

Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 15 April 2015 in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Professor George Baillie Senate Assessor, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Professor Christine Forde Senate Assessor, Dr Carl Goodyear Senate Assessor, Mr Marvin Karrasch SRC Assessor, Professor Karen Lury Senate Assessor, Mr Brian McBride General Council Assessor, Cllr Pauline McKeever Glasgow City Council Representative, Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson General Council Assessor, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Ms Breffni O'Connor SRC President, Mr David Ross General Council Assessor (Convener of Court), Dr Duncan Ross Senate Assessor, Dr Donald Spaeth Senate Assessor, Ms Lesley Sutherland General Council Assessor, Professor Paul Younger Senate Assessor

In attendance:

Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Ms Christine Barr (Director of Human Resources), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate), Professor Jon Cooper (Vice-Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange), Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court),

Apologies:

Members: Mr David Anderson General Council Assessor, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor's Assessor

Attendees: Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Muffy Calder (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor James Conroy (Vice-Principal Internationalisation), Professor Roibeard O Maolalaigh (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal), Professor Miles Padgett (Vice-Principal Research)

CRT/2014/32. Minutes of the meetings held on Tuesday 24 February 2015

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2014/33. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2014/34. Report from the Principal

CRT/2014/34.1 Research Funding

Following the outcome of the 2014 REF, the University had received details of the proposed allocations from the SFC regarding the Research Excellent Grant (REG) and Research Postgraduate Grant for 2015/16. The overall REG would increase from £230.7M in the

current year to £231.8M in the coming year and would then effectively be frozen at that level for the following two years (subject to future UK and Scottish Governments' spending review). The Global Excellence Initiative Grant had been cut entirely. Taken together this would result in an overall decrease of £12.9M in research funding available to universities in 2015/16 relative to 2014/15.

The formula for allocation of the REG had been amended prior to the REF results, with a change to the funding weighting given to research rated as world-leading (4*), compared to work judged to be internationally excellent (3*). The formula had also been made more transparent, separating out the elements of REG in support of charity grant funding and Research Councils UK funding, from the REG grant distribution driven by the REF outcome.

The REF outcomes, and to a lesser extent the formula change, had resulted in a redistribution of funding across the sector (as in England) with the inevitable consequence that some had gained and some had lost. The impact of these changes on Glasgow was relatively positive: between 2014-15 and 2017-18, the University's REG funding would increase from £44.8M to £45.8M.

CRT 2014/34.2 Joint Educational Institute - UESTC China

At the last meeting, Court heard via the Finance Committee report that the Committee had given in-principle approval, subject to risk management considerations, to the formation of a Joint Educational Institute (JEI) with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC), expanding existing programmes with UESTC in Chengdu. If successful, this would be the second JEI, the first having been secured in partnership with Nankai. Links with UESTC focused on Engineering, and were largely aimed at Undergraduates, while Nankai focused on Social Sciences, and Postgraduate students.

The Principal had visited UESTC in March to join with them in seeking to advance negotiations with the Ministry of Education. Progress continued to be very positive.

CRT/2014/34.3 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/2014/34.4 Honorary Degrees

Honorary degrees would be awarded later in April to former Prime Minister Gordon Brown and former First Minister Alex Salmond, who would each also give a lecture following the award.

CRT/2014/34.5 Outcome Agreement

The Outcome Agreement had been updated slightly, and provided to Court under the Secretary's report. Court heard that there had been some examples of dialogue within the sector, involving the SFC, with respect to targets not being met. The Agreements were relatively new and the interaction with the SFC was still developing.

CRT/2014/35. Report on Research

Professor Jon Cooper, Vice Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange, briefed Court on Research and Knowledge Exchange & Innovation (R&KEI) activities over the past year.

Following the REF, in which Court noted the University had performed well overall, units of assessment (UoA) were undergoing review. A framework and associated actions were noted for improving the University's standing across the R&KEI KPIs. Although the formulation of discipline-specific strategies awaited the outcome of the UoA reviews, the institutional R&KEI strategy would focus on areas including: adopting a data-led approach to measuring and managing research performance, KEI activities and external engagement; identifying and developing strategic themes in order to respond to strategically important priorities; and coordinating applications for large-scale and other strategic funding calls.

Processes behind the new research strategy would also include expanding the reach of existing activities and identifying new opportunities for internationalisation; focusing on key themes, including mobilising cross-disciplinary expertise; growing strategic partnerships with industry and the third sector; and further developing networks to deliver research and knowledge exchange

Court noted the report and progress against Research KPIs, the latter relating to Research income, Research grant holding, improvement in output quality, PGR student:staff ratio, and PGR satisfaction. Court also noted steps being taken to stimulate a wider public understanding of academic research. In discussion, Court noted that competition for PG funding was increasingly intense and presented challenges, as did the potential for the upcoming Comprehensive Spending Review to limit Science funding. Court also noted that while research funding volume had increased at the University, there were limits imposed by the institution's size that meant that increasing research volume to the level of some Russell Group competitors was not possible. However, as advised during the presentation, action to improve KPI performance and competitive standing was ongoing. Development of the new Research hub would contribute to this area, through attracting new research.

Court further noted that, through their increasing requirement for impact statements and for evidenced outputs, funders were concerned to understand the societal as well as the economic impact of research.

Court thanked Professor Cooper for the briefing.

CRT/2014/36. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2014/36.1 HE Governance Code

A questionnaire for Court self-assessment/feedback on performance had been circulated earlier in the year. The governance working group had met in March to consider the outcomes of this annual effectiveness review and also, with reference to the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, to ensure that the University was addressing all its responsibilities in terms of good governance.

With regard to the Main Principles of the Code, the Working Group had concluded that compliance was both good and comprehensive, with a very small number of points to attend to, including the requirement for a clear lay majority, which was currently not met but which Court was seeking to address through a revised Ordinance. With regard to the Supporting Guidelines, the Working Group had agreed that the University and Court were compliant. The Working Group had agreed that no recommendations to Court were necessary with regard to Code compliance.

The Working Group had reviewed responses to a self-assessment by Court, which had included sections on the role of Court and its members; Court procedures and meetings; Court committees; and governor development. Overall, the self-assessment had been positive.

Some themes for further action had emerged from responses given. In this regard, Court approved recommendations from the Working Group, relating to: i) greater inclusion of executive summaries in papers; Court Committee chairs highlighting key issues arising from recent meetings; Court members being invited to attend Committee meetings as observers; the Court agenda including specific reference to Court members having the opportunity to highlight any items of business for discussion; a regular programme of lunchtime briefings by Heads of College; and enhanced training/induction, including for student members and for new committee members.

It was agreed that all members would be strongly encouraged to respond to the next self-assessment exercise.

CRT/2014/36.2 Court Procedural Review Group - Centre for Open Studies

The Court Procedural Review Group (CPRG) had met on 1 April to consider an Organisational Change proposal relating to the Centre for Open Studies.

Court had undertaken a wide-ranging consultation in 2010/11 on a proposal that the Open Studies programme be discontinued. The outcome of that consultation had been that Court had committed to sustaining the Open Studies Programme. In doing so, it had agreed that the programme should be offered in future from University Services, rather than an academic unit, and it had asked that steps be taken to address the Centre's annual deficit. The current proposals were planned to move the Centre to a break-even position, from the current position where it had an annual deficit of £525,000. Funding the annual deficit required the University to draw on the SFC Teaching grant income, which reduced the funds available to support the student experience in other areas. The breakeven position would be achieved by delivering a net saving of £420,000 in 2015/16, and thereafter achieving annual increases in tuition fee income.

Court was advised that the proposed changes would impact on the service provided by the Centre in three ways:

- while a wide-ranging programme of study opportunities would continue to be provided, certain courses would be discontinued where they were less popular and therefore financially less viable;
- the Access programme offered by the Centre would be delivered using a more efficient model; and
- the Centre would in future operate on a Teaching-only basis.

Having considered the changes proposed, and discussed them with the Director of the Centre, and the University's Deputy Secretary, CPRG had agreed to recommend to Court:

- .1 that the proposals for organisational change should be taken forward by management, without the need for a further report to Court;
- .2 that Senate should be advised of Court's support for the changes proposed and should be offered the opportunity to comment on them;
- .3 that, subject to any concerns that might be raised by Senate, University Services managers should be authorised to implement the changes, subject to full consultation, which Court noted would include consultation with UCU, who had provided a submission that had been included with the Court papers; and
- .4 that every effort should be made to ensure that the proposed organisational change was achieved through voluntary means.

In discussion, Dave Anderson (Employee Representative) asked for clarity on the role of Senate in the process, and on the relationship between the proposed changes and the figures quoted in the Outcome Agreement in respect of Widening Access activity. He also referred to the three year period that had been given for the Centre to address the deficit, following the 2011 review, and to assurances having been given in relation to opportunities for postgraduates to teach on programmes offered by the Centre. Given that the directorship had changed during the period following the review, it was suggested that the time period has been too short. Court heard from David Newall that the current Director had presented a plan to address the deficit and that, in the view of management, it was correct to proceed with this. If the Council of Senate was content with the proposals then, subject to Court's agreement at the present meeting, the process would continue as suggested in the proposal; if Council of Senate had serious reservations about the proposals, then a management response to these would be necessary. Court would be advised of the details in such an event. Court noted that with respect to Widening Access (WA), as referred to in the Outcome Agreement, the Centre's current Access programme did not significantly address the University's WA agenda, in terms of transition to degree courses of students from under-represented groups, while at the same time absorbing a high level of resource. The proposals were intended to achieve a higher WA impact, making optimal use of a reduced resource. Were the proposals to be taken forward, the Outcome Agreement figures, in terms of expenditure on WA, would be adjusted accordingly.

Comments were made by some Court members about the need to bear in mind the University's commitment to community engagement and to its civic roots, as stated in the strategic plan. It was important that any reduction in the Centre's provision did not result in a gradual and irreversible loss of such engagement, which it needed to be borne in mind included non-WA community links, as well as those with WA target groups. Court noted that the intention was to maintain a broad programme of Open Study opportunities, developing new courses that were sustainable, while stopping offerings that were not viable. With respect to WA, future provision would be marketed as Access routes. The extent of transition onto degree courses would be closely monitored.

Court noted a comment from Professor Frank Coton, who had chaired the review of Open Studies in 2011, that the intention was to develop a better model of provision, and that the proposals were consistent with this, the previous portfolio having been unsustainable.

Court approved the recommendations made by the CPRG. It was agreed that it was important to engage in consultation with the staff involved as soon as possible and that, subject to Senate being content with the proposals, this should happen immediately following the Council of Senate meeting on 23 April. If, however, any serious concerns were expressed by the Council of Senate, then management should reflect on these, and provide its response to Court at its June meeting. Court noted that Mr Newall would brief the Council of Senate on the matter, including providing a clear statement of the process, at its forthcoming meeting.

CRT/2014/36.3 Socially Responsible Investment Policy – Fossil Fuels

At its meeting in October 2014, Court had made a decision in principle to reduce its investment in the fossil fuel extraction industry, in a phased way over a period of 10 years. Court had approved the following recommendations:

1. that the University's direct investment in the fossil fuel extraction industry should be managed in a controlled manner such that the value of such investments does not exceed the current level of 10% of the endowment portfolio for any appreciable time period;
2. that the current level of investment should be reduced to zero over the next 10 years, subject to Recommendation 3 and biennial re-evaluation of the financial and other impacts of the

divestment policy on the University along with the scope for increased investment in renewable energy sources;

3. that prior to executing Recommendation 2, a further examination of the financial impact of that Recommendation be conducted through dialogue with the Glasgow University Climate Action Society (GUCAS) and the University's Investment Committee [IAC] to provide assurance to Court as to the limited scale of the prospective financial impact.

The Investment Advisory Committee had considered the matter in March and Court noted its advice. IAC had received several inputs to its meeting, including from the University's fund managers and from the Glasgow University Climate Action Society. Court had received legal advice on its decision. Court had also asked if information could be obtained on any perceived impact the divestment decision might have on income for teaching and research, and on philanthropic giving to the University. The general position on income for academic activity was that the staff who worked closely with the fossil fuel industry were anxious regarding the possible implications of Court's decision, but that, in the period since October when Court had first discussed the matter, there had been no evidence of significant financial detriment. With regard to the potential impact on University fundraising, the advice from the Director of Development was that the Court discussion in October and the publicity surrounding it had caused little reaction.

On the basis of the advice obtained, Court was being asked at the present meeting to decide whether or not it was satisfied that scale of the prospective financial impact arising from implementing recommendation 2 was sufficiently limited.

In discussion, some members, including a number of lay members, expressed continuing concerns about the level of risk, relating to: a potential breach of the duties of charitable trustees; advice from fund managers that included them not being able to confirm there would be no significant financial detriment; and advice from the managers relating to loss of diversification benefit. It was also pointed out that the decision in October had been conditional on further information being obtained, and had not been absolute.

