status and exception reports:

CP11/433 CP09/305 - GUU/Stevenson

Five tenders had been received with prices ranging within £500k of each other. It was noted however that all tenders were in excess of the approved construction budget of circa £7.4m by approximately £2.1m. Cost consultants, Gardiner & Theobald had undertaken a tender analysis and indicated most of the cost issues sit within the mechanical & electrical services package which Estates and Buildings have instructed the Design Team to review along with other costs savings which might be realised.

EC/2013/5 Estates Committee Operating Matters

EC/2013/5.1 Estates and Buildings Operating Plan 2013/14

Noted.

EC/2013/5.2 Critical Path

Noted.

EC/2013/6 Any Other Business

There was no other business.

EC/2013/7 Schedule of Meetings for 2013/14

The schedule of meetings for session 2013/14 was noted.



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday 9 October 2013

Report from Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee

The minutes of a meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee held on Friday 20 September 2013 are attached. There are no matters requiring Court's approval or decision.

The Committee heard that the University's health & safety risk register has been submitted to SMG in order to feed into the strategic risk register in January 2014; and received updates on asbestos management; on a survey of buildings undergoing repair, in light of some incidents involving ceilings; on accident statistics where there were no significant findings although once incident has resulted in a review of lone working and of training; and on occupational health including sickness absence.

University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Friday 20 September 2013 at 10:00 AM in the Melville Room

Present: Mrs Ann Allen, Ms Mae Boyd, Dr Gordon Duckett, Mr James Gray, Mr Robert Kilpatrick, Mr David Mclean, Dr Catherine Martin, 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 Louise Graham

In Attendance: Ms Debbie Beales, Dr Nicholas Elliott, Mr Gordon Scott

Apologies: Mr David Newall, Christine Barr

HSWC/2013/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 22 May 2013

The Minute of the meeting of Wednesday 22 May 2013 was approved with the change of the wording "School" to "College" when referring to Arts.

HSWC/2013/2 Convenors Business

David Newall, the regular convenor, was unable to chair today's meeting. Ann Allen, Director of Estates & Buildings, convened in his absence. The convenor welcomed the new SRC rep, Louise Graham, as well as Gordon Scott (deputising for Christine Barr) and Nick Elliott who would be updating the Committee on item 3 on the Agenda.

HSWC/2013/3 Matters arising

HSWC/2013/3.1 Health & safety risk register (Paper 1)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that this version of the health & safety risk register would be submitted to SMG in order to feed into the strategic risk register in January 2014. The Committee **agreed** that they were happy with the current findings but would like future reports to include graphical representation of the data. Ms Woolcott **agreed** to look into this for future reports. The Committee **discussed** the work taking place between the University fire officer and E&B regarding fire risk assessments and **acknowledged** the fact that funding, most likely through the CapEx route, would be required to address potential high risk areas.

HSWC/2013/3.2 Employee Assistance Programme (EAP) review (verbal update SW)

This item is covered under item 9.

HSWC/2013/4 Asbestos management (verbal update NE)

Dr Elliott **informed** the Committee that Estates & Buildings (E&B) had recently employed 2 Compliance Officers to concentrate on in-house asbestos management. A Health & Safety Manager was also being appointed as a result of the Marsh audit report. Dr Elliott **informed** the Committee that the first cohort of this year's annual awareness training had taken place with more being programmed. This training, which cost £50 per head, would prove useful to staff with building related duties and anyone interested should contact him directly.

He also **informed** the Committee that summer had been busy but productive with a successful cleanup of the UPS room within James Watt North while maintaining operation of the equipment. Work had also taken place within Virology, James Watt South and extensive removal works within the QMU. Future work was planned in the Boyd Orr building subject to funding. E&B had procured an asbestos database which, when operational, would provide internet access for relevant parties to the asbestos register and which permitted remote updating in real time.

HSWC/2013/5 Enforcing authority visits (verbal report DMcL)

Mr McLean **informed** the Committee that there had been two recent Health & Safety Executive (HSE) visits:

1. Work had taken place to repair the asbestos lagged Steam Main where the main contractor had left an enclosure up longer than had been notified to the HSE. As a result, the University had received a site visit from the HSE. This resulted in an FFI (fee for intervention) being issued for confined space issues identified in the mechanical repair phase of the works for the University. The asbestos removal contractor was also written to by the HSE.
2. SEPS had received a report regarding a case of carpal tunnel syndrome and, as RIDDOR guidelines state that the use of vibrating machinery can contribute to this condition, the case could be considered an occupational disease and had to be reported to the HSE. A visit from the HSE confirmed that as staff had limited vibration exposure no further action was required.

HSWC/2013/6 Incidents regarding ceiling materials (verbal report DMcL)

Mr McLean **informed** the Committee that there had been various incidents on campus that involved ceiling materials:

1. A plaster ceiling had fallen onto a suspended ceiling in an unoccupied office in the Joseph Black building.
2. A stairwell ceiling had collapsed in the Joseph Black Building (wing adjoining University Place).
3. The Boyd Orr building used a ceiling based heating system which used copper piping. Clips holding ceiling tiles periodically came loose and the tiles occasionally fell to the ground.

Whilst these incidents had not involved any injury to persons they did lead to E&B commissioning a survey on all buildings with repairs being carried out in tandem with the survey. The Joseph Black was nearing completion and remedial work had taken place in the Boyd Orr building to install additional brackets.

HSWC/2013/7 Accident statistics (Paper 2)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean **informed** the Committee that there were no significant findings to report and asked that in future this item be reworded as a SEPS report so that the item could cover all SEPS related information and not just accident stats. The Committee **agreed** that this was a good idea and would become effective in time for the December meeting. Mr McLean **informed** the Committee that he would be advertising 3 risk training courses in the Campus News. The courses were risk assessments, accident investigating and inspection regimes. These courses would be free to attend and open to all staff. Interested parties should contact SEPS directly. He also informed the Committee that 14 Units were being invited to participate in internal audits for

session 13/14. E&B had already agreed dates but SEPS had received no other replies as yet.

Mr Gray **informed** the Committee that an incident had taken place in August in the GBRC building. This incident involved a 1st year PG student who had been using a UV light box on her own at 2am on a Friday morning. She had initially used the face shield provided but had removed it as it kept slipping. As a result she had suffered keratitis of the cornea and possibly her lens. This had been treated but she was still experiencing problems with her sight. Mr Gray had submitted a report to both the GBRC and SEPS which highlighted a lack of signage, a lack of training and an issue with lone working. The Committee **agreed** that this incident showed that these issues need to be addressed both at student and staff level and various actions were delegated. College reps **agreed** to take the issues to their College Graduate Schools to ensure that this issue was covered in student inductions. The SRC and Ms Ommer **agreed** to take it to the Student Support Committee and Ms Woolcott would revisit the Lone Working Procedure to see if amendments were required.

HSWC/2013/8 OH report (Paper 3)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated and asked that future reports also show the information in graph form. Ms Stewart **agreed** to look into this for the next meeting and **informed** the Committee that in addition to the OH report she had just received the sickness absence stats. These were shared with the Committee via a PowerPoint presentation and showed that the cost of sickness absence had risen from last year by £400,000 (£2.3M to £2.7M). The figures reinforced the fact that there was still under reporting of absence within academic staff and staff in higher MPA grades. The top sickness reasons for session 2012/13 were mental health 17%, colds 5.9%, chest infections 4.3%, stomach upsets 4.1%, cancer 3.6%, flu 3.5% and "other" 61.6%. The Committee **agreed** that the "other" section should be broken down further and Ms Stewart would work with HR to achieve this in the coming months. The average length of absence was higher than the Russell Group average but number of working days lost was lower. The other stats were comparable with other HEI's. The Committee **welcomed** the sickness absence stats and felt that they were a useful addition to the OH report.

