

WEB COPY

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, subject to the Council of Senate being content with the proposals following discussion at its forthcoming meeting. 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 disinvestment 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 disinvest 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 disinvestment, 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.