Other members were in favour of an approach being agreed whereby recommendation 2. would be confirmed, but with greater clarity on which companies would be excluded from being directly invested in, so that fund managers could be clearly advised: this had been the approach taken by some other institutions, with a clear, specific remit being given to fund managers, for instance restricting divestment solely to coal mining companies. It was commented by these members that the recommendations in October had included a reference to a biennial review, so that the position could be reviewed and changes made if necessary. The decision had been made to move in a certain direction, but slowly, and this should stand.

More specific comments were made in relation to: many of the alternative higher yielding investments identified by one of the fund managers being major users of fossil fuels or (in the case of Zurich) a major insurer of the fossil fuel industry; the original petition having been predicated upon alternative fuel sources being available in sufficient quantity, which was not the case; the original decision having been a moral choice in the right direction, that Court should confirm; the moral basis of that decision having ignored the crucial role of natural gas in fighting fuel poverty in Glasgow and elsewhere; other, alternative, areas for investment existing; evidence of divestment from fossil fuels in other quarters; there being no compelling historical evidence that the endowment funds would have been better or worse off had a decision to divest in the fossil fuel extraction industry been made some time ago: different indices provided different narratives; there being no guidance on what 'significant' detriment meant, and Capital Value risk also needing to be considered rather than simply

focusing in income yield - in this regard there were suggestions of 'stranded asset risk' in relation to the fossil fuel extraction industry, though this is by no means a universally-held view.

Further comments were made that: the previous decision in October had been based on a policy of caution, over a 10 year period and not therefore immediately, with biennial reviews, and that as such Court had been acting responsibly, with good trusteeship; that Court members' responsibilities as trustees included acting in the best interests of the charity, with due care and diligence and with an 'in the round' approach that took cognisance of the institution's reputation - that could include moving forward recommendation 2 in a measured fashion.

It was suggested that a more fine-grained approach would facilitate implementing the recommendations in the context of adhering to trustee duties. As such, it should be possible to identify priorities for divestment, and thus to clarify the scope of a subsequent review of the financial and other impacts. A request was made to check the indemnity situation for Court members. It was noted that the brief to the fund managers for further advice for the present meeting had included the (previously agreed) reference to "direct investment" in the fossil fuel extraction industry, and that the alternative suggestions for investment made by the managers were in line with this instruction.

It was agreed that a more fine-grained approach should be developed bearing in mind the need for Court to comply with its duties as charitable trustees and the benefits of developing a more detailed understanding of how the impact of a decision by Court might be monitored.

CRT/2014/36.4 Conflict Minerals

In 2014, the SRC had supported a motion relating to the Conflict Free Campus Initiative, by calling on the University to make the reduction of the use of conflict minerals a priority in its procurement policy. The issue did not come within the scope of Court's Socially Responsible Investment Policy. Court had agreed, however, to ask a working group to consider the matter; the group had comprised Ken Brown, Marvin Karrasch, Morag Macdonald Simpson, Paul Younger, David Newall and the Head of Procurement, Josephine Gallagher.

Court noted the report, including the working group's conclusion that the introduction into University procurement activity of the Sustainable Procurement Programme (Supply Chain Code of Conduct) was a very positive measure, and while it would not be practical to apply it retrospectively, it went a significant way to addressing key issues in the petition, and that the direction of travel was right. Court approved a recommendation that the response refer to the Code of Conduct, to its use locally at the University, to its promotion by APUC (Advanced Procurement for Universities and Colleges) in the context of consortia arrangements, and to its adoption being promoted more widely on the University website. While noting that APUC, which had developed the Code, was the industry's professional expert body, Court asked that the position relating to any relevant OJEU regulations should be checked.

CRT/2014/36.5 Outcome Agreement 2014-15 to 2016-17

Members had been kept updated since 2012 on the background to, and content of, the University's Outcome Agreement, which was now required to be submitted to the SFC as a condition of funding and which set out what was planned to be delivered in return for Government funding, with a focus on the contribution made towards improving life chances, supporting world-class research and creating sustainable economic growth for Scotland. There had been changes to the process for 2014-15, the most significant of which had been the

introduction of 3-year Outcome Agreements. Court had been provided with details of the 2014-15 to 2016-17 document, at its February 2014 meeting. The document had been updated as of March 2015, with progress against targets identified and some relatively minor changes to the narrative. The document was noted by Court.

CRT/2014/36.6 Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill

At the last meeting, Court had heard that the Bill included clauses designed to address campus extremism, placing a new statutory duty on institutions including universities, colleges and schools to “prevent individuals being drawn into terrorism”.

The Counter-Terrorism & Security Act had received royal assent on 12 February, and the Home Office had then issued statutory guidance on 12 March - for Scotland, and separately for the Rest of the UK. The guidance set out duties the universities would have to address in relation to areas such as: training relevant staff; safety on-line; and welfare and pastoral care. Guidance was still awaited in the area of speakers and events, where strong representations had been made from across the sector and the House of Lords had agreed amendments to the Bill, such that HEIs and the Secretary of State “must have particular regard” to institutions’ duty to ensure freedom of speech and academic freedom.

There had been strong engagement with the draft legislation by the Scottish University Secretaries and by the SRC, and this appeared to have been productive: the Scottish guidance was generally felt to be more moderate in its tone and more practical in its approach.

With respect to arrangements for speakers on campus, and in the context of recent visits by Israeli and Palestinian representatives, it was noted that, given its commitment in particular to academic freedom, the University tried to be as balanced as possible and to promote free speech, within the confines of the law. This included hosting discussions on areas which might be considered controversial. The matter would be raised at Senate for further discussion. Mr Newall was content to receive comments about such visits and University communications relating to these.

CRT/2014/36.7 Appointments of Heads of Research Institute and School

College of MVLS

Institute of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation

Court approved a recommendation that Professor Iain McInnes be re-appointed as Director of the Institute of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation for five years from 1 August 2015.

School of Veterinary Medicine

Court approved a recommendation that Professor Ewan Cameron be re-appointed as Head of the School of Veterinary Medicine for four years from 1 August 2015.

College of Social Sciences

School of Education

Professor Trevor Gale, currently of Deakin University, Australia, had been appointed as Head of the School of Education for 4 years from August 2015, in succession to Professor Robert Davis.

CRT/2014/36.7 SRC Elections

The following candidates had been successful in the Spring 2015 SRC elections and would take up sabbatical officer posts on 1st July 2015:

President:	Liam King
VP Education:	Gemma Gratton
VP Student Activities:	Ameer Ibrahim
VP Student Support:	Una Marie Darragh

CRT/2014/37. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2014/37.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2014/37.1.1 Capex application: Institute of Health and Wellbeing/Social Sciences Hub

Finance Committee had received a capital expenditure application requesting £1.286m in funding for fees to undertake the necessary surveys and design work to inform the preparation of a full business case around the proposal to co-locate the Institute of Health and Wellbeing and the College of Social Science in a single location.

Finance Committee had approved the application. Court endorsed this approval.

CRT/2014/37.1.2 Capex applications

Finance Committee had approved an application for £1.7m of funding as part of an ongoing programme for improvement of central teaching space. For 2014/15, rooms in the Kelvin Building, James Watt South Building, Observatory Building and Boyd Orr Building had been identified as priorities. Finance Committee had also approved a capital expenditure application relating to Phase 2 Imaging, South Glasgow University Hospital, for £29.73m. The Committee had noted that the entire investment would be externally funded and therefore there would be no requirement for University funds. The £1.2m risk that Finance Committee had previously agreed to underwrite had been removed. Finance Committee had further approved a Capex application for the District Heating/CHP Project for £675k to fund a larger sized combined heat and power (CHP) engine rather than the previously approved unit. The Committee had noted the larger engine would double the University's carbon savings, from 2,500 tonnes to 5,000 tonnes per annum, with associated cost savings.

CRT/2014/37.1.3 Finance Key Performance Indicators

Court noted a report on finance-related Key Performance Indicators.

CRT/2014/37.1.4 Endowment Investment Report

Court noted an endowment investment report as at 28 February 2015.

CRT/2014/37.1.5 Financial report

Court noted an Overview of Performance as at 28 February 2015.

The report was noted.

CRT/2014/37.2 Audit Committee

The report was noted. The Committee had been updated about: the appointment of external auditors, the Universities Superannuation Scheme changes and the HE Governance bill. The Committee had received: update reports on actions against recommendations from prior internal audits; reports on recent internal audits of the Pastoral Staffing Model, Ethical Fundraising, Project Management (Research), Project Management (Estates and Buildings and IT Services), Cash Handling and Processes, and the Expenses system. The University's risk register had been noted.

CRT/2014/37.3 Estates Committee

CRT/2014/37.3.1 Estates Committee remit

Court approved an amended remit for the Estates Committee, to reflect governance arrangements for the Estate Strategy.

CRT/2014/37.3.2 CapEx applications

Court noted and endorsed Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications in respect of: Central Learning and Teaching Space in the sum of £1.7m including VAT; Development of Phase 2 Imaging South Glasgow University Hospital in the sum of £29.73m, all of which would be funded from external investment; Institute of Health & Wellbeing (design fees) in the sum of £1,286m including VAT; and District Heating/CHP in the sum of £0.675m including VAT.

The report was noted.

CRT/2014/37.4 Human Resources Committee

CRT/2014/37.4.1 Public Sector Equality Duty - Mainstreaming Report

Court endorsed the HR Committee's approval of the Public Sector Equality Duty - Mainstreaming Report. Such approval was integral to the University meeting its legislative requirements under the Equality Act 2010. The report had also been discussed and approved by the Equality & Diversity Strategy Committee. The Public Sector Equality Duty was set out in the Equality Act 2010 as the 'general equality duty', requiring public authorities, in the exercise of their functions, to have due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other prohibited conduct; Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not; and Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. The specific duties required authorities to report on (and publish) the progress they had made to make the general equality duty integral to the exercise of their functions: to mainstream equality.

CRT/2014/37.4.2 Reappointment Procedure

Court noted that Christine Barr, Director of HR, had reported to the HR Committee the changes recently approved by the Senior Management Group to the appointment arrangements of Heads of School and Directors of Research Institutes. One particular feature of these proposals had been that, where a recommendation was made for the reappointment of a Director of Research Institute, this should be for a further period of 5

years, rather than for just 2 years, as had been proposed when the policy had been introduced in 2010. The HR Committee had supported this proposed change, noting that a 5-year period was more appropriate for staff who were responsible for providing strategic leadership of major research units. Court endorsed this approach.

CRT/2014/37.4.3 Living Wage

Court noted that Christine Barr, Director of HR, had reported to the HR Committee that work was being initiated to explore the potential for the University to become a Living Wage accredited employer. All employees were already paid at this level, but steps would also be proposed in relation to casual workers and those engaged via contractors. Members of the HR Committee had been supportive in principle of this initiative, which had then been considered in more detail by the Senior Management Group. SMG had concluded that the University should, with immediate effect, extend its commitment to pay the Living Wage so as to include casually employed workers (largely student assistants), with an estimated financial impact of £20,000 per annum. Court also supported the intention of SMG to explore fully the requirements for becoming an accredited Living Wage employer, in particular with a view to understanding the nature of the commitment that this would require of contractors working on campus, including those in relation to development of the Gilmorehill Campus in terms of the Capital Plan and Estates Strategy. Should SMG recommend that the University become an accredited Living Wage employer, then this matter should be brought to Court for approval, and this might be done by email correspondence rather than awaiting the June meeting. Court noted a comment that that SRC policy might need to be reviewed in this context, given its close associations with the University.

The report was noted.

CRT/2014/37.5 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

The report was noted. The Committee had received: reports on the University's environmental performance including recycling; on campus security (annual report) and on the Health, Safety & Wellbeing service (annual report); the latest reports from Occupational Health and the Safety & Environmental Protection Services; an update on the Centre for Virus Research safety arrangements for the CL3 (containment) Lab; and an update on the creation of new safety committees..

CRT/2014/38. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2014/39. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 24 June 2015 at 2pm in the Senate Room.

Court - Wednesday 15 April 2015

Principal's Report

Items A : For Discussion

1. Research Funding

Following the outcome of the 2014 REF, we have received details of the proposed allocations from the SFC regarding the Research Excellent Grant (REG) and Research Postgraduate Grant for 2015/16.

The overall REG will increase from £230.7M this year to £231.8M next year and will then effectively be frozen at that level for the following two years (subject to future UK and Scottish Governments' spending review). In addition the Global Excellence Initiative Grant, which had been worth £14M to Universities in 2013/14 and 2014/15 and which was aimed at funding research excellence, has been cut entirely. Taken together this will result in an overall decrease of £12.9M in research funding available to universities in 2015/16 relative to 2014/15.