HSWC/2013/9 EAP statistics (Paper 4)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that a review of the service was currently in place and the group, consisting of representatives from HR, OH and Psychological Services, would produce a report with their findings at a future HSWC meeting. As there was such a low uptake of the service the group were appraising options for delivery of a more varied selection of services, whether that be internal or external. The trade union reps **stated** that they would like to be involved in future meetings of the review of the service. Moving on to the quarterly report, Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that, as the service had now been running for more than a year, comparisons could be made with the same quarter last year. Overall, the service had increased by almost 7.4% with telephone counselling rising by nearly 9%. However, face to face counselling had dropped by 7%. Although the uptake was similar to the previous provider it was still an extremely low uptake considering it was a free service to staff. Another publicity campaign had taken place with an article in Campus e-news alongside the official launch of the revised Management of Stress in the Workplace Policy, and a poster drive.

HSWC/2013/10 Employers liability report (Paper 5)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee on the report that had been provided by the University's Insurance & Risk Manager. She explained that figures cited or paid out had been categorised into ranges and details of accidents which had been anonymised to protect the confidentiality of pursuants.

HSWC/2013/11 Any Other Business

Fire safety training update

Mr McLean **informed** the Committee that, as of 18 September 2013, 745 staff had completed the e-fire safety awareness training with an additional 73 partially completing it.

HSWC/2013/12 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Thursday 12 December 2013 at 10am in the Senate Room.

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales



Court - Wednesday 9 October 2013

Report from the Rector

1. Freshers' Week

I was able to spend more time on campus at Freshers' Week this year, given the party conference running concurrently elsewhere in Glasgow. I shall avoid drawing comparisons!

My strong impression is that this has proved to be one of the most highly successful Freshers' Weeks and all congratulations to the SRC President and colleagues - as well as, of course, the vast army of helpers and volunteers - for the skill, speed and friendliness with which they welcomed and assisted thousands of newly arriving students. First impressions matter a lot; in this respect Freshers' Week marks a great start.

Court colleagues may be aware of some summer press reports highlighting the fact there were unexpected HMO license renewal issues in respect of Murano Halls of Residence. I draw attention to this to also single out for gratitude Neil Campbell, Director of Campus Services, and with him his allocations team and on-site staff for not only ensuring the potential problem was overcome, but indeed accommodating successfully, at short notice, an additional 300 plus students.

I have not received - during Freshers' Week or at my first Rector's surgery of the new session - a single complaint concerning these fundamentally personal and important accommodation issues. And, to the best of my knowledge at the time of writing, the police did not have to carry out a single arrest nor were there any complaints as to noise/disturbance levels from local residents.

The Presidents of QMU and GUU both advise me as to their satisfaction with Freshers' Week - the latter notwithstanding the loss of the Extension building over the summer. If Court colleagues wish to capture a unique opportunity to see how the original 1930's GUU - unextended - actually looked like, then now is the time.

2. Freshers' Week - Crichton Campus

I also visited Freshers' (or their Induction) Week on the Dumfries campus. This has grown in recent years and the Director and his colleagues, as well as highly motivated student leadership locally, have succeeded in creating a genuine campus buzz - one that also (rather like their highly popular and patronised annual Carol Service) draws in considerable support and generates interaction with the surrounding community.

3. SRC Campaigns

It was good to see the SRC campaigning prominently and successfully against the desire of Scottish Water to add an imposition of water charges on top of university residential fees. The proposal has been dropped.

However, anxiety remains as to University policy regarding unpaid debts - the main impact being the inability of students in this category to re-register using MyCampus.

4. Government Student Visas Policy

Suffice to say that this issue remains live across the UK university sector and I anticipate that it will remain so as the new parliamentary season recommences. Colleagues who were unable to attend may find the statistics produced at the recent Court Strategy Day to be illuminating - albeit discouraging, where the disincentive effect on would be students from India in particular are concerned.

5. General

Regular Rector's surgeries have recommenced and a busy campus diary is in place between now and the end of term Daft Friday Ball.

I will provide any oral updates at the Court meeting if necessary.

Charles Kennedy, September 2013

University of Glasgow

University Court – Wednesday 9 October 2013

Communications to Court from the meeting of Senate held on 3 October 2013

(All matters are for noting)

1. Proposed establishment of a Council of Senate

The Senate Operations Working Group has been developing proposals for the establishment of a Council of Senate. The intention is to address a number of issues concerning Senate: with over 500 members, meetings of Senate are rarely quorate; the composition does not align to the new University structure; and there is no provision for student membership of Senate. Subject to technical legal advice being provided by the university's lawyers, Senate was content with the draft constitution of the Council and that it should proceed to decide the matter of establishing the Council. Final legal advice was being obtained as to the most appropriate way forward which safeguarded the interests of Senate and its constitution as set out in the relevant legislation and constitutional documentation.

2. Enhancement-led Institutional Review

Senate received an update on preparations for the forthcoming Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) of the University. The ELIR exercise was the equivalent of the REF for learning and teaching. The University would be assessed on its ability to manage the maintenance of academic standards and the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the student learning experience. It was essential that the University performed well.

Preparations for the exercise were being managed by the Senate Office. The current draft of the Reflective Analysis – the University's self-evaluation to be submitted ahead of the review visits in February and March – was available online for comment. Subsequent drafts would also be uploaded. Given the timings of Senate meetings and the submission date for the Reflective Analysis (6 December), the Education Policy and Strategy Committee would approve the document on Senate's behalf at a special meeting in late November.

3. Outcome Agreements between the University and Scottish Funding Council

Professor Juster, the Senior Vice-Principal, reported that the Scottish Funding Council had requested an evaluation of the University's performance against its 2012/13 Outcome Agreement. This was presently being developed. However, the University appeared to have performed very well, notably in the recruitment of students from 'MD20' areas (that is, areas of Scotland with the worst 20% of multiple types of deprivation). The finalised document would be provided for Senate. The Funding Council was also requesting

information on recruitment for 2013-14. While students were still registering, targets again appeared to have been met.

Discussions with the Funding Council had also been held on the next Outcome Agreement. The Funding Council was planning to change its approach and request Agreement documents on a three-yearly rather than annual basis. The University's was due to be submitted on 10 January 2014; the most recent draft would be provided for Senate at its meeting on 12 December.

4. Comprehensive Spending Review settlement

The Principal reported that, following the UK Government's Comprehensive Spending Review, the Scottish Government had published its draft budget for 2014/15 and indicative spending plans for 2015/16. The Scottish Funding Council budget would rise from £1041.6M in 2013/14 to £1060.9M in 2014/15. Indicative figures for 2015/16 provided for a small uplift in cash terms to £1062.5M. The HE sector had done comparatively well: other sectors had seen reductions in funding.

It was possible that main grants for teaching and research would in practice remain near-level, with the additional funding focused on fresh initiatives.

In a separate development, the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills had made an announcement concerning additional capital expenditure on HE research infrastructure. The implications for the Scottish sector were not yet known.

5. Development of Policy on Recording of Lectures

A draft policy statement on the audio and video recording of lectures had been submitted to the Education Policy & Strategy Committee (EdPSC) in June 2013. The policy and guidelines had been developed in response to increasing demand from students and the need for the University to provide clarity and guidance on recording of lectures to ensure that staff and students were aware of what was permitted and to ensure that students would not be faced with different approaches across their courses. The practice was becoming more widespread across the HE sector. The University presently had 21 large teaching spaces with provision for systematic lecture recording; the number was likely to increase.