In addition to this, the formula for allocation of the REG was amended prior to the REF results, with a change to the funding weighting given to research rated as world-leading (4*), compared to work judged to be internationally excellent (3*). This follows the Scottish Government's decision in 2011-12 to remove 2* research, as rated in the 2008 RAE from the REG. The ratio previously 3.11:1 will be adjusted to 3:1. (The increase to a ratio of 3.11:1 had been due to the introduction of the Global Excellence Initiative element, aimed solely at funding 4* research). HEFCE has also changed its ratios for allocation of 4* and 3* from 3:1 to 4:1. The formula has also been made more transparent, separating out the elements of REG in support of charity grant funding (from e.g. BHF, CRUK, Leverhulme, Wellcome), and Research Councils UK funding, from the REG grant distribution driven by the REF outcome.

The REF outcomes, and to a lesser extent the formula change, have resulted in a redistribution of funding across the sector (as in England) with the inevitable consequence that some gain and some lose. The impact of these changes on Glasgow, however, is relatively positive: between 2014-15 and 2017-18 the University's REG funding will increase from £44.8M to £45.8M.

In addition, the Research Postgraduate Grant (RPG) for Glasgow in support of the cost of PhD training has risen from £6.4M in 2014-15 to £7.3M in 2015-16. Though an indicative figure at this stage it represents a welcome rise, driven by our increase in PGR numbers, one of our strategic KPIs in *Glasgow 2020*.

2. Joint Educational Institute – UESTC (China)

At our last meeting, Court heard via the Finance Committee report that the Committee had given in-principle approval, subject to risk management considerations, to the formation of a Joint Educational Institute (JEI) with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC), expanding our existing programmes with UESTC in Chengdu. If successful this would be our second JEI, the first having been secured in partnership with Nankai. Our links with UESTC focus on Engineering, and is largely aimed at UGs while Nankai focuses on Social Sciences, and PG students.

In March I had the pleasure of visiting UESTC to join with them in seeking to advance negotiations with the Ministry of Education, and I am pleased to report that progress continues to be very positive.

These developments are the fruits of our first Internationalisation strategy which was agreed by Senate and Court in 2009/10 and is currently being updated for the next 5 years to 2020. The strategy has been successful in framing and shaping our activity across a range of initiatives and as the KPIs indicate, has been an effective catalyst for progress. As noted, we teach University of Glasgow degrees in collaboration with key partners in China and Singapore Institute of Technology and by next year around 1500 students will be studying for Glasgow degrees in our three hubs in Asia, which is a remarkable achievement in less than 5 years and a tribute to the hard work of many colleagues across the University. In addition to this, we have further plans to develop our transnational education in the coming year.

Details of the Finance's Committees recent further consideration of our JEI plans appear in its report.

Items B: For Information

3. Outcome Agreement

Court will note from its papers that we have submitted our latest update as required on our Outcome Agreements, the third update thus far.

4. Key activities

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

4.1 Academic Development and Strategy

10 March: Attended the Beatson Institute - Board of Governors Meeting.

10 March: Hosted the Adam Smith Business School EQUIS Accreditation Dinner in the Lodging.

14 April: Attended Universities Scotland Main Committee Meeting.

14 April: Attended SFC/SG Liaison Meeting.

4.2 International Activities

25 February–3 March visited Singapore. This included a Prospects/Campaign lunch; an evening reception for Alumni and friends and a meeting with Professor Tan Thiam Soon, President of SIT.

4–6 March: Travelled to Madrid. This included a visit and alumni reception co-hosted by Santander Universities in Santander Financial City. In addition to a tour of the City and its art exhibition, the Director Santander Universities welcomed guests and gave a short address. I gave an update on the Campus development.

As the second part of the Madrid trip, I was invited to speak at the *University of Alcalá Forum: The Role of the University and Public Policies* and within the session on *The financing of the University* gave a presentation exploring and contrasting the financing of Universities in Scotland and the UK. The meeting was attended by many Spanish universities as well as Government officials.

10 March: Welcomed the Latvian Ambassador to the campus.

16–20 March: Visited UESTC, Chengdu and Ministry of Education in Beijing as noted.

26 March: Met the Rector Mr Ahmet Sanic, and Vice-Rector Sannur Aliyev from Qafqaz University, Azerbaijan as part of their visit to the University.

26 March: Met Professor Manuel Hassassian, the ULK representative of the Palestinian Authority.

6–10 April: Travelled to New York to host a major Alumni event in Carnegie Hall. The Lord Provost of Glasgow and Fiona Hyslop, Cabinet Secretary for Culture, Europe and External Affairs attended. This was combined with Scotland Week.

4.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

10 March: Met with Aileen McKechnie, Director of Advanced Learning & Science, Scottish Government.

11 March: Met with representatives from Lloyds/HBOS to discuss potential areas of collaboration.

20 March: Attended the Merchants House of Glasgow Valedictory Dinner for the retiring Lord Dean of Guild and delivered the toast to Glasgow.

26 March: Attended the NCUB Growing Value Scotland Task Force - Steering Group Meeting.

1 April: Met with Andrew Cubie, Chair of the JNC of the USS.

13 April: Delivered a presentation at the Association of Heads of University Administration (AHUA) Spring Conference held in Stirling. AHUA is the representative body for senior University managers (typically Registrars, Chief Operating Officers, Heads of Administration) in the United Kingdom and Ireland. My subject was *A devolved UK: a divergent HE sector?*

4.4. Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

12 March: Senate Guest Night Dinner. The speaker was Dr Bridget McConnell, Chief Executive of Glasgow Life. Bishop John Keenan was awarded an Honorary Fellowship of the University.

23 March: Attended the Mackenzie Lecture/Stevenson Lecture delivered by Professor Mark Blyth, Brown University and provided a few introductory remarks.

24 March: Travelled to London to host a lunch for potential Campus development supporters and then an evening Alumni Event at Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA). RIBA was hosting the Mackintosh Architecture exhibition previously mounted in the Art Gallery in the University.

1 April: hosted the Stone Moot Final Dinner in the Lodging.

Continued monthly meetings with the SRC sabbatical officers.

5. Senior Management Group business

In addition to standing and regular items the following issues were discussed:

SMG Meeting of 19 February 2015

- Strategic Partnerships in Hong Kong
- Admissions update
- Update on Deloitte report in relation to RIO
- Report on integration of Language provision ('TellMeMore') with mobility agenda and Internationalisation
- Leverhulme Trust Applications
- Information Strategy and Business Intelligence

SMG Meeting of 19 March 2015

- SFC outcome agreement
- Revised Entry Targets for Undergraduates for 2015-16
- Open studies
- Report on Complaints Handling at the University of Glasgow - Academic Session 2014-15: Second Quarter Report



Court - Wednesday 15 April 2015

Report from the Secretary of Court

SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 HE Governance Code

A questionnaire for Court self-assessment/feedback on performance was circulated earlier in the year. The governance working group met in March to consider the outcomes of this annual effectiveness review and also, with reference to the Code, to ensure that the University is addressing all its responsibilities in terms of good governance. A report containing recommendations to Court is Annexed. **Is Court willing to approve the recommendations?**

Earlier in the year, Murdoch MacLennan undertook an appraisal of the Convener's performance and will brief Court at the meeting.

A.2 Court Procedural Review Group - Centre for Open Studies

The Court Procedural Review Group met on 1 April to consider an Organisational Change proposal relating to the Centre for Open Studies. Having considered the changes proposed, CPRG has agreed to recommend to Court:

- .1 that the proposals for organisational change should be taken forward by management, without the need for a further report to Court;
- .2 that Senate should be advised of Court's support for the changes proposed and should be offered the opportunity to comment on them;
- .3 that, subject to any concerns that might be raised by Senate, University Services managers should be authorised to implement the changes, subject to full consultation; and
- .4 that every effort should be made to ensure that the proposed organisational change is achieved through voluntary means.

Is Court content to approve these recommendations?

A.3 Socially Responsible Investment Policy – Fossil Fuels

At its meeting on 8 October, Court made a decision in principle to reduce its investment in the fossil fuel extraction industry, in a phased way over a period of 10 years. Court approved the following recommendations:

- 1 that the University's direct investment in the fossil fuel extraction industry should be managed in a controlled manner such that the value of such

investments does not exceed the current level of 10% of the endowment portfolio for any appreciable time period;

- 2 that the current level of investment should be reduced to zero over the next 10 years, subject to Recommendation 3 and biennial re-evaluation of the financial and other impacts of the divestment policy on the University along with the scope for increased investment in renewable energy sources;
- 3 that prior to executing Recommendation 2, a further examination of the financial impact of that Recommendation be conducted through dialogue with the Glasgow University Climate Action Society (GUCAS) and the University's Investment Committee [IAC] to provide assurance to Court as to the limited scale of the prospective financial impact.

The Investment Advisory Committee considered this matter at a meeting on 11 March. IAC received several inputs to that meeting, including from the University's fund managers and from the Glasgow University Climate Action Society.

Finally, Court asked if information could be obtained on any perceived impact the divestment decision might have on income for teaching and research, and on philanthropic giving to the University. The general position on income for academic activity is that the staff who work closely with the fossil fuel industry - including a Court member, Paul Younger - are anxious regarding the possible implications of Court's decision, but that, in the period since October when Court first discussed the matter, there is no specific evidence of financial detriment. With regard to the potential impact on University fundraising, the advice from the Director of Development is that the Court discussion in October and the publicity surrounding it have caused little reaction.

On the basis of the advice obtained, is Court content to confirm its support for the recommendation 2 above? - i.e. that the current level of investment in the fossil fuel extraction industry should be reduced to zero over the next 10 years, subject to biennial re-evaluation of the financial and other impacts of the divestment policy on the University along with the scope for increased investment in renewable energy sources?

A.4 *Conflict Minerals*

Last year, the SRC supported a motion relating to the Conflict Free Campus Initiative, by calling on the University to make the reduction of the use of conflict minerals a priority in its procurement policy. As previously advised, this issue does not come within the scope of Court's Socially Responsible Investment Policy. Court agreed however to ask a working group to consider the matter; the group comprised Ken Brown, Marvin Karrasch, Morag Macdonald Simpson, Paul Younger, David Newall and the Head of Procurement, Josephine Gallagher.

A report and a recommendation to Court are Annexed. **Is Court willing to approve the recommendation?**

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 *Outcome Agreement 2014-15 to 2016-17*

Court may recall that members have been kept updated since 2012 on the background to, and content of, the University's Outcome Agreement, which is now required to be submitted to the SFC as a condition of funding and which sets out what is planned to be delivered in return for Government funding, with a focus on the contribution made towards improving life chances, supporting world-class research and creating sustainable economic growth for Scotland. As previously advised, there were changes to the process for 2014-15, the most significant of which was the introduction of 3 year Outcome Agreements. Court was provided with details of the 2014-15 to 2016-17 document, at its February 2014 meeting. The document has been updated as of March 2015.

B.2 *Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill*

At the last meeting, I reported that the Bill included clauses designed to address campus extremism, placing a new statutory duty on institutions including universities, colleges and schools to "prevent individuals being drawn into terrorism".

The Counter-Terrorism & Security Act received royal assent on 12 February, and the Home Office then issued statutory guidance on 12 March - for Scotland, and separately for the Rest of the UK. The guidance sets out duties the universities will have to address in relation to areas such as; training relevant staff; safety on-line; and welfare and pastoral care. Guidance is still awaited in the area of speakers and events, where strong representations were made from across the sector and the House of Lords agreed amendments to the Bill, such that HEIs and the Secretary of State "must have particular regard" to institutions' duty to ensure freedom of speech and academic freedom.

There has been strong engagement with this draft legislation by the Scottish University Secretaries and by our own SRC, and this appears to have been productive: the Scottish guidance is generally felt to be more moderate in its tone and more practical in its approach.

B.3 *Appointments of Heads of Research Institute and School*

College of MVLS

Institute of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation

Court is asked to approve a recommendation that Professor Iain McInnes be re-appointed as Director of the Institute of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation for five years from 1 August 2015. There has been strong support for this recommendation from the responses within from the Institute.

School of Veterinary Medicine

Court is asked to approve a recommendation that Professor Ewan Cameron be re-appointed as Head of the School of Veterinary Medicine for four years from 1 August 2015. There has been strong support for this recommendation from the responses within from the School.

College of Social Sciences

School of Education

Professor Trevor Gale, currently of Deakin University, Australia, has been appointed as Head of the School of Education for 4 years from August 2015, in succession to Professor Robert Davis.

B.4 *SRC Elections*

The following candidates were successful in the Spring 2015 SRC elections and will take up sabbatical officer posts on 1st July 2015:

President: Liam King
VP Education: Gemma Gratton
VP Student Activities: Ameer Ibrahim
VP Student Support: Una Marie Darragh

B.5 *Honorary Degrees*

There will not be a report from the Council of Senate to the April meeting of Court, because of the timings of the respective meetings. In the meantime, for Court's information, former Prime Minister Gordon Brown and former First Minister Alex Salmond have accepted Senate's invitations to accept an honorary degree of the University. Mr Salmond will receive his award ahead of a public lecture on 21 April. Mr Brown will also receive his award before delivering a public lecture, on 29 April.

Court Working Group

Review of Compliance against Scottish Code of Good HE Governance and of Court Self-Assessment

A. Code Compliance

The Court Governance Working Group, which comprises David Ross, David Anderson (General Council Assessor), Dave Anderson (Employee Representative); Ken Brown, Margaret Morton, Breffni O'Connor and Duncan Ross, has reviewed compliance against each of the 18 Principles in the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, and compliance against the Supporting Guidelines.

The Code's Principles include provisions about the functions of a governing body, its Statement of Primary Responsibilities, frequency and conduct of meetings, appointment and conduct of members, remuneration matters, and effectiveness reviews. The Supporting Guidelines expand on what governing bodies might do to comply with the Principles, and include examples of good practice.

With regard to the Main Principles, the Working Group has concluded that compliance is both good and comprehensive, with a very small number of points to attend to, as follows:

1. The requirement for a clear lay majority. This is currently not met, but Court is seeking to address the matter through a revised Ordinance.
2. The requirement for an evidenced evaluation of the balance of skills, attributes and experience required for membership of the governing body, to inform the recruitment of independent members of the governing body. Although recent recruitment at Glasgow has sought individuals with specific skills, a 'skills matrix' will be developed in due course to show the spectrum of professional skills and experience of current Court members, and to highlight any areas where these might be augmented when future vacancies occur.
3. The requirement for better evidencing to Court of the institution's engagement with stakeholders. Although there is a wide range of such University engagement, including local community-facing activity, this is not always obvious to all Court members. The Working Group has asked the Secretary to consider this point and to report to a future meeting of Court.

With regard to the Supporting Guidelines, the Working Group agreed that the University and Court are compliant. There were some changes in practice made during the development and publishing of the Code, to ensure full compliance. Examples include a revision of Court's Standing Orders; addition of the SRC President to membership of the appointing panel for the appointment of a Principal; and the chairmanship of the Remuneration Committee being altered so that it is no longer chaired by the Convener of Court, but instead by another lay member of Court.

The Working Group agreed that no recommendations to Court are necessary with regard to Code compliance.

B. Court Self-Assessment

The Working Group has reviewed the self-assessment responses. Thirteen completed assessments were received from Court members (8 lay and 5 internal), a response rate of 54% excluding the Rector. The group agreed that all members should be strongly encouraged to participate in the next assessment.

The self-assessment included sections on the role of Court and its members; Court procedures and meetings; Court committees; and governor development.

Overall, the self-assessment was positive, and is well summarised via one comment as "In general, I believe Court is an effective governing body which, through its members, contributes in a positive and constructive way to the successful management of the University". The following themes for further

action emerged from responses given; the Working Group's recommendations appear within each section.

1. *Greater focus on strategic issues and refinement of Court papers*, including comments about the volume of paperwork; some need for improved layout and summaries incorporating clear guidance on action requested of Court; and the need for increased focus within major Court papers. The Working Group agreed that the quality of Court papers was in general good, but **recommends that:**

i) an executive summary should routinely be provided, with complete clarity about what Court is being asked to do in relation to the subject matter, to be clearly stated at the beginning of the executive summary.

2. *Balance of Committee/Court business*. The Working Group agreed that because of the size of Court, business is necessarily devolved to smaller fora, where there is time and practical scope (with smaller numbers of participants) for detailed discussion of relatively specialist topics by members with appropriate skill sets. The Working Group agreed that the decision making process is as correctly balanced as is possible between Court and Committees, but **recommends that:**

i) on a trial basis in the first instance, chairs of Court Committees be asked to highlight a number of key issues arising from the recent meeting, on the cover page for the relevant Committee report to Court. This would involve a short written summary of the topics, to which the chairs will also speak briefly at the Court meeting;

ii) Court members who are not already full members of Committees be invited to attend Committee meetings as observers, on a 'first-come, first-served' basis and - for practical reasons - with a maximum of two attending any one meeting;

iii) the 'AOCB' section of the Court agenda page be amended to include a specific reference to Court members having the opportunity to highlight to the clerk (with reasons) any items of business not listed on the agenda, on which a member wishes a discussion to take place;

3. *Engagement of Court with Senior Management*, in the sense of Court having regular and transparent access to College and other Vice-Principal 'portfolio' activity, including KPIs. **The Working Group recommends that:**

i) the programme of briefings by Heads of College should return to being a priority for the lunchtime briefings on the day of Court meetings; and that these briefings should always include progress against KPIs and sufficient opportunity for interactive discussion.

4. *Governor development opportunities*. Training and CPD were generally considered adequate, but **the Working Group recommends that:**

i) the opportunity be taken to maximise the 'Court day' and optimise interaction between Court members; that student members be given earlier and greater opportunity to meet other Court members; that Committee chairs run a short induction for their new Committee members, to include input by relevant senior management on, for example, specialist terms/acronyms.

A request was made for clarity on personal liability of Court members. The law is complex but, in general terms, governors would not incur personal liability for actions taken in the course of their role as a governor, as long as they have acted honestly and reasonably. Court members have certain fiduciary duties and duties of skill and care. In observing these duties they must act bona fide in the best interests of the University, must not make any secret profit or gain at the University's expense, nor fetter their discretion to act in the best interests of the University, nor place themselves in a position where interests may conflict with those of the University. It is unlikely that a Court member would be held liable for breach of duty or for acting negligently unless she/he had been grossly negligent. For the purposes of Charity legislation, members of Court are regarded as 'charity trustees', and must act in the interests of the charity.

Conflict Free Campus Initiative (Conflict Minerals)

Background

In 2014, the SRC supported a motion relating to the Conflict Free Campus Initiative, by calling on the University to make the reduction of the use of conflict minerals a priority in its procurement policy.

A Court Working Group was set up to consider the matter.

The Working Group has met and discussed this matter with representatives of the group behind the Initiative, on two occasions, for the second of which the petitioners revisited the petition paper to focus on those points that they considered were of most importance. The working group also undertook some enquiries about the current regulatory framework for HEIs and about the feasibility/practicalities of action that might be taken in response to the SRC motion.

Summary of initial meeting

While being supportive of the broad aims behind the petition, the Working Group had a number of concerns arising from its initial discussion of the requests, including:

- the feasibility and practicality of demonstrating full - and complicated - supply chains being 'conflict free', including the practicality of a full search for compliance potentially being required for each goods order;
- the likely impossibility of accessing information from some countries;
- the definition of the 'Conflict Minerals' scope not being entirely clear.

There were also some compliance and governance implications, such as HE collaborative/consortia agreements having fixed terms and conditions and contract format; and relevant legislation EU or UK possibly not permitting certain actions.

At the first meeting, the key wishes of the petition were clarified by representatives as being:

- for the University to change its procurement policy for future contracts, to prioritise companies which were making efforts to do due diligence with regard to the supply chain for Conflict Minerals, with companies being asked to disclose their policies. This would raise awareness and help to gradually improve the situation;
- that (readily accessible) lists might be used, including ranked lists, which identified companies who were trying to address the issue of Conflict Minerals within their policies;
- The onus would be on companies, rather than the University, to investigate sources. There exists an OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas, which might be used in this respect.

Summary of second meeting

By way of further focus, the petitioners subsequently asked the University publicly to recognise and act on the issue of Conflict Minerals (Tin, Tungsten, Tantalum and Gold) and their use in electronic goods, as well as their illicit extraction and trade which served to perpetuate violent conflicts, with emphasis placed on the issue due to its

significance in the continuation of one of world's largest conflicts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and to take measures including encouraging its contracted electronics suppliers to adopt the framework of OECD Due Diligence, which included identifying and assessing risks in supply chains and ensuring audits of these.

At the second meeting, while the working group had similar concerns about the feasibility and practicality of the (updated) requests being made, the petitioners' attention was drawn by the Working Group to the University's Sustainable Procurement Programme (Supply Chain Code of Conduct) (attached at **Appendix 1**), which had been adopted in late 2014 in the context of a programme of the same name led by the Advanced Procurement for Universities and Colleges (APUC) consortium. As indicated in its preface, the document is being incorporated into all local University of Glasgow procurement and supply chain activities including tendering and contract procedures.

While the document does not apply to contracts concluded in the past, it is wide ranging in its ambit and in particular the references to the following are highlighted as having particular resonance for the Conflict Minerals matter:

1. Current and potential suppliers are asked to acknowledge their compliance with the principles of the Supply Chain Code of Conduct with respect to their organisation and their supply chain. Acknowledgement of compliance is now a requirement of contracts concluded locally with the University, and as such there would be enforceable sanctions for material breach;
2. The Code contains specific references to Social Compliance, covering areas including: not using forced, involuntary or underage labour; provision of suitable working conditions and terms; and the fair treatment of employees;
3. The Code contains requirements relating to Ethical and Environmental Compliance.

The APUC Supply Chain Code of Conduct is also used by 8 of the HE consortia for procurement activity in Scotland; this applies to local & collaborative negotiated contracts within APUC's remit. In addition, APUC is in negotiation with the London Universities Purchasing Consortium (LUPC) (IT Agreements) to include the Code of Conduct in all new (future) framework agreements. LUPC is a professional buying organisation which generates savings and better value through the collaborative procurement of goods and services. In the meantime, APUC is prioritising approaching key collaborative providers to embrace the Code as a goodwill gesture in existing (current) framework agreements. The supplier self-certification website '*Sustain*', which would reflect such adopting of the Code by providers, is in live test.

Conclusions

The working group considers that the introduction of the Sustainable Procurement Programme (Supply Chain Code of Conduct) is a very positive measure, and while it would not be practical - nor indeed potentially enforceable - to apply it retrospectively, it goes a significant way to addressing key issues in the petition, and that the 'direction of travel' is right. As such the group **recommends to Court** that a response to the petition be sent to refer to the Code of Conduct, to its use locally at the University of Glasgow, to its promotion by APUC in the context of consortia arrangements, and to its adoption being promoted more widely on the University website.

April 2015

SUSTAINABLE PROCUREMENT PROGRAMME

SUPPLY CHAIN CODE OF CONDUCT

The University of Glasgow has adopted the following Supply Chain Code of Conduct document in alignment with the sustainable procurement programme led by Advanced Procurement for Universities and Colleges (APUC). This policy is a part of University's Procurement Policy and incorporated into the all procurement and supply chain activities including tendering and contract procedures.

For any issues or concerns relating to University of Glasgow Sustainable Procurement Programme, please contact the Procurement Office at procurementhelpline@glasgow.ac.uk

Head of Procurement

University of Glasgow

APUC Supply Chain Code of Conduct

APUC and its client community of Colleges and Universities are committed to carrying out procurement activities in an environmentally, socially, ethically and economically responsible manner and to entering into agreements and contracts with suppliers that share and adhere to its vision. To demonstrate this commitment, current and potential suppliers are asked to acknowledge their compliance with the principles of the APUC Supply Chain Code of Conduct, below, with respect to their organisation and their supply chain.

With respect to **Social Compliance** suppliers shall:

Not use forced, involuntary or underage labour

- Employees should be free to choose their employment and leave that employment without hold by financial deposit or personal items.
- Forced, bonded or involuntary prison labour shall not be used.
- Support the effective abolition of child labour.
- Comply with the national minimum age for employment, or minimum age 15, whichever is the higher unless a lower local minimum age is permitted under International Labour Organisation (ILO) convention 138.
- Where any child is found to be engaged in or performing child labour, to provide support for that child to enable them to complete, as a minimum, their compulsory education (even if they shall cease to be involved in child labour), or an equivalent education level, as provided for under the UN Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Such support by the supplier should recognise and not prove detrimental to the conditions of the child or those that their work supports.

Provide suitable working conditions and terms

- At least statutory minimum wages (or if none, a realistic living wage) must be paid without discrimination to all employees and all non-statutory deductions must be with the consent of the employee.
- Working hours must not be excessive (not over 48 hours per week, excluding overtime) and must allow for at least 1 day off for each 7 day period on average. Working beyond this should be non-regular and of employees own will.
- A safe and hygienic working environment must be provided, including any catering or accommodation areas. Any hazardous working, as defined by ILO, should only be carried out by persons aged 18 years or over.
- All equipment must be safe for use and processes must allow a safe working environment.
- Policies and processes must be in place for recording and eliminating occurrence/reoccurrence of health and safety related incidents.

Treat employees fairly

- Allow employees the freedom of association to join (but not be forced to join), or be represented by, a trade union or similar organisation of their choice, and be free to leave such organisations.
- Not discriminate or unfairly treat any employee for any reason including education, social class / caste, nationality, trade union membership or any of the 9 Protected Characteristics of the UK Equality Act 2010.
- Provide a workplace free from discrimination, harassment or victimisation.

- Treat all employees with respect and dignity, and not accept inequality as justifiable on a basis of culture.
- Remunerate all employees equally at the same employment grade, regardless of any characteristics listed above, unless statutory conditions require otherwise.