EdPSC had agreed on the need for a policy. However, it was clear that the issues around recording lectures were very complicated. It had therefore been agreed that the draft policy should be submitted to Senate to provide the opportunity for discussion by a wider audience of senior academic staff.

Discussion was introduced by Professor Coton, Vice-Principal for Learning & Teaching. He considered that there was need for the policy, not least because the present absence of guidelines left students and staff were unprotected. The systematic recording of lectures brought clear benefits to students whose first language was not English, and to students with disabilities.

Note had been taken of the legal situation, which was complicated. The Intellectual Property of lecture content of legally belonged to the University. At the same time, though, under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act (1988) concerning performance rights, the rights to the 'performance' of a lecture by a member of staff belonged to the lecturer.

However, the University of Manchester had adopted the position that, since such lecture performances were part of the fulfilment of staff members' duties as employees, the rights belonged to the University. While this had led to disquiet at Manchester, one aspect of it was that it meant that the University could take legal action on behalf of staff in the event of unauthorised use of their lecture material. Professor Coton noted that opt-in or opt-out approaches to recording lectures might be adopted for staff. He reported that the London School of Economics had started using an opt-in approach, but that staff willingness had support for the scheme had led to a switch to an opt-out position.

Ms McGrellis, the President of the Students' Representative Council (SRC) and Mr Coombs, Vice-President (Education), both spoke in favour of the recording of lectures. Ms McGrellis argued that the effect of lecture recording would be to augment students' learning, to the benefit of staff as well as students. Mr Coombs put the view that a university that systematically recorded lectures would be more attractive to potential applicants than one which did not. It was noted that concerns were sometimes voiced that an effect of systematic recording of lectures would be to reduce attendance. However, there was evidence (stemming partly from the University of Manchester) that this was not the case. Students tended to make use of recorded lectures in support of examination revision as well as at the time of delivery. One member reported that, in his experience, recording of teaching did not adversely affect attendance, but in fact promoted student engagement. Professor Davis, the Head of the School of Education, reported that there was evidence that the pedagogical benefit of the traditional lecture was significant. He suggested that the University should consider conducting research on this matter.

Professor Metzger reported that, after a lengthy period of reflection, the School of Law had recently introduced its own policy on the recording of lectures and had based this on individual staff members' preferences. He offered to report to Senate once experience had been gained of the Law School policy in operation. Professor Metzger also noted there were two principal issues involved: the provision of consent to record; and the use made of subsequent recordings.

It was reported that, in some areas, including Archaeology, many lectures were already uploaded onto Moodle, the Virtual Learning Environment platform.

The draft policy restricted the use of lecture recording to the student accessing the material. Unauthorised sharing and publishing of recordings on social media, e.g., would not be permitted under the Code of Student Conduct. It was observed that the policing of this would be difficult: it was likely that there was much recording of lectures taking place already, with and without the knowledge of lecturing staff. Members recognised the benefits of a clear policy statement on unauthorised recording, not least out of the University's duty of care to its students. Professor Coton explained that there was no intention to enforce any ban on unauthorised recording retrospectively.

The view was also put that the systematic recording of lectures would add a fresh set of considerations staff needed to deal with in the course of their teaching. There was the risk that this could distract staff from providing effective teaching for students present at classes. Staff would be concerned that the asides and spontaneous comments which comprised an inevitable and also beneficial element of lecturing were used out of context.

Members discussed the inclusion of copyright materials in lectures. It was noted that a flexible approach could be adopted, with audio-only recording taking place in lectures where

visual copyright material was used. The draft policy suggested that staff would be responsible for ensuring they complied with copyright requirements. However, it was noted that copyrighted material was very frequently quoted in lectures and that this would impose an unreasonable burden on staff.

The statement in the draft policy that access to recorded lectures would obviate the need for detailed note-taking was questioned. Rather than distract students, it was argued that note-taking aided understanding, and that it represented an essential skill for use by graduates in their future employment.

The Principal thanked members for their contributions to a wide-ranging and constructive discussion which would inform the way forward for the University. A similarly inclusive approach would continue to be followed in taking forward the development of a final draft policy.

6. Governance issues: Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013 and Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance

The Principal reported that the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013 had now been passed.

Following the recommendation of the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland, the Scottish Funding Council had convened the first meeting of the University Sector Advisory Forum. The Forum included representatives from the Trades Unions, National Union of Students, Government, as well as the universities, and was chaired by the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning.

Senate also considered the recently published Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance. It was noted that compliance with the Code and its main principles would be expected. The Code mainly affected university governing bodies; however, there was a requirement to review the effectiveness of academic boards/senates through an externally-facilitated exercise, to amend structures and processes in light of findings and publish review results.

It was noted that there had been extensive recent internal reflection on the role of Senate and its effectiveness, with a review of the academic governance arrangements introduced with restructuring and two Working Groups reporting to Senate on operational issues since 2011. This had culminated in the current proposals to establish a Council of Senate. Consideration would therefore be given to the timing of a review. If the establishment of the Council of Senate were to be approved, it was likely that Senate would wish to allow a settling-in period to elapse before commencing a review, in order to derive most benefit from the exercise. The Clerk of Senate and Director of the Senate Office will also consult with the Secretary of Court on Court's consideration of proposals for reviewing its effectiveness and with counterparts at the other Scottish ancient universities on their approach to the requirements to review their senates.

Options for Senate to consider in implementing the new requirements would be developed and submitted to Senate before the end of the session.

Senate heard that Court had discussed the Code previously and had noted the emphasis on employee and student engagement, in contexts such as the appointment of Principals and

Chairs of Court. It was also noted that the Code contained little on the relationship between senates/academic boards and universities' governing bodies. It was thought that this was likely to stem from the fact that the universities' constitutions varied and were in some cases (such as the University of Glasgow) established by primary legislation and therefore beyond the remit of the group that had developed the Code.

7. Honorary Degrees 2014

Senate received the report from the Honorary Degrees Committee concerning recommendations for the conferment of honorary Degrees in 2014. The Clerk of Senate will provide a report to Court at its meeting on 9 October 2013.



University
of Glasgow

Court – Wednesday 9 October 2013

Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR)

Role of University Court in Quality Assurance and Enhancement

At the University, Senate has by statutory responsibility for teaching and this has been understood as meaning responsibility for academic standards and quality.

The academic provision of the University is governed by the Academic Quality Framework. The full document may be found at:

http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_127773_en.pdf#page=7&view=fitH,30

A summary of the measures the University employs to manage quality is provided in the introduction to the Quality Framework. It covers the external examiner system, annual monitoring, the periodic subject reviews we carry out, and other forms of monitoring – importantly, the periodic reviews undertaken by professional/statutory bodies to accredit the many programmes of study where the professional body has an interest. The Academic Quality Framework also explains how we ensure that our standards are appropriately set by means of keying University provision to a number of external reference points. The most important of these is the Quality Assurance Agency's Quality Code for Higher Education, and the university is required to explain

To meet Scottish Funding Council requirements, for several years Court has formally received and signed off the University's report to the Funding Council on the previous year's academic quality review and monitoring activity.

The Funding Council has added the requirement that the University's governing body provides also a signed 'statement of assurance'. This is also on the agenda for agreement.

It is important, therefore, that Court have the opportunity to comment on and contribute to the preparations for the Enhancement-led Institutional Review.

Enhancement-led Institutional review of the University 2014: preparations and Reflective Analysis

ELIR is the equivalent of the Research Excellence Framework for learning & teaching. It covers all credit-bearing academic provision, including research degrees and collaborative provision and is undertaken on a four-year cycle.