With respect to Ethical Compliance & Economic Development Suppliers shall:

- As a minimum, comply with all laws and regulations of the countries they are working in, manufacturing in or trading with, as applicable.
- Not be involved in any way with acts of corruption or bribery, or support acts of violence or terrorism or abuse of individual people or communities.
- Not force unsustainable or unfair contract terms on their suppliers, or throughout their supply chain, nor allow unfair exploitation of a dominant market or customer position.
- Support fair trade conditions for producers, where applicable.
- As a minimum, comply with all financial regulations and taxations of the countries they are working in, manufacturing in or trading with, as applicable.
- Include community benefit delivery in the locality of where the contract is performed (including publishing and delivering levels of local training and employment opportunities etc.).
- Appoint sub-contractors through an open and fair process such as public advertising of such opportunities wherever possible.
- Act at all times with respect and integrity, including open and transparent accounting.
- Allow staff protection if reporting misconduct or raising concerns with respect to their own, or another organisation, and ensure all affected staff are treated in a fair and transparent manner.

With respect to Environmental Compliance Suppliers shall:

- As a minimum, comply with all local and national environmental laws, regulations and directives of the countries they are working in, manufacturing in or trading with, as applicable.
- Actively avoid causing environmental damage and/or negative environmental impact through manufacture and supply of the goods or services and disposal of supply chain waste.
- Have a business plan in place, and be acting on it, to minimise their environmental impact year on year and adopting or working towards internationally recognised environmental standards and/or behaviours.
- Encourage the development and use of environmentally friendly technologies.
- Promote positive environmental impacts (such as reduced carbon emissions, better carbon management, waste management and water management, reduced pollution levels and technological improvements) through their activities wherever possible.

Supplier Commitment

I, the undersigned, acting as a representative of the Company, hereby confirm that the Company adheres to the APUC Code of Conduct and shall ensure its supply chain adheres to the Code of Conduct also, in order to enforce and promote sound social, ethical, environmental and economic practises.

Signed.....

Name of the Company.....

Position.....

Date.....

Supply Chain Code of Conduct copyright © 2013 APUC Ltd.

APUC 'Sustain'

Is a collaborative project to understand the Social, Ethical, Environmental and Economic standards of our suppliers

With a range of parties in our Working Group

Uses Sector spend and supplier information to identify areas of risk and opportunities for scope and influence

Provides opportunity for **1** supplier site assessment, not numerous and is FREE for suppliers

Allows supply chain (sub supplier) information to be gathered

Uses our Code of Conduct covering Social, Ethical, Economic and Environmental issues as our standard to assess supplier compliance against.

Driven by actual Sector contracts and spends, through the Sector wide contract database 'Hunter'.

The website is currently in Phase II development and testing. Planned go live will be late Summer 2014.

Supply Chain Code of Conduct copyright © 2013 APUC Ltd.



Court – Wednesday 15 April 2015

**Report from the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on
25 March 2015**

Brief description of the paper

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

Action Requested

A Items – for action

CA/2014/53. Capex application: Institute of Health and Wellbeing/Social Sciences Hub

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting £1.27m in funding for fees to undertake the necessary surveys and design work to inform the preparation of a full business case around the proposal to co-locate the Institute of Health and Wellbeing and the College of Social Science in a single location.

Finance Committee approved the application.

Court's endorsement of this approval is sought

B Items – for noting

CA/2014/51. Capex application: Learning and Teaching investment

Finance Committee received an application for £1.7m of funding as part of an ongoing programme for improvement of central teaching space. For 2014/15, rooms in the Kelvin Building, James Watt South Building, Observatory Building and Boyd Orr Building had been identified as priorities.

Noting that £1.7m had been identified in the current capital plan for this work, the Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/52. Capex application: Phase 2 Imaging, South Glasgow University Hospital

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application setting out the total cost of Phase 2 Imaging investment: £29.73m. The Committee noted that the entire investment would be externally funded and therefore there would be no requirement for University funds. The £1.2m risk that Finance Committee had previously agreed to underwrite has been removed.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/54. Capex application: District Heating/CHP Project

The Committee received an application for £675k to fund a larger sized combined heat and power (CHP) engine rather than the previously approved unit. The Committee noted the larger engine would double the University's carbon savings, from 2,500 tonnes to 5,000 tonnes per annum, with associated cost savings.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/57. Finance Key Performance Indicators

Finance Committee received a report on Finance Key Performance Indicators, showing details of KPI data for UK universities that are of a similar size and nature to Glasgow. The paper shows comparisons across the following areas: total income; year on year growth; funding council growth; tuition fees growth; research income growth and other income growth.

CA/2014/58. Endowments Investment Report as at 28 February 2015

Finance Committee noted the Endowments Investment Reports.

CA/2014/61. Overview of Performance as at 28 February 2015

Finance Committee received the overview of performance as at 28 February 2015 noting the full year outlook was £11.8m, £6.1m higher than budget.

University of Glasgow

Finance Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 25 March 2015

Melville Room, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:

Mr Graeme Bissett, Mr Ken Brown (Convener), Mr Robert Fraser, Dr Carl Goodyear, Ms Margaret Morton, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Ms Breffni O'Connor, Mr David Ross, Dr Duncan Ross, Mr Iain Stewart

In attendance:

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

Apologies:

Mr Paul Brady

CA/2014/48. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 14 January 2015

The minutes of Finance Committee held on 14 January 2015 were approved.

CA/2014/49. Matters arising

CA/2014/41. University of Glasgow / UESTC Joint Educational Institute

The Principal updated the Committee on positive discussions with UESTC and the Ministry of Education in Beijing. The Ministry was supportive of the application to develop a Joint Educational Institute and the details would be worked out over the next few months, with a view to signing the final agreement in September.

The Committee noted that the risk management issues would be addressed, and in particular the issues around liability. Advice on this matter was awaited from the University's auditors.

CA/2014/50. Conflicts of Interest

There were no declarations.

CA/2014/51. Capex application: Learning and Teaching investment (paper 5.1.1)

Finance Committee received an application for £1.7m of funding as part of an ongoing programme for improvement of central teaching space. For 2014/15, rooms in the Kelvin Building, James Watt South Building, Observatory Building and Boyd Orr Building had been identified as priorities.

The investment was prioritised by a Committee led by the Vice Principal Learning & Teaching and the Committee was satisfied that the rooms identified were the highest priorities for this year.

The Secretary of Court noted that this ongoing maintenance and improvement work was crucial in order to maintain a high standard of teaching space. The work would address fabric, services and AVIT requirements and represented an essential investment in the existing University estate, which was required to be done alongside the new capital developments which would be taking place.

Noting that £1.7m had been identified in the current capital plan for this work, the Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/52. Capex application: Phase 2 Imaging, South Glasgow University Hospital (paper 5.1.2)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application setting out the total cost of Phase 2 Imaging investment - £29.73m. The Senior Vice Principal noted that a further application may come to the Committee relating to a fourth floor which the NHS wished to add to the development. The current proposal for a building of three floors had been granted planning permission.

The Committee noted that the entire investment would be externally funded and therefore there would be no requirement for University funds. The £1.2m risk that Finance Committee had previously agreed to underwrite has been removed.

The Committee wished its thanks and congratulations to be conveyed to Professor Dominiczak and her team for successfully achieving this major investment for the University.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/53. Capex application: Institute of Health and Wellbeing/Social Sciences Hub (paper 5.1.3)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting £1.27m in funding for fees to undertake the necessary surveys and design work to inform the preparation of a full business case around the proposal to co-locate the Institute of Health and Wellbeing and the College of Social Science in a single location.

The Committee noted that the project provides an opportunity to bring together areas of research and teaching previously undertaken in multiple locations across the campus and off campus. It will meet the University's obligation to bring the MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit (SPHSU) back to Gilmorehill and will provide an opportunity for the closely aligned College of Social Sciences and Institute of Health and Wellbeing (predominantly an MVLS research institute) to be physically closer together. An additional benefit will be realised

in bringing together researchers and realising new PG teaching opportunities as the College embarks on an ambitious interdisciplinary strategy.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Director of Estates outlined the governance processes which had been approved by Court for development and approval of individual projects in the campus development. All individual business cases would be put before Finance Committee for scrutiny before commencement of each project.

Court had agreed that Finance Committee would be authorised to approve full business cases for individual projects up to £25m and would make a recommendation to Court, whose approval would be required, for any project in excess of £25m.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/54. Capex application: District Heating/CHP Project (paper 5.1.4)

The Committee received an application for £675k to fund a larger sized combined heat and power (CHP) engine rather than the previously approved unit.

Director of Estates reminded the Committee that it had been stated in the previous Capex paper that a further application would be presented, should the development of the business case for the larger engine show operational and economic benefit to the University.

The Committee noted the larger engine would double the University's carbon savings, from 2,500 tonnes to 5,000 tonnes per annum, with associated cost savings. Overall, the engine was estimated to achieve a net reduction on costs of approximately £7m over the 15-year life of the engine.

The Director of Finance confirmed that he was content with the figures that had been produced. The Director of Estates noted that Professor Paul Younger, Professor of Energy Engineering, and his team had assisted with the calculations, bringing to bear their academic expertise.

The Committee noted the ongoing side benefits, including learning applications for Engineering students and the opportunity to run a research project linked to the CHP project.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2014/55. Annual TRAC Return for 2013/14 (paper 5.2)

The Committee received a report giving an overview of the Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) Return for 2013/14. The TRAC return had been submitted end January 2015 and the TRAC (Teaching) return at end February 2015.

The Committee noted that TRAC was introduced across the UK Higher Education Sector in 1999 as a Government accountability requirement with the introduction of full economic costing for Research Council applications. Another of the Government's objectives was to support institutional management, through better understanding of costs within individual institutions.

Finance Committee noted that the TRAC deficit has decreased from £20.4m to £11.9m. The movement of £8.5m is the effect of an increase in year on year operating surplus of £9.7m

(£10m to £19.7m, consistent with the University's statutory accounts) and offset by an increase in the Infrastructure & RFI Adjustment driven by increase in net assets.

The proportion of costs allocated to teaching has increased, due to a significant increase in student numbers in 2013/14.

The Committee noted that the cost accounting methodology was reviewed over time by HEFCE and other Funding Councils. The submission was compliant with requirements placed upon all universities, in terms of the methodology adopted, and this was verified annually by Internal Audit.

The Committee noted the report.

CA/2014/57. Finance KPIs (paper 6.1)

Finance Committee received a report on Finance Key Performance Indicators, showing details of KPI data for UK universities that are of a similar size and nature to Glasgow. The paper shows comparisons across the following areas: total income; year on year growth; funding council growth; tuition fees growth; research income growth and other income growth.

In welcoming the report, and while acknowledging the challenges present in drawing out reliable narrative from the fairly substantial amounts of data presented, the Committee agreed it would be useful to have a brief commentary to accompany the charts, and that the analysis might be expanded to include operating surplus and long-term debt. The Group Financial Controller would provide some narrative and analysis of the charts at the next meeting.

The Committee noted the KPIs.

CA/2014/58. Endowments Investment Reports as at 28 February 2015 (paper 6.2)

The Committee noted the Investment Managers Reports as at 28 February 2015.

CA/2014/59. Minutes of Investment Advisory Committee held on 11 March 2015 (paper 6.3)

The Convenor of Court provided a summary of discussions on Smart Beta, noting that careful consideration was being given to introducing a balance between passive and active investment management. There would soon be a requirement to carry out a tender exercise for the funds managed by Newton, and the Investment Advisory Committee had agreed to commission research into the desirability of investing a portion of the funds in a more passive form of investment management, while retaining ethical restrictions on the investments.

Finance Committee noted the minutes.

CA/2014/60. Budget process

The Senior Vice Principal tabled a paper providing the Committee with an update on the current status of the budget for 2015/16 and financial forecasts to 2017/18. Finance Committee noted

the forecast of March 2015 projects surpluses of £9.3m in 2015/16, £12.3m in 2016/17 and £15.7m in 2017/18.

Finance Committee noted that the Senior Management Group had discussed the position at a recent meeting and had agreed a series of actions to be taken ahead of the final presentation of the 2015/16 budget to Finance Committee and Court in June 2015.

The Committee welcomed the update, noting that the insight into the planning cycle as it developed was helpful.

CA/2014/61. Overview of Performance as at 28 February 2015 (paper 7.1)

The Group Financial Controller provided an overview of performance as at 28 February 2015. Finance Committee noted that at Period 7 the operating surplus was £23.9m, £8.3m higher than budget.

The full year outlook was £11.8m which was £6.1m higher than budget.

Tuition fees are forecast to be £0.4m lower than budget, with Social Sciences and MVLS down, offset by £1.2m increase in Science and Engineering.

Salaries were £3.5m lower than budget, based on detailed reviews of salary costs across the Colleges.

There was £178.8m in net funds as at end of Period 7. Cash inflow was £19.2m for the year to date. The closing cash forecast for 2014/15 was £127.6m.