Our management of our academic provision is assessed against the Scottish national Quality Enhancement Framework with its expectation that we are maintaining standards and maintaining and enhancing quality. A key benchmark used is the QAA Quality Code.

The University was reviewed in 2004 and 2009. In 2004 the University received a judgement of 'confidence' and in 2009 a judgement of 'broad confidence'; respectively the highest confidence judgements available.

There have been minor modifications only to the ELIR process since ELIR 2 in 2009-10.

ELIR Steering Committee

The University has established an ELIR Steering Committee, convened by the Vice-Principal Learning and Teaching, which meets on a regular basis (six-weekly from April to December) throughout the ELIR preparations to consider and inform progress. Key elements of the process under development are:

- The Reflective Analysis (University self-evaluation)
- Three Case Studies to exemplify our strategic approach to enhancing the student learning experience
- Preparation of Advance Information Set – a summary and evidence of our academic quality assurance processes
- Preparations for the Part One and Part Two visits.

Drafting of the Reflective Analysis

The Reflective Analysis, attached, is in the process of being drafted. The Senate Office has taken lead responsibility for drafting of the Reflective Analysis following consultation with colleagues across the University. In preparation for drafting, over fifty consultative meetings were held with members of staff across the institution; a focus group for c. 50 students gathered feedback and was subsequently verified by a meeting with SRC Council Members, SRC Sabbatical Officers and the SRC Permanent Secretary

The draft Analysis has been subject to an iterative process of engagement with comments from the staff consulted in the earlier phase and with the ELIR Steering Committee and was subsequently made available to all staff via MyGlasgow for comment. Additionally, a set of experienced student reviewers and external reviewers reviewed the Reflective Analysis in September 2013.

Following this feedback, the Analysis will progress through committee approval in October and November.

Key Themes

The University has identified 'key themes' which will run throughout the RA. 'Key themes' do not necessarily reflect good practice but are significant developments within the institution which the ELIR Team would be looking for evaluation and reflection on or promotion of. It was agreed to highlight four themes:

- Restructuring
- Internationalisation
- MyCampus
- Student Engagement

Case Studies

The Quality Assurance Agency requires Universities to submit at least one Case Study to augment the Reflective Analysis. The Case Study is intended to provide an example of the University's strategic approach to enhancement, illustrate the institutions approach to self-evaluation and management of change. The QAA guidance states that "[Case Studies] are not intended to be simple illustrations of good practice. Case Studies need not might illustrate the institution's approach to addressing a challenging area." The University agreed to produce three case studies:

- Widening Participation and Success
- Developing Academic Writing Skills
- Developing Graduate Attributes

Key Dates

- 6 December 2013 Reflective Analysis and Case Studies submitted
- 19-20 February 2014 Part 1 visit
- 24-28 March 2014 Part 2 visit
- 23 May 2014 Draft report submitted to the University for comment
- 18 July 2014 Final report published

Action Requested

Court has been provided with:

- Executive Summary (**Annex 1** to this paper)
- Draft Reflective Analysis
- Case Studies (3)

Court is asked to consider the documentation and provide feedback and comments. If feedback is provided after the meeting please feedback to Gavin Lee (Gavin.Lee@glasgow.ac.uk) by 16 October 2013.

Prepared by: Gavin Lee

Last modified on: 27 September 2013

University of Glasgow Reflective Analysis Executive Summary

Overview

The University's approach to enhancement is framed by its inclusive institutional strategy, 'Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision'¹. This is the context that shaped preparations for the Enhancement-led Institutional Review (ELIR) 3 which were overseen by a Steering Committee comprising of and leading consultation with staff and students from across the University. The ELIR Steering Committee met [TBC] times and had oversight of the development of the Reflective Analysis, Case Studies and Advance Information Set.

Three case studies were selected to highlight areas that were both strategically important and challenging for the University and that illustrated our reflective approach to enhancement: Case Study 1 Widening Participation and Success, Case Study 2 Developing Academic Writing Skills, Case Study 3 Developing Graduate Attributes. Additionally, the Reflective Analysis is informed by four 'key themes': Restructuring, Student Lifecycle Project, Internationalisation, Student Engagement. The 'key themes' are not necessarily intended as examples of good practice, but rather represent the pervasive and significant, transformational challenges or strategic priorities that have shaped the University since ELIR 2 (in 2009-10).

1 Institutional context and strategic framework

- 1.1.1 Since ELIR 2, the University has undergone a period of far-reaching change and transition including a major restructuring which sought to reduce barriers between academic areas to increase and enhance interdisciplinarity and sharing of practices. Further change is planned or anticipated: the ambitious development of the campus, the growth in transnational education and the outcomes of the Research Excellence Framework have the potential to literally and strategically re-shape the University in the coming years.
- 1.1.2 For the University to continue to maintain and enhance its activities against this background of change, it must support change projects effectively and engender broad engagement and reflection throughout. Various major transformational projects have been undertaken since 2009, each of which has been challenging and, in some cases, continue to challenge. These have, however, been strategically-aligned and aimed at delivering on the aims and objectives established in the University Strategic Plan and the thematic Plans which accompany it. In each case, the case for change was accompanied by the promise of future review and setting of metrics for measuring success. There has been value from self-evaluation during the projects and the lessons learned following the projects. The University continues to review and refine its approach to major transformational projects. In support of this, it has appointed a Process Improvement Manager to enhance the effectiveness of and engagement with underlying core processes.

¹

- 1.1.3 The University has set aims for increased student recruitment, increased internationalisation, improved research output, enhanced league table position and maintaining a high-quality student experience. Despite potential tensions between these aims, the University's engagement and oversight processes have generally contributed to positive outcomes.
- 1.1.4 The University has achieved success across its priorities to grow the postgraduate student population, increase the international student population, and increase the number of applicants for undergraduate study while raising the entry tariff. The University has almost doubled the international PGT cohort from 2009 to 2012-13. As displayed through Case Study one (Widening Participation and Success) this has not been at the expense of our traditional student base and long-term commitment to widening participation and success. The University has, particularly, increased international recruitment from East Asia into postgraduate degrees in the Adam Smith Business School. The University will seek to diversify the recruitment base to reduce the reliance on East Asia and to achieve a more even distribution of the PGT population across the University.
- 1.1.5 To support its future strategy, the University is investing in its staff and organisational effectiveness through a People and Organisational Development Strategy. It also recognises and is grappling with the challenges of effective communication within such a large, complex organisation. The MyCampus Benefits Realisation exercise, for example, highlighted the extent to which challenges with communication limited the effectiveness of revised processes and changed responsibilities. The University has recently appointed an internal communications manager to enhance internal communication structures and ensure that staff are involved in and aware of significant developments. This work has already begun, for example through the introduction of 'Campus Conversation'² events, but will be developed and expanded through the next review cycle.
- 1.1.6 The University continues its commitment to maintain and enhance the quality of the student experience. Central to this has been the partnership with the Students' Representative Council (SRC). The SRC is an effective body and the interactions with the University are hugely positive; we will seek to continue this highly effective partnership throughout the next cycle and ensure that our students retain a key role in discussion, policy development and decision making.

2 Consolidating and enhancing the student learning experience

- 2.1.1 The University has adopted a more effective, embedded approach to equality and diversity since 2011. The University was already meeting all legislative requirements but the revised structures and approach has allowed the requirements to be met in a more efficient manner. This has allowed the Equality and Diversity Unit to undertake further projects such as supporting the University (and individual Schools) to seek recognition such as Athena SWAN and the Gender Charter Mark. However, the University recognises that there is still much work to be done to truly, effectively embed equality and diversity in standard processes – including the commitment to raising the awareness of all staff by ensuring all staff undertake equality and diversity training by 2017.

²

- 2.1.2 We have continued to develop and support student representative structures and have, over the period since ELIR 2, increased the number of student representatives undertaking training and subsequently carrying out the role effectively. The roll-out of the online tool Student Voice has further enabled student representation by providing a forum for students and their representatives to interact. We continue to find challenges in engaging postgraduate students in representation and quality processes and restructuring highlighted a gap in our representational structures at School (formerly department) level. In both cases the University is working with the SRC to identify and break down the barriers. Through the Gilchrist Postgraduate Club we hope to enhance engagement of postgraduate students and encourage greater involvement in representation.
- 2.1.3 The development of the Fraser Building and physical and managerial co-location of services in the Student Services Division has allowed for the structured and organic growth of partnerships and cross-service working. This has been of benefit to the support and provision for international students and students with counselling or crisis support needs. As these structures continue to bed-in there is increased opportunity for systematic enhancement of student services.
- 2.1.4 The University has placed considerable emphasis on supporting the broader developmental needs of the student. Case Study three (Developing Graduate Attributes) demonstrates the way in which the University has sought to systematically embed awareness of attribute development across the full spectrum the student experience. It has further supported this through the roll-out of the Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) and a series of targeted initiatives such as the reshaping of Student Enterprise and the expansion of its Club 21 work placement scheme. Work continues to raise awareness and encourage personal ownership of graduate attribute development.

3 Enhancement in learning and teaching

- 3.1.1 The University approaches learning and teaching in a strategic manner, demonstrated through the Learning and Teaching Strategy, and has maintained or enhanced the commitment to supporting learning and teaching through a range of structures designed for that purpose.
- 3.1.2 Some structures were in place at ELIR 2, including the Learning and Teaching Development Fund and the Teaching Excellent Awards. These have continued to be hugely important mechanisms for promoting enhancement and supporting innovations (successfully demonstrated in Case Study 2 Developing Academic Writing Skills) and in recognising the excellence of our learning and teaching staff in a range of categories. The University has also been delighted to support the development of Student Teaching Awards allowing students and the SRC to feedback on and support the teaching excellence they experience on a daily basis. The University restructure allowed strengthening of leadership in Schools and Colleges of learning and teaching through the creation of College Deans for Learning and Teaching, Graduate Studies and Research and equivalent positions within Schools. These dedicated roles, in place in each College and School, have acted as facilitators for learning and teaching strategic developments and for the nurturing and support of learning and teaching in Schools, Graduate Schools and Institutes.
- 3.1.3 The strength of these support structures will allow the University to continue to enhance through the next ELIR cycle. The University has recently launched and will implement the E-Learning Strategy

and increase the effective use of technology in supporting learning and teaching. The strategy and the central support provided by the Learning and Technology Unit will be a catalyst to enable colleagues in developing technology-enhanced learning founded on effective pedagogy and which harnesses the behaviours and expectations of our students as identified in our First Year Technology Survey.

- 3.1.4 At ELIR 2, the University sought to enhance practices around monitoring and tracking of good practice. It is evident that a great deal of good practice is ongoing across the institution, and a number of different approaches to identifying good practice are established. We will continue to address the difficult challenge of ensuring widespread dissemination and subsequent monitoring of good practice through various new initiatives. These will include the introduction of an online good practice 'gateway' and dissemination of good practice through Learning and Teaching Committee.
- 3.1.5 The University recognises the role that all staff play in enhancing learning and teaching and good practice. The People and Organisational Development Strategy and supporting projects seek to provide structured opportunities for staff to enhance their practices and seek support for their development. These projects reflect a strategic priority to support our staff and to ensure that staff engagement and staff development is of a high priority and is providing the support required to continue to provide an excellent standard of learning and teaching.

4 Academic standards

- 4.1.1 The University's Academic Quality Framework provides a comprehensive, coherent overview of the arrangements in place for securing academic standards and enhancing academic quality. The approach to managing academic standards and quality is well-established and effective, as demonstrated in the Advance Information Set, and was revalidated against the revised expectations and indicators established in the QAA Quality Code.
- 4.1.2 Periodic Subject Review (PSR) continues to provide a thorough, effective mechanism for reviewing the standards and quality of provision across the University. The effectiveness of PSR has been enhanced through the increased training providing to Conveners, cognate Review Team members and student reviewers. In advance of the third cycle of periodic subject reviews (to begin in 2014) a comprehensive review is being undertaken by the Senate Office with a view to further enhancement of the process.
- 4.1.3 In the next year the University will consider the most appropriate support and leadership for quality within Schools and Colleges and ensure that the role is either carried out by a Quality Officer (perhaps with a revised remit or revised support) or identify another role which could carry out the tasks more effectively. The review of the role of Quality Officer will consider what structures would best support the management of academic standards and enhancement of quality enhancement at School and College level.
- 4.1.4 At the time of ELIR 3, the University is undertaking a review of annual monitoring with a view to increasing effectiveness. Annual monitoring meets the Quality Code expectations and indicators but is not performing as effectively as other quality processes. The review of annual monitoring will

seek to ensure that annual monitoring is better embedded within the routine academic processes and effectively and efficiently supports course and programme leaders, Schools, Colleges and the University in taking forward any actions that are required to maintain academic standards or enhance academic quality, while seeking to minimise the impact on academic workload.

- 4.1.5 The introduction of MyCampus and the Key Information Sets highlighted the large number of degree programmes which had very few or no students enrolled on them. The University will review its provision with a view to providing clarity of choice for the student population and reducing the ongoing administration required for maintaining various divergent plans in MyCampus, reducing the number of Key Information Sets produced annually and allowing staff to be more effective in supporting the academic advisement process.

5 Management of information

- 5.1.1 Investment in student data systems presents the opportunity to utilise management information across student support and student engagement activities to identify gaps or issues and seek to resolve these. The enhanced data set provided by MyCampus has not yet been fully utilised in allowing the University to really benefit from the information available. We will seek to extract and utilise management information from MyCampus to enable a more proactive and strategic approach to student support and student engagement.
- 5.1.2 The MyCampus Benefits Realisation paper highlighted the limited extent to which a business intelligence approach has been taken to the use of data held in MyCampus. The University will develop a more strategic approach to reporting and business intelligence through the development of a suite of standard reports to support greater, more consistent use of the enhanced management information available from MyCampus.

6 Collaborative activity

- 6.1.1 The University has adopted a more strategic, more effective approach to the management of collaborative activity since ELIR 2. The University's strategic priority to enhance global reach has shaped the University's approach to developing collaborative provision. This has brought a necessary strategic driver to collaborations and partnerships at a time of increased collaborative activity.
- 6.1.2 The strategic focus on internationalisation and collaborations has also led to increased investment in the support of strategic aims. This has included increased resources for the Academic Collaborations Office to support increased scrutiny and quality management in the proposal, development and monitoring and review of collaborative partnerships and a review of governance structures.
- 6.1.3 The University will continue to review the standard of student experience on collaborative provision and, pending the outcome of the audit of the student experience at validated institutions, will take forward actions as necessary to enhance the student experience and enhance the processes for reviewing the student experience at collaborative partners to ensure it meets the University expectation of comparability with students at the main University campus.