The Committee also received a report on Procurement, which identified the progress made in increasing the proportion of purchases made from approved suppliers. The non-compliance run rate was 10.4% (calculated as a rolling 12 month average from January 2014).

CA/2014/62. Capital Projects approved by Finance Committee (paper 7.1.1)

The Committee received a paper setting out a summary of Capex applications which had been approved and were ongoing. Finance Committee welcomed this information, noting the helpful format, particularly the notes explaining the status of projects.

CA/2014/63. Debtors Report as at 28 February 2015 (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received a report of debtors as at 28 February 2015. The Committee noted that overall debt levels had decreased year-on-year from £65.25m at February 2014 to £42.06m at February 2015. Student and sponsor tuition fee debt had decreased from £40.76m at February 2014 to £17.64m at February 2015. It was noted that student and sponsor debt levels were lower than prior year due to earlier receipt of SAAS (Student Awards Agency for Scotland) payments. The top ten sponsor balances represent 59% of total sponsor balances outstanding.

An aged-debt analysis was provided of all student debt as at February 2015. This stood at £12.7m, a decrease of £4.4m since January 2015. £0.907m had been passed to external collectors.

The Committee noted that commercial debt stood at £21.69m at February 2015, an increase from £20.8m at February 2014.

CA/2014/64. Date of Next Meeting

Date of next meeting: Wednesday 27 May 2015, 2pm, Melville Room.

*Prepared by: Fiona Quinn, Clerk to Committee, fiona.quinn@glasgow.ac.uk
Last modified on: Monday 30 March 2015*

Court - Wednesday 15 April 2015

Report from the Audit Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on Wednesday 18 February 2015 are attached for information. **There are no specific matters requiring Court's approval or decision.**

The Committee was updated about: the appointment of external auditors, the Universities Superannuation Scheme changes and the HE Governance bill.

The Committee received: update reports on actions against recommendations from prior internal audits; reports on recent internal audits of the Pastoral Staffing Model, Ethical Fundraising, Project Management (Research), Project Management (Estates and Buildings and IT Services), Cash Handling and Processes, and the Expenses system. The University's risk register and recent updates to it were noted.

Prepared by Deborah Maddern

7.4.15

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Audit Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 18 February 2015 in the Melville Room

Present:

Dr Paul Brady (Chair) (PB), Mr Neil Menzies (NM), Ms Lesley Sutherland (LS), Mr David Watt (DJW)

In attendance:

Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance) (RF), Ms Denise Gallagher (PWC) (DG), Mr Nick Holland (Group Financial Controller) (NH), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk) (DM), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal) (AM), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court) (DN), Ms Lindsey Paterson (PWC) (LP), Mr Stephen Reid (Ernst & Young) (SR), Dr Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary) (DAW)

Apologies: Ms Heather Cousins (HC), Mr Jo Elliot (JE), Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young) (KB)

AUDIT/2014/26. Announcements

Lesley Sutherland was welcomed to the Committee as a full member, having attended the previous meeting as an observer. David Watt was welcomed to his first meeting as a new member of the Committee. Stephen Reid was welcomed back to the committee, given the recent reappointment of Ernst & Young as external auditors.

AUDIT/2014/27. Minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2014

The minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2014/28. Matters Arising

.1) Audit Committee membership - new member, including declaration of interests

David Watt had been appointed as a member of the Committee for 4 years with effect from 1 February 2015. He had in his declaration of interests form declared occasional consultancy work for KPMG, and this was formally noted.

.2) Appointment of External Auditors

Ernst & Young had been appointed as external auditors for 3 years from 1 February 2015.

.3) Pension Scheme USS - update

Negotiations between the Employers Pension Forum of Universities UK (UUK) and UCU had led to agreement on a joint proposal for a revised benefit structure for USS. This joint proposal had been approved at the JNC meeting on 29 January without a vote, and put forward to the USS Trustee Board. This outcome had followed more than a year of discussions and negotiations aimed at developing a viable joint proposal. The reforms proposed were designed to address the deficit in the scheme and to mitigate the risk that contribution rates would become unaffordable for employers and employees alike.

In summary, the proposal was that final salary accruals would cease as at 31 March 2016, with benefits built up before this date being protected. Future defined benefits would be built up in the Career Revalued Benefits (CRB) section of the scheme. Benefits in this section would be based on the first £55,000 of the member's pensionable salary, based on actual pay. Any pensionable salary over this threshold could be pensioned through a new Defined Contribution (DC) section of the scheme.

The setting of the assumptions by the Trustees on the technical provisions allowed for the employers (blended) contribution rate to be set at 18%. There would now be a statutory consultation process with current and prospective USS members, expected to begin in mid-March, for at least 60 days.

.4) HE Governance Bill - update

A government consultation on the Bill had concluded at the end of January. The key proposals on which institutions had responded included the possibility of a transfer of HEI constitutional powers currently held by the Privy Council, to a Scottish body; a widening of the definition of academic freedom; the issue of election of governing body chairs; and membership of the academic body and Court itself.

The Committee would be kept updated.

.5) Updated Charter and Annual Report of PWC

The documents had been circulated, with amendments (including PWC's statement of assurance) as agreed at (and since) the last meeting, and which in part reflected new SFC reporting requirements.

AUDIT/2014/29. Implementation of Outstanding Audit Recommendations

Finance Office

Since the last meeting, 8 new audit actions had arisen, 10 actions against audit reports had been completed, 8 partially implemented, 19 were being progressed and there was one recommendation where action had not yet commenced.

A separate, detailed, update report had been provided on progress on Departmental Compliance, the report having already been shared with the internal auditors. The report included clarification with respect to use of locally held financial records, to the effect that when decisions were being made by a College (including at operational meetings), all of the numbers that were being referred to came from (and reconciled to) the primary systems of the University. It had been agreed that, from a risk perspective, this was acceptable, and the matter was now closed off.

A separate report had also been provided on progress on the Research Management System, and was taken together with item 30.3, below.

Departments other than the Finance Office

Key points to note from audit reports were:

Risk Management

There had been five medium category findings. Two had been fully implemented: the format and timing of annual risk workshops had been refreshed; and risk had been formally placed on the agenda for College Management Group meetings. One recommendation had been partially implemented: updating the University's risk management policy. Two recommendations were not yet implemented, but would be addressed in the first half of 2015.

The Committee noted that PWC had undertaken risk workshops for each College and were in the process of collating information. The Committee agreed that it would

maintain its interest in this area, given that the process was not yet fully embedded in the Colleges. The next Audit Plan would include reference to compliance in this area.

Action PWC

Houses in Multiple Occupancy – licence arrangements

The report included two medium category findings. These had both been addressed: Standards of delivery on HMO tasks had been agreed with Sanctuary Housing Association; and University HMO policy and procedures had been formally documented.

Contract management – Estates & Buildings

A report on progress against each of the recommendations had been included in the report to the Committee from the Director of Estates & Buildings, submitted for the pre-meeting briefing, and was formally tabled. In summary, the recommendations of this audit were being actively addressed. While none had yet been fully implemented, significant progress had been made against each of them. Continuing progress would be reported to the May and September meetings of the Audit Committee.

International Activity

The report had included four recommendations categorised as medium. Two, a review of reporting arrangements, and a reminder to staff on the importance of completing risk assessments, had been implemented. The other two were in the process of being implemented: Establishment of SMART objectives; and a review of the criteria for monitoring success of partnerships.

Data Assurance - Performance & Development Review

This audit had reviewed the paperwork for the annual Performance & Development Review exercise for academic staff. The forms used for this exercise were populated by financial data, student data and publications data drawn from corporate business systems. The audit had found that the processes for transferring data to the Performance & Review forms were robust. There had been no recommendations.

Consultancy Policy

The report had included three medium category recommendations: that Heads of College should take responsibility for ensuring compliance with University consultancy policy in their college; that Staff in the Contracts team should ensure that proper authorisation was in place prior to a consultancy contract being signed; and that Finance Office should provide quarterly management reports on consultancy income per member of staff. The report had been discussed at the Senior Management Group, and all parties had committed to implementing the recommendations

Capital Investment Projects

A report on progress against each of the recommendations had been included in the report to the Committee from the Director of Estates & Buildings, submitted for the pre-meeting briefing, and was formally tabled. There were three medium recommendations. One of these (a threshold beyond which capital project overspends required to be reported to the CapEx Committee) was already in place at the time of the audit. The other two were partially implemented. These were: to introduce a resource strategy in relation to managing capital projects; and to formalise the means of managing capital projects and incorporate this in a capital investment policy document.

The Committee was also updated on IT Penetration testing, to the effect that testing of systems was ongoing on a regular basis. It was agreed that a further penetration test would be undertaken by PWC, and the results reported to September Audit Committee.

Action PWC

AUDIT/2014/30. Internal Audit Update

The Committee noted a status update on reviews being undertaken during 2014/15. In discussions with management, Payroll work had been split into three self-contained reviews and it was planned to bring together departmental compliance with the budgetary control work. There was no impact upon the agreed number of days in the plan.

Six reviews had been completed since the last Audit Committee. No reports had been classified as critical risk. The key messages for the Committee on the completed reviews were as follows:

30.1 Pastoral Staffing Model

The review had included 4 medium recommendations relating to the staffing model and its costings/budget, and to the need for formal documentation in relation to governance, which were being addressed. It was noted that the audit had been requested as an addition to the audits in the management plan, and that the chair would be consulted ahead of any further such non-scheduled audits.

30.2 Governance: Ethical Fundraising

The review had identified that there was scope for improvements to be implemented to strengthen the control environment in relation to governance, policy, compliance and monitoring, specifically in relation to the University's ethical principles and approval of donations. This was being addressed by the service, and it was noted that in the context of major fundraising over the coming decade, a revised system of delegation of authorities for acceptance of gifts/donations would be implemented.

30.3 Project Management: Research

Overall, the review had noted a requirement for improvements to be made in order to ensure that consistency was achieved over research projects across the University, and that the risks of each project were identified and managed accordingly. Five medium risk findings had been identified, including no formal project management methodology being in place for use in research projects, and a lack of review and oversight of research projects at a portfolio level in order to facilitate the monitoring of the extent to which the University's research objectives were being met. The overall risk assessment was 'high'.

The Committee noted planned improvements, including the Research Support Office identifying a number of issues in relation to management of research projects, and the preparation of a project plan to address each of these as part of the Transforming Research Management project. Planned improvements within this project included: the revision of roles and responsibilities in relation to management of research projects, with the introduction of a new role of Project Coordinator within dedicated Research Support teams in each College; establishment of a central EU grant project management team; and standardised reporting templates and processes for use across research projects.

The Committee had also received from NH a detailed update on implementation of the Research Management System, and noted a concern from RF about the importance of appointing staff with appropriate skills sets for the system to function optimally. The Committee agreed that senior management ownership of this area was vital and requested that the SMG examine the issues, with an update from that group to come to the May 2015 meeting of the Committee, for further discussion.

Action AM

30.4 Project Management: Estates and Buildings and IT Services

The review had considered the design and operating effectiveness of key controls relating to project management processes with Estates and Buildings and IT Services, with four medium risk findings identified, including: a lack of a standardised methodology for use across all projects; no central oversight of significant projects in order to facilitate effective portfolio management; and a lack of consistency between the project management documentation and templates used on projects both within Estates and Buildings and IT Services.

The Committee noted the management response, which had accepted the points made in the report, and noted also the good progress that had already been made in standardising estates project management. The Committee requested that IT Services be advised of the high priority that the Committee placed on early implementation of the recommendations.

Action DN

30.5 Cash Handling/Processes

The audit had evaluated the design and operating effectiveness of key controls in relation to cash handling processes across the University, for both till and petty cash floats. Key processes had been reviewed, to determine aspects including: whether appropriate policies and procedures were in place and compliance was monitored; if physical access to cash was appropriately restricted and segregation of duties enforced; and whether banking and reconciliations were performed. No high risk or medium findings had been made; 5 low risk findings had been made. Management had noted the points and processes would be reviewed with a view to optimising procedures.

30.6 Expenses

Overall, the review had concluded that the controls over expenses were operating effectively as currently designed. The audit had also noted plans to withdraw the paper-based claim system in early 2015, and agreed this should serve to further strengthen the operation of controls in the Expenses process. Two areas of low risk control design improvement had been identified relating to: (i) the claimant's responsibility to ensure their claims were in line with policy and allocated to the correct project code and (ii) formalising the process for approving claims outwith policy.

The Committee was pleased to note progress in this area, agreeing that this should be reflected in its annual report.

AUDIT/2014/31. Risk Register

The University Register was noted.

AUDIT/2014/32. Any Other Business

There was no other business

AUDIT/2014/33. Date of Next Meeting

Monday 18 May 2015 at 2pm Venue TBC
Pre-meeting briefing for Committee members 12.30pm

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

Court - Wednesday 15 April 2015

Report from the Estates Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Estates Committee held on 13 March 2015 are attached.