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday, 9 October 2013

Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Institution-led Review of Quality and Governing Body Statement of Assurance for AY 2012-13

Brief Description of the Paper

A copy of the University's draft annual report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) on institution-led review of quality for AY 2012-13 is attached. The contents are specified by the SFC. The statement summarises review activity undertaken by the University of its provision for students, ie: reviews of Periodic Subject Reviews (PSR), Graduate Schools and Administrative Review Process exercises carried out in respect of student-facing University services. Information concerning review activity carried out at the University by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies is also included.

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

Court has duly approved the annual report for the last several years. The Statement of Assurance is a new requirement from AY 2012-13. The prescribed text is quoted below and should be signed off by the Chair of the Governing Body with an indication of when it was endorsed.

“On behalf of the governing body of [University of Glasgow], I confirm that we have considered the institutions arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for AY 2012-13, including the scope and impact of these. I further confirm that we are satisfied that the institution has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision. We can therefore provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at this institution continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.”

How we assure the effectiveness of arrangements for maintaining academic standards and quality

Under the terms of its constitution, at the University, Senate has responsibility for teaching. This has been understood as meaning responsibility for academic standards and quality.

Senate employs a range of mechanisms to ensure standards and quality are maintained. The main methods used are:

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

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

The findings from the range of mechanisms detailed above are analysed and responded to by committees at School, Research Institute, College and Senate levels. This includes normally annual consideration of ways to enhance the effectiveness of the mechanisms themselves and of the committees that receive and consider them also. The framework of these arrangements is detailed in the University's Academic Quality Framework, which may be found at: http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_127773_en.pdf#page=7&view=fitH,30

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

Compliance with the Quality Enhancement Framework is assessed at the four-yearly Enhancement-led Institutional Reviews (ELIRs). The University has received the best result possible in each of the reviews in has undergone.

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

The QAA also checks the University's compliance with the requirements of the annual report to the Scottish Funding Council. No notes of concern have been received on these reports since they began to be required.

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

Action Required

Court is requested to approve the draft report and endorse the statement of assurance above.

Note: the appendices to the report will be emailed to Court for reference and are not included.



Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Progress of Institution-led Reviews conducted in 2012-13

1. Introduction

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

A progress report on each process follows, together with details of the role and nature of student involvement and of any significant issues relating either to development needs or to good practice that we have identified as a result of these processes.

2. Periodic Subject Review (PSR)

The University's process of internal subject review is known as Periodic Subject Review (PSR). The process for PSR is consistent with the SFC's guidance on the characteristics of institution-led review (e.g. they are conducted on a cycle of not more than 6 years; include a student member and at least one external member on the review panel, etc).

More detailed information on the PSR process is available at:

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/psr/>

The PSR process is evaluated on an annual basis. The most significant changes made this year were:

- Introduction of a separate briefing session with Panel Conveners regarding appropriate wording of commendations/recommendations within the final report during review visit to ensure effective transmission through Academic Standards Committee and endorsement of explicit statement regarding the Panel's evaluation, guided by the External Subject Specialist(s), of the programmes currency and validity in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and practice in its application¹;
- Provision of a collaborative tailored one-day training course for all Student Panel Members in association with the Student Representative Council, Academic Development Unit, Learning and Teaching Centre and the Senate Office. The

¹ For details of QAA's Code of Practice see Section 7, precepts 7 and 8 – <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/Code-of-practice-section-7.aspx>

course provides an overview of PSR in relation to the Scottish Quality Enhancement Framework as well as highlighting what is expected from Panel Members, including how to: analyse and interpret documentation; be an effective communicator and plan for the Review. The training also includes a mock review visit meeting with 'School' staff involving an experienced Convener and student panel members. This was filmed last session and will be made available to students via the new Student Voice web page (a new interactive social forum to promote student interaction) and the Senate Office website.

For Session 2013-14, Heads of Subject/School/SER leads undergoing PSR, are being offered a support session to provide an opportunity to: learn more about the purposes of the SER; consider good practice in SER preparation; and to discuss with staff from the Academic Development Unit (ADU), Learning and Teaching Centre, the Senate Office, as well as colleagues from other disciplines who are undergoing PSR. There will also be a more substantive review of the PSR process, in advance of the third cycle in 2014-15. This will include consultation with Student Representative Council, VP Learning and Teaching, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, Deans of Learning and Teaching, Heads of Subject/School from previous reviews, Director of Learning and Teaching Service, Postgraduate Research Strategy Manager, and focus groups with staff members from the Senate Office/ADU and Student Panel members. It is hoped that a draft report will be considered at ASC on 15 April 2014.

2.1 Subject Areas Reviewed in Session 2012-13

Seven reviews were conducted during 2012-13, as follows:

Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences Graduate School: Postgraduate Taught Programmes ²	22/23 November
Veterinary Medicine	4/5 December
Engineering	28/29 January
Modern Languages and Cultures ³	18/19 February
Celtic and Gaelic	15 February
Politics	4/5 March
Centre for Open Studies ⁴	11/12 March

Details of the programmes covered by the reviews are included in Appendix 1. The University's confirmed PSR review reports are publically available at

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/psr/reportsresponses/>

² Postponed from late 2011-12 to early 2012-13 and did not include PGT for Dentistry and Life Sciences as they had been reviewed in 2009-10 and 2011-12 respectively.

³ Modern Languages and Cultures and Open Studies had originally been scheduled to be reviewed during 2011-12 but was deferred to 2012-13

⁴ Postponed from 2011-12

2.2 Update on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2011-12

One year on, Progress Reports were considered by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for the following subject areas that were reviewed in 2011-12:

Life Sciences ⁵
Physics and Astronomy
Education
Law
Management
Medicine (UG) ⁶

The Academic Standards Committee found that recommendations had been given full and appropriate consideration. A further update on progress for four recommendations made during the Review of Life Sciences had been requested and would be considered by the Academic Standards Committee on 4 October 2013. In addition, further follow up reports were requested for actions that had been proposed but had not yet been implemented for: three of the recommendations made in the Review of Physics and Astronomy; five recommendations made in the Review of Education; three recommendations made in the Review of Law; six recommendations made in the Review of Management and ten recommendations made in the Review of Medicine (Undergraduate). All of these additional reports will be considered by the Academic Standards Committee on 15 November 2013.

2.3 Subject Reviews to be conducted in Session 2013-14

Philosophy
Theology and Religious Studies
Nursing and Health Care
Computing Science
Economic and Social History
Education Community Development and Adult Education
Sociology

Education Community Development and Adult Education programmes are being reviewed separately from the School of Education, which was reviewed in 2010-11, due to organisational changes affecting the subject area that would have made it difficult for the review to produce meaningful outcomes at that particular time.

⁵ The Review of the School of Life Sciences was scheduled to take place on 17/18 March 2011 but was postponed due to industrial action until 27/28 October 2011.

⁶ The review of PGT medicine was scheduled to take place during 2011-12, however it was postponed to allow extended discussion of the scope of the review in an organisationally complex subject area.

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

3.1 PSRB Reviews conducted in Session 2012-2013.

Please note that the reviews listed below are those reported to the SFC in Autumn 2012 as expected in 2012-2013. The reviews shaded in grey will be carried over to the 2013-2014 report and will be noted there.⁷

Subject	PSRB	Outcome
Business School	Association of MBAs (AMBA)	Review undertaken in June, 2013. School is awaiting report.
Computing Science	The British Computer Society (BCS), Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	All programmes accredited by both bodies until 2017-2018
Engineering	Royal Aeronautical Society,	Royal Aeronautical Society: Accreditation up to the 2016 intake and 2018 intake (see Appendix 2);
	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET),	IET: Accreditation up to 2013 intake. Monitoring visit to occur in 2013-2014;
	Institution of Engineering Designers (IED)	IED: BEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering accredited to 2015. MEng Mechanical Design Engineering & MEng Product Design Engineering to be reviewed in 2013-2014
	Institute of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)	IMechE: programmes accredited to 2015
Geographical and Earth Sciences	Chartered Institute of Civil Engineering Surveyors (CICES)	Accredited to October, 2013. Visit scheduled for September, 2013
Subject	PSRB	Outcome
Humanities	The Chartered Institute of Library and Information (CILIP)	Review scheduled for Autumn, 2013
Physics and Anatomy	Institute of Physics (IoP)	Review requested by IoP for November, 2013.
Psychology	British Psychological Society (BPS)	Accreditation review undertaken in March, 2013. Accredited until 2017-2018
Veterinary Medicine	Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS), American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), Australian Veterinary Boards Council (AVBC) and the European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE)	Review undertaken in April, 2013. Report expected September, 2013.

⁷ While the reviews may have taken place in 2012-2013, some reports of reviews were not available at the time of writing. These programmes will be noted in the 2013-2014 listing with appropriate comment.

A Sixth Year Review of programmes in the Business School was undertaken in 2013-2013 by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). A letter from AACSB to the Head of School emphasised that the Sixth Year Review would not change the current accredited status of the degree programmes in business. The outcome of the review is to be confirmed.

The Business School also received confirmation from the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) that students on the relevant programmes would gain exemptions from professional examinations subject to completion of relevant modules. This accreditation was not reported to SFC in the 2012 report. Please see Appendix 2 for details.

During academic session 2012-2013, the Business School has also been accepted as a member of the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD).

3.2 PSRB reviews to be conducted in Session 2013-14

The following PSRB visits are anticipated in 2013-14. Subjects noted in grey are reviews carried over from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014.

Subject	PSRB
Education	General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS)
Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET); Joint Board of Moderators (JBM) Institution of Engineering Designers (IED)
Geographical and Earth Sciences	Chartered Institute of Civil Engineering Surveyors (CICES)
Humanities	The Chartered Institute of Library and Information (CILIP)
Interdisciplinary Studies	General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS)
Physics and Anatomy	Institute of Physics (IoP)
The following subjects were reviewed in 2012-2013 but reports of accreditation reviews have not yet been received. The reports from the accrediting bodies listed below are due to be received/confirmed in 2013-2014.	
Business School	Association of MBAs (AMBA)
Veterinary Medicine	Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS), American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), Australian Veterinary Boards Council (AVBC) and the European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE)

4. Graduate School Reviews

The University underwent a restructuring process in 2010 creating 4 Colleges each with a Graduate Schools. Graduate School Reviews now take place in a 5 year cycle – one Graduate School per year and one consolidation year. During the first year post-restructure (session 2010-11), the Deans of Graduate Schools Committee undertook a review of all four Graduate Schools in order to record the development of the new

organisational arrangements and to facilitate the sharing of good practice. A review of the College of Science and Engineering Graduate School took place in June 2012 and the report was considered by the Research Planning and Strategy Committee (RPSC) in November 2012. A follow-up response one year on from the report will be tabled by the College at RPSC during 2013-14. The College of Social Sciences Graduate School was reviewed in May 2013. The report from this Review has yet to be considered by RPSC. The report and the Graduate School Response will be tabled at RPSC during 2013-14. It is anticipated that the Graduate School in the College of Arts will be reviewed during 2013-14.

5. University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP)

A revised Administrative Review process was introduced in 2012-13, and two service areas were reviewed. These were IT Services, and Estates and Buildings (an exercise that probed progress against the recommendations arising from the Review in 2011-12).

Below is the complete list of services reviewed since 2005.

Subject	Year
SRAS	2005
Safety & Environmental Protection	2006-07
Human Resources	2007-08
Library	2007-08
SCAS	2007-08
Finance Office	2008-09
Senate Office	2008-09
Careers	2009-10
Janitorial & Security	2009-10
Registry	2010-11
Estates and Building	2011-12
IT Services	2012-13
Estates and Buildings (follow-up)	2012-13

Reviews beyond Session 2012-13 have not yet been scheduled. ARP will continue, and services to be reviewed in Session 2012-13 will be agreed in September 2013.

6. The Outcomes of the Institutional-led Review Processes

The outcome of a subject review visit at the University of Glasgow is a report produced by the Review Panel identifying the key strengths of the School or Subject Area along with conclusions and recommendations for improvement or change. There were no recommendations during the 2012-13 PSR reviews that called into question the continuation of any programme for reasons relating to quality or standards.

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

7. The Role and Nature of Student Involvement in Institution-led Review Processes

The University continues to work closely with the Students' Representative Council (SRC) to explore ways in which the representation of students at internal reviews can be further enhanced. Students are currently involved in several ways in the institution-led review process at the University of Glasgow scheduled in February and March 2014 which includes:

- SRC Council participation in structured meetings to brainstorm and discuss the key themes;
- SRC Sabbatical Officers participation in structured meetings to discuss the key themes, consider the strategic issues surrounding learning and teaching and the student experience from a student perspective and discuss the agreed notes from focus groups with students, representatives and SRC Council members;
- Students and Class or PGR Representatives participation in informal facilitated meetings (focus groups, attendance at informal or formal representative groups meetings) to brainstorm the key strengths and weaknesses of the student learning experience and discuss their experience and understanding of the key themes;
- PSR Student Reviewers acting as an editing 'sounding board' and will review drafts of the Reflective Analysis.

These approaches were approved by the University's ELIR Steering Committee.

7.1 *PSR process*

Student panel members have been involved in internal reviews since 2006-07; the nominated student representatives are senior Council members of the SRC. The Senate Office and the SRC liaise over which reviews might benefit from the participation of the respective SRC College Postgraduate Convener (e.g. where the Subject/School has a number of PGT programmes) or the inclusion of a student from a professional programme where the review includes programmes with professional or clinical practice. The Senate Office, in collaboration with the SRC and the Academic Development Unit, Learning and Teaching Centre, developed the one and a half day 'mini-review' training event (including pre-course preparation) for student panel members, which was piloted in November 2012 and detailed in Section 2. Course evaluation from the student participants was extremely positive, particularly in relation to confidence, knowledge development and overall enjoyment of the course. Feedback received from convener panel members post-review, suggested that student panel members had clearly benefitted from the new training provision, which features a more tailored and extensive course content and utilises interactive small group teaching to prepare student panel members for PSR.

As previously reported, students from the subject being reviewed (undergraduate and taught postgraduate) have an opportunity to contribute to the development of the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and the Subject/School is asked to give details in the SER on how this was done. Panels do comment in PSR reports where there is evidence of good, or a lack of, engagement with students in preparing the SER. The review panel also meets with groups of students which should be representative of the student body from the Subject/School (e.g. each level of study, mode of study (part time, full-time, distance learning), ethnicity, home and international, disabilities, etc) and guidance is provided to Subjects/Schools on this. Where appropriate, evening meetings with students have been held to accommodate the attendance of part-time students, and distance learning

students have been invited to comment by e-mail/video conference. Students also make an important contribution to the internal review process through their feedback being incorporated into annual monitoring reports, minutes of staff: student liaison committees, etc. From 2013-14 Heads of Subject/School/SER leads undergoing PSR, are offered informal 'open discussion' support sessions on SER preparation, which include a section specifically aimed at student engagement. A pilot presentation in August 2013 received excellent feedback and uptake was enthusiastic, with six of the seven subjects/schools to be reviewed represented.