Action Requested

Court is asked to:

Approve an amended remit (**Annex 1**) for the Estates Committee, to reflect governance arrangements for the Estate Strategy.

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

Central Learning and Teaching Space in the sum of £1.7m (inc VAT) (EC/2014/31.3.1 refers);

Development of Phase 2 Imaging South Glasgow University Hospital (SGUH) in the sum of £29.73m, all of which would be funded from external investment (EC/2014/31.3.2 refers);

Institute of Wellbeing (design fees) in the sum of £1,286,400 inc VAT (EC/2014/31.3.3 refers); and

District Heating/CHP in the sum of £0.675m (inc VAT) (EC/2014/31.3.4 refers)

Note the remainder of the minute.

UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW

Estates Committee

Minute of the meeting held in the Estates and Buildings Conference Room on Friday 13 March 2015

Present: Mrs A Allen, Professor N Juster, Professor K Lury, Mr D Milloy, Ms M Morton (Convener), Professor A Muscatelli, Mr D Newall, Ms B O'Connor, Mr A Seabourne, Professor P Younger

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

Apologies: Mr R Fraser

EC/2014/26 Minute of the meeting held on 7 January 2015

The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2014/27 Matters Arising

EC/2014/27.1 Western Infirmary Transfer (EC/2014/18.1 refers)

The Committee noted that the NHS had not yet formally served the required 12 month notice but were actively working with their legal team to conclude on this. **A further update would be provided at the meeting scheduled to take place on 15 May 2015.**

EC/2014/27.2 Naming of Campus Buildings (EC/2014/21.1 refers)

The Campus Names Working Group had been established and its first meeting had taken place on 10 March 2015. The Group had agreed a proposed policy statement and draft Terms of Reference which, subject to the undernoted amendment, were endorsed by Estates Committee:

Page 2 of 3 - "This policy will be implemented by the Campus Names Working Group which will ***propose and recommend to Estates Committee, for its approval***"

The Committee noted that the Group had considered and supported a request from the Law School, proposing that the University rename a seminar room in the Stair Building, 8 Professors Square in honour of Lady Cosgrove. Estates Committee noted and approved this recommendation.

EC/2014/28 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2014/29 Strategies and Performance

EC/2014/29.1 Estate Strategy Update

The Committee noted that Court had approved the ten year capital plan in the sum of £775m at its meeting of 24 February 2015. Specific approvals had been given for the University's priority projects including a Learning and Teaching Hub, a Research Hub and a range of College co-locations. The Committee noted that business cases were being developed for a number of projects and funding requests for project fees would follow. **The first to be reported to Estates Committee, in Autumn 2015, would be the Learning and Teaching Hub.**

Estates and Buildings was progressing appointment of the Learning and Teaching Hub design team, master planning and infrastructure teams. Pre-Qualification Questionnaires had also been issued for the Research Hub.

The Committee thanked Alan Seabourne for his advice in respect of forms of procurement. A workshop was held on 27 February 2015 at which options were considered. An industry workshop was scheduled for 18 March 2015 and a further meeting of the Procurement sub-group would take place on **2 April 2015, after which an update would be provided to Estates Committee.**

The Committee noted the high level programme plan and **requested that further clarity be provided in respect of phasing. It was also requested that a legend be developed to include planning, design, activity and completion phases.**

The Committee noted that Court had approved the proposal for development of a new Estates capital investment governance structure with a requirement that all capital projects over £25m in value be proposed to Court for approval upon recommendation from Finance Committee.

Estates Committee would provide governance for the programme and the master planning work and a standard reporting format would be presented at its next meeting scheduled for 15 May 2015.

EC/2014/30 Governance

EC/2014/30.1 Estates Committee Remit

The Committee noted the current remit “*Develop and maintain a strategic estates plan for consideration by Court which supports the delivery of the University’s Strategic Plan taking into account resource implications and the importance of environmental sustainability*”

It noted the proposed additions to reflect the revised governance arrangements for the Estate Strategy and capital plan and approved these, subject to final revisions on specific matters of detail and clarification of acronyms.

EC/2014/31 Projects

EC/2014/31.1 Approved Projects Status (RAG) report

The Committee noted the report and the current status of projects.

EC/2014/31.2 Project Exception Report

The Committee noted the position in relation to the project exceptions:

EC/2014/31.2.1 CP11/412 - Garscube Learning and Social Space (GLaSS)

A project delay of 12 weeks was noted which was primarily due to ground conditions, removal of above-ground services, poor drainage infrastructure and late procurement of steelwork. Practical completion was expected to be 6 November 2015 with the building scheduled to be operational from the beginning of 2016.

An Extension of Time notice was being considered. It was reported that if found in favour of the Contractor the sum due would be containable within the financial contingency for the project.

EC/2014/31.2.2 LM12/534 Main Building Tower (Phase Two)

A CapEx application for additional works had been prepared. **The Committee would be asked to consider this at the meeting scheduled to take place on 15 May 2015.**

EC/2014/31.2.3 CP13/570 – Wind Tunnel Acre Road

Valve specifications and user-provided equipment specifications had been clarified. The financial position was being reviewed but as previously reported the project would exceed the authorised budget which was due to operational brief and specification changes; **a revised CapEx application would be submitted when the final cost position was known.**

EC/2014/31.3 Project Approvals

EC/2014/31.3.1 Learning and Teaching Investment (Centrally Timetabled Space)

The Committee noted the 2014/15 commitment to learning and teaching space improvements within the Capital Plan. It approved the CapEx application in the sum of £1.7m (inc VAT) for investment in: Kelvin Building (LT312); James Watt South Building (LT361); Room 204-214 Observatory Building; and Computing Science Room 720, Boyd Orr Building.

EC/2014/31.3.2 Development of Phase 2 Imaging South Glasgow University Hospital (SGUH)

The Committee noted the approval given in April 2014 for Phase 2 Imaging at South Glasgow University Hospital which indicated an investment range of £14.9m - £26.9m dependent upon the level of external funding received and with a requirement for the University to underwrite a risk of £1.2m.

Following a £16m funding award from MRC/BIS towards the construction of an Imaging Centre of Excellence (ICE), the scope of the building to accommodate Phase 2 imaging had been determined and the expected cost of Phase 2 Imaging investment (building plus equipment) was £29.73m, all of which would be externally funded. The Committee also noted that the £1.2m underwriting risk previously agreed had been removed.

The Committee approved investment in the sum of £29.73m, noting that the full sum would be funded from external investment.

EC/2014/31.3.3 Institute of Wellbeing (fees)

The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £1,286,400 inc VAT (fees) for surveys and design work to RIBA Stage 2+ which would inform the full business case for the project.

It noted that a further application would be made for full project (construction costs) following survey and feasibility work and presentation of the developed business case to Court in February 2016.

EC/2014/31.3.4 District Heating/CHP

The Committee noted the additional CapEx application to fund a larger combined heat and power (CHP) engine than that previously approved. It noted the evidence provided of significant operational and economical benefits to the University of the increased engine and therefore approved the application in the sum of £0.675m (inc VAT).

The Committee noted that the project would be subject to a satisfactory financial review by the Director of Finance prior to tender award.

EC/2014/32 Estates Operating Matters

EC/2014/32.1 Critical Path

The Committee noted the updated Critical Path.

EC/2014/33 Any Other Business

EC/2014/33.1 Estates Committee Membership

It was noted that Dr Steve Inch had demitted from the Committee and that an exercise would commence to appoint a new Lay Member of Court.

EC/2014/33.2 Department Performance Update (Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL) Report)

The Committee noted the progress and improvements made in respect of the findings of the report and the subsequent Capital Programme Review conducted in September 2014.

EC/2014/34 Schedule of Meetings for 2014/15

Friday 15 May 2015 (proposed to take place at Tay House, 300 Bath Street, Glasgow)



Court - Wednesday 15 April 2015

Report from the Human Resources Committee

Brief description of paper

Minute of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Tuesday 31 March 2015; and Public Sector Equality Duty - Mainstreaming Report.

Action requested

Court is asked to endorse the HR Committee's approval of the Public Sector Equality Duty - Mainstreaming Report. Such approval is integral to the University meeting its legislative requirements under the Equality Act 2010. The report has also been discussed and approved by the Equality & Diversity Strategy Committee.

The Public Sector Equality Duty is set out in the Equality Act 2010 as the 'general equality duty', requiring public authorities, in the exercise of their functions, to have due regard to the need to:

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

The specific duties require authorities to report on (and publish) the progress they have made to make the general equality duty integral to the exercise of their functions: to mainstream equality.

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

HR/14/66 Reappointment Procedure

Christine Barr, Director of HR, reported the changes recently approved by the Senior Management Group to the appointment arrangements of Heads of School and Directors of Research Institutes. One particular feature of these proposals was that, where a recommendation was made for the reappointment of a Director of Research Institute, this should be for a further period of 5 years, rather than for just 2 years, as had been proposed when the policy was introduced in 2010. The Committee supported this proposed change, noting that a 5-year period was more appropriate for staff who were responsible for providing strategic leadership of major research units.

HR/14/68 Living Wage

Christine Barr, Director of HR, reported that work was being initiated to explore the potential for the University to become a Living Wage accredited employer. All employees are already paid at this level but steps would need to be taken to ensure all casual workers and those engaged via contractors were, as far as possible, similarly compensated. Members of the committee were supportive in principle of this initiative and the proposal to take papers to the Senior Management Group prior to reporting to Court.

Court is asked **to note** the draft minute of the HR Committee meeting on 31 March 2015.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Human Resources Committee

Minute of meeting held in the Principal's Meeting Room on Tuesday 31 March 2015

Present: The Principal (AM); Mrs C Barr (CB), Professor E Cameron (EC), Mr R Cloughton (RPC), Mrs H Durndell (HD), Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson (MMS), Mr David Newall (DN), Professor R O Maolalaigh (ROM), Dr D Spaeth (DS); Professor G Baillie (GB);

By Invitation: Professor Neal Juster (NJ), Mrs Lesley Cummings (LC), Mr Phil Taylor (PT)

Apologies: Mr D Anderson (Convener) (DA), Professor C Forde (CF), Mrs A Allen (AA), Mrs S Campbell (SC).

HR/14/59 Opening Remarks & Apologies

DN opened the meeting and noted that he had agreed to chair the meeting on behalf of DA who had given his apologies. Other apologies were noted as above.

HR/14/60 Minute of the Meeting held on 21 January 2015

The minute was taken as read and approved by the committee.

HR/14/61 Matters arising from meeting held on 17 November 2014

The Committee noted that there were no outstanding actions which were not covered in the HR Director's Report or other agenda items.

HR/14/62 HR Director's Report

CB provided an overview of the HR Director's Report highlighting a number of substantive areas including an update on the consultation regarding proposed changes to USS, the evolving Strategic Plan and Improvement Programmes, changes to the appointment procedures for Heads of School and Directors of Research Institutes and considerations regarding the Living Wage.

HR/14/63 CB reported that the trade dispute between UCU and the University employers regarding proposed reform and benefit changes to USS was formally concluded. The University is now engaged in supporting the statutory consultation process with current and prospective members of the scheme. This will involve a series of meetings offered to staff at which the joint proposal put forward to the USS Trustee Board with the support of UUK and UCU would be explained along with details of how to participate in the consultation process. Members of the committee encouraged CB to ensure all staff were aware of these important sessions.

HR/14/64 CB reported that a joint claim had been received by the employers in relation to the National Pay Negotiations for 2015-16. This included reference to the Living Wage and the gender pay gap as well as zero hours arrangements. A series of meetings is arranged to facilitate the negotiations but at this point no offer has yet been tabled.

HR/14/65 CB updated the committee on the activities of the Gender Pay Working Group. The output report would include a series of best practice case studies. It was noted that the University of Glasgow has taken action with a range of different initiatives but there was still work to do to tackle the overall gender pay gap. The Committee members emphasised the importance of continuing work on this and hoped that the range of initiatives on career progression, Athena Swan and related activities would contribute to improving the situation both at Glasgow and indeed across the sector.

HR/14/66 CB reported the changes recently approved by the Senior Management Group to the appointment arrangements of Heads of School and Directors of Research Institutes. One particular feature of these proposals was that, where a recommendation was made for the reappointment of a Director of Research Institute, this should be for a further period of 5 years, rather than for just 2 years, as had been proposed when the policy was introduced in 2010. The Committee supported this proposed change, noting that a 5-year period was

more appropriate for staff who were responsible for providing strategic leadership of major research units.

Noting the discussion on the previous item, a number of questions were raised regarding how the University might act to encourage more female academics to apply for these roles. It was noted that future appointments would be at Grade 10 and it was hence all the more important that the pipeline for promotion to this level was further developed and female academics supported in preparing and applying for both promotion to Professorial level and specifically these managerial roles. AM noted that this progression from Grade 9 to 10 is key and was keen to ensure that all colleges were taking action to encourage applications from females. In response to a question from MMS, CB noted that there were a range of factors which may be impacting on this situation and a range of interventions including targeted mentoring and regular feedback was sought from females via initiatives such as the Early Career Development Programme. It was noted that information from recruitment activity suggested that female academics are typically less mobile and also tend to be more cautious in applying for promotion. However the data demonstrates a strong success rate for those females applying.