7.2 *Graduate School Reviews*

As part of Graduate School Reviews, there is a student member of the review panel (where possible, this will be an SRC Postgraduate Convener) and review panels will meet with postgraduate research students (PGR) from across Subjects and Schools within the College. At the review of the College of Social Sciences that took place in May 2013, the student panel member was a former student representative sabbatical officer and a current PGR student within the College of Science and Engineering. The group of students who met with the Review panel was an excellent representation of students from across the College, including a student from the Dumfries campus, from all years of study, including a student with thesis pending status, and across home students and international students. The student Panel member is provided with training by the Senate Office. All students interviewed by the Panel are provided with a guidance note to explain the process, a link to the full guidance document and encouraged to communicate with or meet with the Panel Clerk to address any questions. Additionally, Graduate Schools submit for Panel review minutes from relevant internal College Committees, including staff student liaison groups or similar student-focused groups.

7.3 *University Services Administrative Review Programme*

A student member is included in all Administrative Review Panels.

8. **Development Needs and the Identification of Good Practice**

8.1 *PSR*

Development Needs

As in previous years, an examination of the recommendations made by PSR Panels during Session 2012-13 has been undertaken. In total, 70 recommendations were made following 6 reviews⁸. As part of our standard practice, a report on the examination of the recommendations will be submitted to the October 2013 meeting of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). ASC's attention will be drawn to the groupings with specific attention drawn to any recommendations that have potential for University-wide consideration.

The recommendations were grouped under the follow categories:

- ***Resources for Learning and Teaching*** (25 recommendations)

⁸ The report from the review of Open Studies is subject to endorsement by ASC and will be included in the Annual Statement for 2013-14.

- **Assessment** (9 recommendations)
- **Recruitment** (6 recommendations)
- **Learning Opportunities** (6 recommendations)
- **Curriculum** (6 recommendations)
- **Aims/ILOs** (5 recommendations)
- **Student Support** (5 recommendations)
- **Strategic Aims** (5 recommendations)
- **Maintaining Standards** (2 recommendations)
- **Quality Enhancement/Assurance** (1 recommendation)

The conclusion of our examination of the recommendations is that, whilst a number of themes can be identified, the majority of the recommendations (70%) refer to issues particular to the Subject/School concerned. However, the cumulative effect of grouping recommendations has highlighted some areas where University-wide action might be considered and these are detailed below.

Resources for Learning and Teaching (6 recommendations)

The recommendations grouped under this category highlighted the need to: provide training opportunities and support for new staff and Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs); ensure that tutorials were meeting the needs of international undergraduate students, and continued investment to ensure that the University's Student Central Records System (MyCampus) enhances the student and staff experience.

Assessment (4 recommendations)

These recommendations were mainly concerned about feedback on assessment in terms of quality, clarity of timescales and the need for prompt communication with students about delays.

Learning Opportunities (4 recommendations)

The recommendations proposed enhancing learning opportunities such as virtual learning environments, group/team work, work placements and study abroad.

Student Progression/Support (3 recommendations)

The provision of additional support for students offered to pre-honours and overseas students and review of induction arrangements.

Recruitment (1 recommendation)

Development of Postgraduate Taught programmes that are responsive to students needs.

Curriculum (1 recommendation)

It was recommended that course review should include students through the Staff Student Liaison Committee.

Aims and Objectives (1 recommendation)

It was recommended that there was more consistency in provision of information on Intended Learning Outcomes.

Quality Enhancement/Assurance (1 recommendation)

It was recommended that a Postgraduate Taught student representative was included on the Staff Student Liaison Committee.

Key Strengths and Good Practice

A total of 46 areas of good practice/key strengths were identified, out of which 20 had potential for University-wide dissemination. From Session 2013-14, to further promote areas of good practice identified, a number of examples arising from PSR will be annually presented to the Learning and Teaching Committee for review. Individuals responsible for initiatives will be invited to give a short presentation at the Learning and Teaching Committee's Away Day so that the potential for wider implementation can be discussed.

The table below identifies the areas good practice/key strengths identified:

Area of good practice	Number	Examples
Curriculum	10	Wide range and challenging suite of courses addressing core areas plus offering flexibility in terms of specialisation and focus; successful introduction of new programme of study; preservation of breadth of provision; flexibility and choice, interdisciplinary aspects of curriculum; student engagement in curriculum review process ensuring shared ownership and understanding of approach to teaching.
Learning and Teaching environment	6	Work undertaken in providing a supportive Gaelic environment for students; progress in achieving School-wide procedures; development of a School which staff and students value and can see benefits in terms of support, inter-disciplinarity, enhancement of quality and good practice and collegiality; level of consultation with industry through the Industrial Liaison Committee. An effective and productive forum which helped to ensure the relevance of the School's programmes and M.Eng projects.
Staff	5	Conscientious and reflective approach of skilled and research-led teaching staff operating at maximum capacity; professionalism, dedication and enthusiasm of Graduate Teaching Assistants who were committed to their students and teaching role; effective use of the Teaching Office in supporting the advisory system.
Staff support	5	Support and mentoring arrangements to integrate probationary members to body of staff; skilled and dedicated subject-level administrative staff; evident commitment and hard work of staff, reflected not only in their high aspirations but in the achievements of the School and in the positive reflections of the students.
Assessment	4	Broad range of forms of assessment; interactive formative assessment making innovative use of technology; diversity of assessment methods, meeting the varying needs of student ability/expectations and professional criteria in the development of

		transferable skills; use of reflective journals to encourage students to consider the nature/ quality of their communication and reflect on relationship between theory and practice, potential issues and own learning process and skills.
Assessment Feedback	3	High level of detailed feedback provide and introduction of feedback timetable, returning assessment work with written feedback within a week.
Self Evaluation Report for PSR	3	Analytical and reflective Self Evaluation Report (SER) which demonstrated an inclusive and transparent approach to development and accurately portrayed an innovative School demonstrating self awareness and an ability to reflect on and enhance practices and provision; collaborative and reflective approach which delivered an honest, self-critical analysis of the Subject's activities.
Student Feedback	3	Feedback pro-forma and School's plan to closely monitor the feedback procedure including the level of student awareness; comments from students highlighted the important role of focus groups within the School. It was clear to the Review Panel that the students felt that their views were listened to and taken into account. Staff confirmed that they valued the immediate nature of feedback from focus groups.
Student support	1	The level of involvement of students in developing the SER and the contributions made by students who met the Team. The number of students who were willing to meet the Review Team and their positivity indicated a School which values and supports its students.
QA processes	1	Streamlined annual monitoring process with a view to streamlining procedures and increasing staff engagement with the process.
GTA support	1	Development and mentoring of Graduate Teaching Assistants.
Graduate attributes	1	Successful study abroad programme.
Quality of students	1	Positive External Examiner feedback, particularly in relation to the quality of the Glasgow graduates.
Recruitment	1	Recruitment of highly qualified students at undergraduate level.
Widening participation	1	Engagement with the widening participation (WP) agenda and in particular the number of Diploma students recruited through a variety of initiatives.

A fuller document on Key Strengths and Good Practice will be submitted to Academic Standards Committee (ASC) on 4 October 2013. ASC will be asked to confirm which areas of good practice identified in 2012-13 is to be widely disseminated across the University. In addition, ASC will be asked to confirm that, where good practice has been identified, consent will be sought from Heads of Subject/School for further information to be forwarded directly to the Head of School/Subject where recommendations have been made on corresponding activities.

Both the Summary of Recommendations and the Key Strengths and Good Practice reports can be made available in due course, if required.

University of Glasgow
Glasgow G12 8QQ
General switchboard
Telephone +44 (0)141 330 2000
www.glasgow.ac.uk
The University of Glasgow. Charity number SC004401