HR/14/67 Members of the HR Committee endorsed the new appointment arrangements whilst signaling the need to ensure the wider work on gender balance continues to ensure the changes do not undermine this goal in relation to these key University positions.

HR/14/68 CB reported that work was being initiated to explore the potential for the University to become a Living Wage accredited employer. All employees are already paid at this level but steps would need to be taken to ensure all casual workers and those engaged via contractors were, as far as possible, similarly compensated. Members of the committee were supportive in principle of this initiative and the proposal to take papers to the Senior Management Group prior to reporting to Court.

HR/14/69 CB noted the range of positive feedback from staff who had recently moved to Tay House and the benefits in terms of culture change this was already having. It was agreed to hold a future meeting of the committee in Tay House. **Action RPC.**

HR/14/70 University Strategy – update and progress report

Professor Neal Juster provided an update on the University Strategy and the current consultation process. Work is ongoing to refine the KPIs used to monitor progress and it is likely that there will be slightly more in support of the updated strategy to ensure the appropriate focus on key areas such as student satisfaction.

NJ emphasized the importance of putting people at the heart of the strategy and this was clear from the three emerging priority themes, namely Focus, Agility and Empowering People. It was noted that CB is leading working group on the latter, alongside ROM.

HR/14/71 GB noted that some staff may feel nervous about the Focus element of the strategy. NJ acknowledged this but it was felt any changes would be developed bottom up and he did not envisage any sudden changes, more a development over time. AM endorsed this view noting that the University starts from a position of strength and has the time to develop its Focus in a managed way over time. It was recognised how important staff engagement would be in this process.

MMS expressed her support for the emerging strategic themes but asked NJ how he felt the various initiatives might be properly resourced. NJ indicated that he and the SMG were mindful that resource would be needed and he expected to cover this in his paper to Court in June. There may be a need for external consultants but also a strong desire to build skills and knowledge internally in such areas as project management and change management.

EC noted that the process of staff engagement had been very positive and encouraged the SMG to ensure this continued into the period of implementation. He asked what student engagement there had been. NJ stated that this was an area that he would consider as the strategy moved towards implementation. DN thanked NJ for his paper and discussion and he offered to provide updated information to the committee in May if desired.

HR/14/72 Internal Communications Strategy – update

PT joined the meeting and provided a short presentation to the members of the committee regarding the internal communications strategy which had now been in place for two years. He noted the increased use of online information via the MyGlasgow portal and the developing ability to analyse pages being accessed. Recent campaigns such as the one supporting the Tay House move had delivered positive feedback and the use of social media style communications via Yammer was increasing in popularity.

PT noted that the communications strategy would be updated as the University Strategy refresh is published and he expected to work closely with HR and other management colleagues in support of this work, especially in relation to Empowering people. It was recognised that this and the Estates Strategy could result in significant demands on the Communication team. MMS asked if sufficient resources were in place. PT said that, whilst some Universities do have larger teams, he felt it was better to let the communications initiatives grow organically. He noted though that large projects such as the estates strategy may require additional dedicated resources.

DN thanked PT for his update and recorded the support of the committee for the work being carried out by communications in support of the University's work.

HR/14/73 Pay, Performance and Reward

Lesley Cummings joined the meeting and provided a detailed update on the work of the PPR team within the Corporate HR function. LC's role was created in May 2014 as part of the new senior team and she had worked with her small central team, which now includes a compensation & benefits specialist at officer level, to review each area of activity and consider the key priorities in each.

LC emphasised the importance of the PDR process as central to supporting the University's strategic goals and recognised that the disciplines and processes for this were now becoming embedded and would be further supported by the introduction of a new on-line module within the Core HR system. This should assist in simplifying the management of the significant amounts of data required to support the process.

LC noted that the process for Academic Promotion would be reviewed and consideration given to encouraging more female applicants in support of the wider work on gender across the University. A similar concern was noted in regard to the process of movement between professorial zones. Members of the committee referred back to the earlier discussion around the need to explore multiple initiatives in support of gender equality which also should support the need to further tackle the current gender pay gap.

There was further discussion on the pay gap, recognising that this was an issue across the sector but that Glasgow needed to do more to address this. The various strands of the PPR agenda should assist this.

DN thanked LC for a comprehensive presentation and invited members of the committee to provide feedback via RPC of any aspects on which they would welcome a more in-depth discussion.

HR/14/74 Policy update

RPC spoke briefly to the paper which outlined the scope of the current review of the Management of Organisational Change document. This related primarily to the role of the Court Procedural Review Group in relation to "Tier two" proposals. The members of the committee were supportive of the scope of the review as outlined and noted that, following consultation with members of the CPRG, the recognised Trade Unions and other managers, a revised policy would be presented to the next meeting of the HRC prior to being presented to Court.

HR/14/75 HRC Sub-Committee Update

HR/14/76 *EDSC (Equality & Diversity Strategy Committee):*
The minute of the meeting of the EDSC held on 26 February 2015 was noted.

HR/14/77 Members of the committee commended the work which had gone into the Public Sector Equality Duty – Mainstreaming Report. The Report had been discussed and approved by the Equality & Diversity Strategy Committee, and HR Committee also recorded its approval of the document. DN noted that Mhairi Taylor from the Equality and Diversity unit was due to present to the next meeting of the HRC when elements of the report and data might be discussed.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12.30pm.

HR/14/78 **Date of next meeting**
The next meeting of the HR Committee was noted as Thursday 28 May 2015 at 10am – 1.00pm in The Melville Room, Main Building.

Dates for meetings in 2015/16 would be published in due course.



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday 15 April 2015

**Report from the Meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee
held on 11 March 2015**

Brief description of the paper

The paper contains the draft Minute of the meeting held on 11 March 2015, for information.

The Committee received: reports on the University's environmental performance including recycling; on campus security (annual report) and on the Health, Safety & Wellbeing service (annual report); the latest reports from Occupational Health and the Safety & Environmental Protection Services; an update on the Centre for Virus Research safety arrangements for the CL3 (containment) Lab; and an update on the creation of new safety committees.

Action required

For information purposes only

University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 11 March 2015 at 10:00 AM in the Melville Room

Present:

Mrs Ann Allen, Mrs Christine Barr, Ms Mae Boyd, Mr James Gray, Mr David McLean, Mr John F Malcolm, Dr Catherine Martin, Mr Paul Phillips, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Selina Woolcott, Mr Liam King, Mr Oscar Schafer

In Attendance:

Ms Debbie Beales, Professor Richard Elliott, Dr Steve Johnson

Apologies:

Dr Gordon Duckett, Mr David Newall, Ms Julie Ommer, Mr Deric Robinson, Mr David Somerville, Ms Louise Bowden

HSWC/2014/1 Convenors Business

In the absence of Mr Newall, Mrs Allen deputised as Convenor. The Convenor **welcomed** Dr Johnson and Prof Elliott to the meeting. The Convenor **informed** the Committee that, due to lack of attendance by Union reps, the meeting was inquorate. As a result the meeting would proceed as a minuted discussion with any decisions being deferred to the next quorate meeting.

HSWC/2014/2 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 10 December 2014

The Minute of the meeting held on Wednesday 10 December 2014 was approved.

HSWC/2014/3 Matters arising

HSWC/2014/3.1 Review of US safety committees (verbal update SW)

Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that most US had nominated reps for the new safety committees and that dates were currently being organised for the first set of meetings. These would take place by the end of April and she would report back to the Committee at the next meeting.

HSWC/2014/3.2 Health & safety for students (verbal update SW)

Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that she had met with the SRC and Ms Ommer to discuss a Lone Study Policy for students. She would be meeting with Deans of Graduate Studies in May for their input before drafting a Policy with guidance which she would bring to the Committee once completed.

HSWC/2014/3.3 E-cigarettes (verbal update DN)

This item is carried forward to the next meeting in Mr Newall's absence.

HSWC/2014/4 Current environmental set up (Paper 1)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Dr Johnson **informed** the Committee that since he started his role as Environmental Adviser he had visited more than 20 Units to assess the current environmental performance of the University as well as to build key contacts. In most cases there were no specific environmental reps and so he met mainly with senior technicians, Unit administrative heads or facilities managers. Overall, the University was performing reasonable well but was not compliant in recycling across the board. Staff were keen to recycle batteries but were unsure where to take them. There seemed to be confusion as to who was responsible for recycling material, especially cardboard, and clarity was required on this matter. The Convenor **agreed** that as this was a potential fire hazard she would raise this issue at the next USLT meeting and would report back to the Committee. Dr Johnson **informed** the Committee that staff felt that current online waste guidance was too text heavy and he hoped to simplify the waste web pages to make them more user friendly.

HSWC/2014/5 Campus Security Annual Report (Paper 2)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that she would speak to the Paper in the absence of Campus Security. The good news was that the University had a very low serious crime level despite having a huge footfall on Campus. Cycle theft continued to be the most problematic crime and Police Scotland had apprehended 6 individuals so far. The University was continuing to conduct a cycle marking scheme which had so far marked over 200 cycles. Another issue of concern was the high number of incidents where buildings were being left insecure. This would be a key focus this year as previous efforts to highlight instances to Heads of School had little impact. Forward planning would include working with the SRC to ensure that students avoided falling victim to accommodation fraud which had increased significantly.

HSWC/2014/6 CVR safety arrangements for CL3 Lab (PowerPoint Richard Elliott)

Prof Elliott **informed** the Committee that the new CL3 Lab was now complete and had been approved by HSE. It was hoped that staff would work on 14 viruses in total with access to the suite requiring swipe card access and a pin code. A management group had been created to oversee the lab and would report to CVR Safety Working Group and Ill's Safety Committee. Their remit would include staff training for safe usage of the lab and this had already commenced. The Committee **thanked** Prof Elliott for taking the time to show them the layout of the lab as well as explaining the many safety features in place.

HSWC/2014/7 OH Report (Paper 3)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart **informed** the Committee that management referrals had remained steady throughout the year and did not appear to have increased as a result of the cessation of self-referrals in May. Comparing referrals for mental health (both work and non-work related) to the same quarter last year, there had been a decrease. Ms Stewart **informed** the Committee that a review had been undertaken for the administration of health surveillance (HS). On discussion with MVLS, it had been agreed that overall co-ordination needed to come from local safety committees who would ensure that line managers were aware that staff needing HS were notified to OHU. As a result OHU staff would no longer take the lead in chasing up HS lists, this being the responsibility of the LM. Ms Stewart would report back to the Committee in June to report on the progress of this matter.

HSWC/2014/8 SEPS Report (Paper 4)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean **informed** the Committee that the incident stats had been altered separating RIDDOR reportable incidents from minor incidents (which would now include near misses). A new table had been added to show fire incidents that didn't involve human injury. Mr McLean **tabled** a Paper updating the Committee on the progress of the safety audit programme. The Committee asked that future audit reports be amended slightly to incorporate audit dates in to table 2.

HSWC/2014/9 EAP Quarterly Report (Paper 5)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that overall uptake of counselling services had decreased by 7% compared to the same period last year with only 29 employees using the service during the previous quarter.

HSWC/2014/10 EAP Annual Report (Paper 6)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that the numbers of employees using the service averaged 9 per month which was disappointing. The contract with Optum had been extended by 6 months and it was hoped that CAPS would have parallel in house services by May/June. The idea was to see which service staff preferred before making a final decision. Ms Woolcott **agreed** to keep the Committee up to date on results. So far only 5 people had used the CAPS drop in service.

HSWC/2014/11 HSW Annual Report (Paper 7)

The Committee **noted** the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that 2014 had been another busy year for HS&W with a lot of staff movement. SEPS worked closely with Estates & Buildings in matters regarding both operational and estates issues including various accommodation moves. The biological safety web pages had been improved and the in-house audit programme was now well established. 3641 employees received some sort of health & safety training during 2014 and the staff survey was conducted by an external provider which resulted in a substantial increase in employee participation. RPS were involved in 9 decommissioning projects and OH had a full review of service ensuring the continuing fitness for purpose of the service. The Committee **thanked** HS&W for their hard work over the past 12 months.

HSWC/2014/12 Communication of updates to Policies (verbal report SW)

Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that it had come to her attention, in the course of recent visits to management groups across the University, that there was a poor awareness of the work of this Committee. She emphasised the need for College and staff reps to share information for the Committee (unless identified as confidential and not for wider circulation) with their local safety committees/management groups, as appropriate.

HSWC/2014/13 Any Other Business

The Convenor **informed** the Committee that this would be Dr Martin's last HSWC meeting and **thanked** her for her input to the Committee.

HSWC/2014/14 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Wednesday 3rd June at 10am in the Senate Room.

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales