

WEB COPY

Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 24 June 2015 in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Professor George Baillie Senate Assessor, 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, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor's Assessor, 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 Muffy Calder (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor James Conroy (Vice-Principal Internationalisation), 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), Mr Liam King (SRC President-elect), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Roibeard O Maolalaigh (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal),

Apologies:

Members: Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Cllr Pauline McKeever Glasgow City Council Representative

Attendees: Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Jon Cooper (Vice-Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange), Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal Learning & Teaching), Professor Miles Padgett (Vice-Principal Research)

CRT/2014/40. Announcements

The Convener referred to the very sad and untimely deaths of Charles Kennedy and David Anderson. The University had held a memorial service for Charles Kennedy. Among many contributions to the University over his 7 years on Court, David Anderson had been Chairman of the UGPS Trustees and Convener of the HR Committee. Court marked their passing by a minute's silence.

Court welcomed the SRC President-elect, Liam King, to the Court meeting.

Don Spaeth and Breffni O'Connor and, probably, Marvin Karrasch were attending their final meeting of Court. Court thanked them for their contributions to Court and wished them well in the future.

CRT/2014/41. Minutes of the meetings held on Tuesday 15 April 2015

The minutes were approved, subject to the final paragraph of the minute relating to the Centre for Open Studies being amended, so that the first sentence read “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”.

CRT/2014/42. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2014/43. Report from the Principal

CRT/2014/43.1 Vice Principal portfolio

Court noted that Vice Principal Professor Frank Coton’s title would change to Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation, with immediate effect. Professor Coton’s role would include greater involvement with the Information Strategy, including chairing the Information Policy and Strategy Committee.

CRT 2014/43.2 Internationalisation Strategy

Court received details of the new Internationalisation Strategy, from Professor Jim Conroy, Vice Principal Internationalisation. The first Internationalisation Strategy had been agreed by Senate and Court in 2009/10, with the aim of highlighting Glasgow’s international ambition, and providing a framework for the development of international activity. In the five years since that strategy had been introduced, the University had made substantial progress across the full range of its international activities. The new strategy had been developed to tie in with both the University strategic plan and the Learning and Teaching strategy, and had involved discussion and consultation with Colleges and Schools. The strategy aimed to build on the platform developed since 2009, by adopting a more targeted approach that made the most of the international assets and capacity developed over the past five years, in order to enhance a number of priority areas, including: increasing the number of international students as a percentage of overall student numbers, and further developing opportunities for study and placements abroad. The latter would be as flexible as possible and involve a mixture of opportunities including industry placements. In terms of financial outlay, it was noted that there would be some additional costs, but the plans were largely achievable within existing resource. There would be KPIs associated with the overall area of activity.

While supporting the terms of the updated strategy, Court asked that targets for philanthropic income generation in this area be reviewed by Professor Conroy in discussion with the Development & Alumni Office.

Court noted that it was important that Court had a good understanding of how the University’s the Trans-national Education (TNE) agenda was being delivered at its various locations and that, as a result, Professor Paul Younger would be visiting these locations and would update Court on this activity from time to time.

CRT 2014/43.3 The debate on the UK's Future within the European Union

Court noted that the University would maintain a position that was politically neutral, in terms of not being seen as aligning itself with a particular political party. However, given the University sector's very strong ties with the EU - including the University of Glasgow's significant EU student body and numbers of EU staff members, and its income from EU funders - groupings such as Universities UK, Universities Scotland and the Russell Group were likely to campaign strongly in favour of the UK staying within a reformed EU. In these circumstances, Court endorsed a proposed approach whereby:

- The University would encourage all of its staff and students to speak on all sides of the EU referendum debate;
- The University would actively invite speakers on both sides of the debate to the University;
- Because of the importance of maintaining EU research funding and the free mobility of researchers and students within the current EU/EEA area, the Principal and Senior Management would be able to speak openly on behalf of the University to defend its interests in research and teaching;
- The Principal and academic senior managers would be able to speak in a personal capacity to issues concerning the referendum outwith the University's special interests in research and teaching, when this aligned with their particular academic expertise, in line with the University's adherence to the principles of academic freedom.

CRT 2014/43.4 Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS)

There had been a statutory consultation process with current and prospective USS members, from 16 March to 22 May, relating to proposed changes to the scheme. The outcome of the consultation was awaited.

CRT 2014/43.5 Joint Educational Institute - UESTC China

At the last meeting, it had been reported that the Principal had visited UESTC to advance negotiations with the Ministry of Education with regard to the formation of a Joint Educational Institute (JEI) with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC), expanding existing programmes with that institution in Chengdu. Discussions were continuing, with positive progress.

CRT 2014/43.6 Widening Access Commission

In April, the Principal had been appointed to the Commission on Widening Access, which would be chaired by Dame Ruth Silver. The Commission included a cross-section of education, business and student representatives, and would develop plans to help more students from disadvantaged backgrounds in Scotland to enter and succeed in Higher Education. The Commission had been announced by the First Minister in November as part of the Scottish Government's Programme for Government, guaranteeing a move towards 20% of university entrants coming from the most disadvantaged 20% of society.

CRT/2014/43.7 Key Activities

Court noted a summary of some of the main activities in which the Principal had been involved since the last meeting of Court, covering internal and external activities beyond daily operational management and strategy meetings. The activities were under the broad headings

of: Academic Development and Strategy; Internationalisation activities; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; Internal activities and Communications.

CRT/2014/44. Strategic Plan and KPIs, Budget 2015/16 and Financial Forecasts

Court had received a briefing on the draft new Strategic Plan and related KPIs, from Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice Principal, at a lunchtime session. The draft plan had been developed following wide consultation with the University community. Key outcomes from the consultation had been that people were at the heart of the institution and that they should be supported, developed and allowed to pursue their fields; that the University made a difference in the world and that its global impact should be enhanced and promoted; and that the University should remain broad-based, but should focus.

The plan's vision was for a world class, world changing university. The mission had three major strands, which were: *1. Bringing inspiring people together*, through: securing the best staff; attracting outstanding students; and connecting with the world through internationalisation; *2. Creating a world class environment for learning and research*, through: developing an inspiring and transformative campus; streamlining policy, processes and systems; and providing staff and students with first class support; *3. Discovering and sharing knowledge that can change the world*, through: inspiring learning with outstanding teaching; leading discovery through world class research; and creating impact for society and the economy through innovative engagement.

22 KPIs were included in the plan, and it was intended that nine of the KPIs (Primary KPIs) would be used to direct behaviour at School, Research Institute and Service Unit level, with the other 13 Secondary KPIs being used to monitor progress at University level; some of these would also be taken into account within Schools, Research Institutes and Service Units.

Court now approved the new Strategic Plan and related KPIs, thanking Professor Juster and his team for their work in developing an excellent plan.

At the Court meeting, Professor Juster provided an update on progress against the University's current strategic plan and KPIs. The overarching strategic objective in the current strategic plan, *Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision*, had been to raise the University's reputation as a world-leading international research-intensive university. The strategic planning period (2010-2015) had been entered with a relatively good reputation for the undergraduate student experience compared to Russell Group peers, but a relatively poor performance in terms of RAE 2008 scores, international profile and student recruitment.

The first part of the current strategic cycle (2009-12) had involved restructuring and reducing costs in order to provide the basis for strategic investment in the academic base. Between 2012 and 2014, there had been selective investment in the research base, in preparation for REF 2014. This investment had helped current staff to improve research grant capture, grow PhD student numbers, increase the number of research outputs published in the most prestigious journals and conferences, and grow citation rates. This had led to a good outcome in REF 2014. Over the current strategic cycle, international student numbers had grown, and the University's transnational education presence (TNE) had grown very rapidly in parallel with growth in international profile and reputation. Court noted the annual performance against the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and noted a summary of the University's performance in the domestic and international league tables for the 2010-2015 period.

As the new Strategic Plan was launched, the 2015/16 budget would build on recent success and

align with the priorities set out in the new plan. The key investment priorities were to: prepare for the major development of the Gilmorehill Campus; develop underlying student infrastructure; continue to invest and build towards REF 2020; invest in improving the student experience; and improve business intelligence by investing in improving data quality and in implementing a data warehouse. With regard to the latter, it was noted that while there would be an administrative load on staff to enter full and accurate data into University systems, it was vital that this occurred so that there was not local duplication - and unnecessary reconciliation - needed, and so there was a single, authoritative, source of data.

The financial forecast showed that the University would maintain its surpluses at a level that would enable the planned £775m investment in the estate over the next 10 years. This was achievable through modest growth in international student numbers, the implementation of a premium-fee policy for popular courses, growth in contribution from research and commercial activity, and control of costs

The 2015-16 budget outlined a management accounting surplus of £11.5m, equating to a statutory accounting surplus of £13.4m. The budgetary forecast predicted management accounting surpluses of £14.3m, £16.9m and £15.6m in 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 respectively. This equated to statutory accounting surpluses of £16.2m, £18.8m and £17.5m in the same three-year period. Surpluses to 2018-19 were based on a number of assumptions, including: removal by SFC of all funded rUK cohorts from the funding base (replaced by all rUK students paying fees); overseas student fee growth as determined by Colleges and confirmed by RIO to the effect that it would increase incrementally to £107.2m per annum (2018-19) from £81.9m in 2015-16; RUK student fee growth (net of discounts), Research growth and commercial growth as determined by Colleges; salary voids and pay award assumptions; utility savings arising from the new Combined Heat and Power system; provisions relating to pension schemes and additional National Insurance Contributions from April 2016; and cash flow profile.

The risks and challenges around the forecast were noted, particularly with regard to: overseas student demand; UK Visas and Immigration issues; changes in England and rUK demand; cuts in overall SFC budget after the 2015 Comprehensive Spending Review; cuts in, and refocusing of, RCUK resources after the 2015 comprehensive spending review; potential exit from the EU; and funding the estates development.

Court noted a breakdown of the Capital Plan. It was noted that in relation to populating new buildings, while it would be important to ensure that research staff were in place when the buildings were ready, the funding horizon and the post-REF reviews needed to be examined ahead of this. The matter would be reviewed further in the autumn when more information was available.

Court thanked Professor Juster for the briefing.

Court approved the 2015/16 Budget and four year financial forecasts, and approved the Capital Plan.

CRT/2014/45. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2014/45.1 Nominations Committee Business

There were a number of Court and Court Committee vacancies arising in the coming months. The details had been reviewed by the Nominations Committee and recruitment would take place via appropriate media, with recommendations for appointment coming to Court, by email if necessary.

All the recruitment would be particularly mindful of the need for gender balance (at least 40% F and M), in line with both the Committee of Scottish Chairs' and the University's equality agendas, and with actions under the Athena Swan scheme.

CRT/2014/45.2 Court Procedural Review Group (CPRG) - Centre for Open Studies

At its April meeting, Court had agreed recommendations from the CPRG, aimed at moving the Centre for Open Studies to a break-even position, eliminating the current annual deficit of £500k. The agreement by Court had included a reference to the Council of Senate being advised of Court's support for the changes proposed, and to the Council of Senate being offered the opportunity to comment on them, and that if there were any serious concerns, then management should reflect on these, and provide its response to Court at its June meeting. The Council of Senate had expressed some concerns about the proposed restructure, in particular about the proposed removal of the standalone Access Programme; and about the proposed removal of all courses in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) areas.

As a result of the concerns expressed by the Council of Senate, a revised proposal was being proposed to Court, such that:

- the Access Programme would be retained as a discrete aspect of the Centre's provision, rather than replacing it with a 'credit for entry' scheme, and all three pathways would continue to be offered in their current form (Access to Arts and Social Sciences; Access to Law, Business and Accountancy; and Access to Science, Engineering and Nursing), with the distinct cohort identity of Access students being maintained within the Centre's student body. This change to the original proposal would however mean that savings to address the deficit would not be as great as had been previously calculated.
- the Centre would no longer offer the current range of science (STEM) programmes managed by individual subject specialists, but that those courses which were in demand would still be offered in future, where such courses were financially viable.

Court noted that although certain subject areas were proposed to be removed as discrete elements in the provision offered, the Centre remained keenly committed to community education and would continue to deliver a large, open access programme of accredited and unaccredited courses predominantly, but not exclusively, in the liberal arts. The Centre would be a key contributor to the Kelvin Hall development, along with the College of Arts and the Hunterian, offering significant opportunities for the Centre to develop its programme of collections-based learning across the disciplines, and also enabling the Centre to reach out to new audiences.

Court approved the revised proposals.

CRT/2014/45.4 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.

Court had received advice in April from its Investment Advisory Committee, agreeing at that meeting 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.

Having considered further financial advice received, and noting objections from Ms Morton, Mr McBride and Professor Younger to the proposed way forward, Court agreed to implement a first stage of divestment, which would involve a 25% reduction in fossil fuel holdings over the next 4 years. Court would receive a progress report on divestment after 2 years and, in 2019, would undertake a further financial evaluation of the impact of the divestment policy, before deciding on whether to proceed with a further stage of divestment. The impact of this first stage of divestment would mean that, by 2019, 6.4% of the University's endowment investments will be held in fossil fuel companies, as compared with the current figure of 8.5% and the original figure (at March 2014) of 10%.

It was agreed that the progress report after 2 years should include details of what the investment portfolio returns would have looked like had the agreed first stage of divestment not occurred. It should also include consideration of the impact of the policy in terms of possible reduced external support for teaching and research in relevant areas of academic work.

CRT/2014/45.5 Ordinance on Composition of Court

The Ordinance on Court membership was scheduled to be considered by the Privy Council on 15 July.

CRT/2014/45.6 HE Governance (Scotland) Bill

The Bill had been published in June and it was understood that parliamentary scrutiny was likely to run through until the first quarter of 2016. The sector had expressed concerns about elements of the content, some of which had not been contained in the consultation on the draft Bill, and which included provisions that would involve direct government control of the composition of governing bodies.

Court agreed that, if required, the Court Governance Working Group should meet over the summer to discuss the matter, and keep Court informed.

CRT/2014/45.7 Appointments of Heads of Research Institute and Schools

College of MVLS/College of Science & Engineering

Institute of Neuroscience and Psychology and School of Psychology

Professor Philippe Schyns had been re-appointed as Director of the Institute of Neuroscience and Psychology for 5 years from 1 August 2015 and as Head of the School of Psychology for 2 years from 1 August 2015.

College of MVLS

Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine

Professor Dan Haydon had been re-appointed as Director of the Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine for 5 years from 1 August 2015

College of Science & Engineering

School of Geographical and Earth Sciences

Professor Martin Lee had been appointed as Head of the School of Geographical and Earth Sciences for 4 years from 1 August 2015, in succession to Professor Maggie Cusack.

CRT/2014/46. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2014/46.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2014/46.1.1 Budget 2015/16 and four year forecasts

Finance Committee had agreed to recommend the budget and forecasts to Court.

Court had approved the 2015/16 Budget and four year financial forecasts, under item *CRT/2014/44. Budget 2015/16 and Financial Forecasts and KPIs*.

CRT/2014/46.1.2 Capital Plan

The Finance Committee had noted the focus on larger projects approved by Court as part of the campus redevelopment, combined with projects already committed, and a limited number of new strategically-aligned smaller projects. Finance Committee had also noted the rationale applied in the prioritisation of smaller projects, based on essential backlog maintenance; efficiency of the use of space; and the resilience of the estate, with a view to facilitating future large projects.

The Capital Plan forecast £771.2m of capital and revenue spending on estates development projects through to 2024/25, which included £172.7m on maintenance and minor works.

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

Court had approved the Capital Plan under item *CRT/2014/44. Budget 2015/16 and Financial Forecasts and KPIs*

CRT/2014/46.1.3 Bank credit ratings

Finance Committee had considered potential changes to the bank rating criteria used by rating agencies, that could result in many banks being downgraded by either one or two points. The Committee had accepted a recommendation to reduce the minimum required rating for organisations with which the University dealt, by one point.

CRT/2014/46.1.4 Capex applications

Finance Committee had approved Capex applications relating to: Research Hub (Fees) in the sum of £1,704,000; Institute of Health and Wellbeing/College of Social Sciences (Fees) in the sum of £1,286,400; College of Arts Hub (Fees) in the sum of £1,200,600; Estate Strategy Masterplanning (Fees) in the sum of £2,616,000; Bell Tower and Spire

Repairs in the sum of £930k; and Library Level 2 in the sum of £2,905,000.

CRT/2014/46.1.5 Financial reports

Court noted an overview of performance as at 30 April 2015.

The report was noted.

CRT/2014/46.2 Estates Committee

CRT/2014/46.2.1 Estate Strategy

Court noted the progress made in respect of the Estate Strategy, and noted also that a number of governance boards for individual projects had now been set up, and that training for members was ongoing.

CRT/2014/46.2.2 Capital Plan

Court noted the updated ten-year Capital Plan 2015-2025, which had been included in Paper 4 for the Court meeting.

CRT/2014/46.2.3 CapEx applications

Court noted and endorsed Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications in respect of: Research Hub (Fees) in the sum of £1,704,000; Institute of Health and Wellbeing/College of Social Sciences (Fees) in the sum of £1,286,400; College of Arts Hub (Fees) in the sum of £1,200,600; Estate Strategy Masterplanning (Fees) in the sum of £2,616,000; Bell Tower and Spire Repairs in the sum of £930k; and Library Level 2 in the sum of £2,905,000.

The report was noted.

CRT/2014/46.3 Audit Committee

The Committee had been updated on Court's discussion of the Campus Estate Strategy, including the governance structure for the associated major capital projects. The Audit Committee had expressed some continuing concerns about mechanisms for overarching governance in this area, and the Internal Audit plan for the coming year would cover a review of the governance arrangements for the Campus Estate Strategy.

The Committee had received reports on recent internal audits of:

- Professorial Zoning, where in the context of high-risk findings connected to instances of University policy not being applied, recommendations had been made about better regulating the award of market supplement payments. With regard to this issue, Duncan Ross advised he had been in touch with the Audit Committee chair and had received assurances that this was being addressed; Ms Barr confirmed this was the case;
- Governance over Subsidiaries, where the audit had generally been positive, but it had been recommended that the University implement a more formalised governance framework to facilitate effective oversight and scrutiny, and that (proportionate) risk management arrangements be put in place for each subsidiary entity;
- Health and Safety, where one high risk had been identified relating to there being no list detailing individuals working/studying offsite in the UK or overseas - to this end, a

document on Management of International Travel has now been prepared;

- International Activity (UESTC (China)), where one medium level control design finding had been made about monitoring of programme aims and objectives; and
- Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC), where a medium level recommendation had been made for improvement in areas including audit trails to support all key assumptions and judgements made in the preparation of the TRAC return.

Subject to some adjustment after the meeting, the Committee had approved the 2015/16 Internal Audit Plan, which was driven by the University's organisational objectives and priorities, and the risks that might prevent it from meeting those objectives. With regard to the plan containing reference to audits of the student experience including experience of MyCampus, Duncan Ross advised that he had been in touch with the Audit Committee chair with respect to this matter being taken forward.

The Committee had approved the External Auditors' approach to preparing the financial statements for the year to 31 July 2015.

The report was noted.

CRT/2014/46.4 Human Resources Committee

The HR Director had provided an update to the Committee highlighting a number of substantive areas including the National Pay negotiations, the USS consultation, this year's Performance & Development Review process, the University seeking accreditation as a Living Wage employer and a review of the infrastructure in place to support Athena Swan.

The Committee had received a presentation on the work of the Researcher Development Framework and initial reflections and actions arising from the recent REF; and an update on strategic Equality and Diversity activities.

The Committee had received an update on policy matters. This had included proposed changes to the Management of Organisational Change Policy, including a change to extend the remit of the CPRG to enable its members to provide strategic sign off for all Tier 2 proposals; details would continue to be reported to Court and the membership of the CPRG would be increased so that it contained 3 lay members of Court and 2 Senate Assessors. There had been discussions with the unions regarding the proposed changes, which only impacted on Tier 2 proposals. The Committee had recorded its support for the proposed changes and had agreed these should be presented to Court for formal approval.

Court agreed that the policy should be clarified so that there should always be staff consultation prior to the CPRG being convened. The remit should also include specific reference to the CPRG's option of soliciting input from unions as well as management on a given matter.

Subject to these points being addressed, Court approved the recommended changes to the remit of the CPRG and the associated changes to the Management of Organisational Change policy; and noted the Committee report.

CRT/2014/46.5 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

The report was noted. The Committee had received: reports on a Hazardous areas survey, and on the Organisational Level Stress risk assessment; the latest reports from Occupational Health and the Safety & Environmental Protection Services; and an update on the uptake of

the Employee Assistance Programme.

CRT/2014/47. Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate held on 4 June 2015

Senate had discussed the Organisational Change proposal relating to the Centre for Open Studies, had had expressed a number of concerns that had been relayed to Court for, and subsequently discussed at, the present meeting under the Secretary of Court's Report.

Council of Senate had received briefings on the new University strategic plan, and on the draft Budget for 2015/16 and four-year financial forecast. Council of Senate had received a report from the Education Policy and Strategy Committee. Council of Senate had noted a report from the University Court meeting on 15 April 2015.

The report was noted.

CRT/2014/48. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2014/49. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 7 October 2015 at 2pm in the Senate Room.

Court - Wednesday 7 October 2015

Principal's Report

Items A : For Discussion

1. Student Admissions including RUK

Admissions to the University for 2015/16, for Undergraduate and Postgraduate (PGT/PGR), Home, RUK and International students, is summarised below.

Undergraduate

A total of 4,516 undergraduate students will be admitted to the University this September versus a total target of 4,507. The sections below detail the intake by funding category.

Non RUK (Scottish & EU Admissions)

At total of 3,236 students were admitted from Scotland and EU versus a maximum funded target of 3,315 (79 below target). This is the first time in many years that this target has not been exceeded and is indicative of the effective controls that are now in place to restrict intake in categories, such as Psychology, where the University has significantly over-recruited in recent years.

MD20/MD 40

Within the 3,315 Scottish Funded Target, the University was required to recruit a minimum of 783 students from areas of Multiple Deprivation (MD20/40 postcodes). A total of 825 students have been admitted in this category, meeting our SFC funded target.

RUK Admissions

A total of 766 RUK students have been admitted against a minimum target of 710. Within this number, less than 50 students were admitted through Clearing – significantly fewer than in 2013 and 2014 and in spite of the increased competitive environment resulting from the removal of caps in RUK.

International

A total of 514 International students have been admitted versus a minimum target of 482.

Postgraduate PGT/PGR

While the registration process for PGT and PGR is not 100% complete, indications are that all international targets will be met or exceeded.

Total PGT intake is anticipated to be 4,433 split 1,970 Home/EU and 2,463 international. The international intake exceeds the target of 2,356 by 4.5% and represents a 9.2% year on year growth. This success is to be welcomed given the increasingly competitive international environment.

PGR registrations are far from complete and are complicated by a significant number of in-year registrations. The PGR international cohort target is 585 (new intake plus continuing students) and it is anticipated that this target will be exceeded.

Items B: For Information

2. Universities Superannuation Scheme USS.

As Court is aware, a revised benefit structure for USS has been developed, to address the deficit in the scheme and to mitigate the risk that contribution rates become unaffordable for employers and employees. 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 grown in the Career Revalued Benefits section of the scheme up to a threshold of £55k. Any pensionable salary over this threshold would be pensioned through a new Defined Contribution section of the scheme. There was a statutory consultation process, which ran from 16 March to 22 May.

Following the consultation, the final position is that the new USS will be introduced in phases from 1 April 2016. The timing of these phases is still being discussed by USS and the employers. The key features, once fully implemented, will be:

- Career Revalued Benefits (CRB) for all members on salary up to £55,000. Pension will be built up based on 1/75th of salary per year. The lump sum will be 3/75ths of salary. This is a change from the current basis of pension being built up based on 1/80th of salary per year and the lump sum being 3/80ths of salary.
- Defined contribution section for members based on salary above £55,000.
- An option for all members to make additional contributions to the defined contribution section of the scheme and to claim an additional 'matched' 1% from the employer contributions, provided the member contributes an additional 1%.

To fund the changes to the USS, employee contributions will rise from 7.5% (Final Salary members) or 6.5% (CRB members) to 8% of salary. The University will also pay more, contributing 18% of an employee's earnings to his/her pension.

3. Living Wage

Earlier in the year, under the HR Committee report, Court heard that work was being initiated to explore the potential for the University to become a Living Wage accredited employer. The Living Wage (set by the Living Wage Foundation) is a voluntary rate that employers can choose to commit to paying, is the same for all workers over the age of 18, and is based on the cost of living and the "Minimum Income

Standards” required for a basic, but adequate standard of living. The Living Wage is currently £7.85 per hour in Scotland.

All our employees are already paid at this level, but steps were taken in relation to casual workers and those engaged via contractors. Court has already heard (at the April Court meeting) that SMG concluded that the University should, with immediate effect, extend its commitment to pay the Living Wage to include casually employed workers (largely student assistants), with an estimated financial impact of £20,000 per annum. SMG has since explored the requirements for becoming an accredited Living Wage employer, and in particular to understand the nature of the commitment required of contractors working on campus.

I am pleased to advise that in August we received formal confirmation of our accreditation as a Living Wage Employer. We now have the right to display the Living Wage Employer Mark to promote our accreditation and will be added to the list of accredited employers on the Living Wage Foundation Website. Further, achieving accreditation goes some way to satisfying a key aspect of the Scottish Business Pledge which the University intends to adopt.

4. Joint Educational Initiatives in China

Negotiations took place earlier this year with the Ministry of Education with regard to the formation of a Joint Educational Institute (JEI) in Engineering with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC). The new Institute, once formally approved, will see the launch of three new undergraduate degree programmes in Telecommunications, Microelectronics and Biomedical Engineering. The JEI is expected to become a substantial entity with an anticipated 2,500 students enrolled in the three new programmes in steady state. A delegation visited the UK on the 18 June to consolidate the agreement and at the UK-China Education Summit in London in September, Professor Li Yanrong, President of UESTC and I signed an MoA in the presence of the Minister for Education China and UK Ministers and government officials, confirming our commitment to establish the JEI.

In July, the First Minister observed the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between the University and Nankai University, one of China’s top research universities. It marked the inauguration of the University of Glasgow-Nankai University Joint Graduate School (our first JEI), the first postgraduate higher education programme to be set up on a Chinese university campus in partnership with a UK institution. The School opened in August, with its first intake of postgraduates. They will study a two-year MSc degree in either Environmental Management, International Relations or Urban and Regional Planning.

The programmes will be taught in English, at Nankai, by academics from both the University of Glasgow and Nankai University. The dual Masters qualification will be awarded by each university.

5. Queen Elizabeth University Hospital

In early July, the Queen officially opened the new south Glasgow hospitals and Teaching and Learning Centre, which have been named The Queen Elizabeth University Hospital, Glasgow, The Royal Hospital for Children, Glasgow, and The Queen Elizabeth Teaching and Learning Centre – Stratified Medicine Scotland. Quite apart from the impact these developments will have on the provision of healthcare in the city, this is a significant development for medicine at Glasgow, with immense potential to deliver translational research, enhanced engagement with the pharmaceutical industry, and advances on clinical medicine

6. University Rankings and Awards

In June, I reported that two of the UK League Tables had been published for 2016: the Complete University Guide and The Guardian. In the Complete University Guide, we remained at 30th place, and were placed 24th in the Guardian league table, up from 25th last year. We also remained in 26th place in the Times/Sunday Times league tables.

In international league tables, we fell back from 55th to 62nd place in the QS World University Rankings and on 1 October it will be announced that we will rise from 95th to 76th place in the THE World Rankings, our highest position ever. Both publishers changed their methodologies this year.

In July, the University was named Institution of the Year at the inaugural Herald Higher Education Awards, and the groundbreaking postgraduate Masters programme in Stratified Medicine received the award for Outstanding Employer Engagement. The Outstanding Contribution from a Student award went to University veterinary medicine student, Ruby Shorrock, for the Trusty Paws project, which helps maintain the health of pets of homeless people.

In August, the University was ranked top in Scotland and third in the Russell Group in the National Student Survey 2015 as measured by overall satisfaction (Question 22 in the NSS). The results also placed 15 of the University's subject areas in the UK's top ten.

In September, the University received the award of a 5* plus rating in the QS Stars University Ratings, the first UK university to achieve this. The QS Stars system allows students to get a wider picture of the qualities of universities around the world, by looking at a range of areas including the employability of graduates, sports facilities and community engagement. The audit evaluates an institution against more than 50 different indicators, and awards universities between one and five-plus stars over eight wider fields, as well as an overall rating. The University was rated as 5 Stars Plus overall, becoming the first and only UK university to hold this rating. 5 Star ratings were achieved across all eight other categories: Teaching, Employability, Research, Internationalisation, Facilities, Innovation, Inclusiveness, and Specialist Criteria: Life Sciences and Medicine.

The University has been shortlisted as University of the Year in the Times Higher Education Awards, for the second consecutive year. The University has also been nominated in three other categories: Professor David Clark's End of Life Studies is shortlisted for the Research Project of the Year; University spinout MODE Diagnostics is in the running for the Outstanding Contribution to Innovation and Technology prize; and the University is nominated in the Outstanding Support for Early Career Researchers category.

7. Key activities

Below is a summary of some of the main activities I have been involved in since the last meeting of Court, divided into 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.

7.1 Academic Development and Strategy

7 July: Attended the Commission on Widening Access - Data Working Group and on 5 August the Commission on Widening Access.

7 July: Attended Growing Value Scotland Task Force Steering Group – National Centre for Universities & Business (NCUB).

8 July: Met with Principal of the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland to discuss collaborations.

3 August: Participated in Professorial interview for MVLS.

28 September: Took part in the official opening of the CVR, Sir Michael Stoker Building, Garscube. Sir Mark Walport opened the facility.

5 October: Will attend a dinner organized by the Committee of Scottish Chairs. This was arranged following the review of University governance, and the view of the Convener of US and Chair of the Committee of Scottish Chairs that it would be useful for Principals and Chairs to have an annual opportunity for collective discussion.

7.2 International Activities

From 25 to 28 July I visited Beijing for signing a MoU between the University and Nankai University, in the company of the First Minister, as noted in Section 4 of the report.

1 September: Undertook a filmed interview with the China Business TV. This was in cooperation with the Glasgow City Marketing Bureau.

1 September: Welcomed the Croatian Ambassador to the University and took part in the signing of an MoU sponsored by the Croatian Government. It is intended to support programmes in Croatian culture and literature within School of Modern Languages and Cultures.

1 September: Gave an interview with Alisdair Jones for Shanghai Top 500 Research Universities Encyclopedia.

17 September: Attended the UK-China Education Summit in London and UESTC signing as noted in section 4 of this report. In the evening attended the UK-China High Level People to People Dialogue Reception.

2 October: I received the Italian Consul General on a visit to the University.

7.3 Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

2 July: Attended the 6th Annual Santander UK Vice Chancellors Reception in London.

9 July: Attended the Trades House Lecture delivered by Vice Principal and Head of College MVLS, Prof Anna Dominiczak, and the Trades House dinner which followed.

14 July: Attended USS Board Meeting in London and on 16 July and 10 September the USS Investment Committee Meetings. On 23-24 September I attended the USS Board Strategy Session which was then followed by a Board meeting.

15 July: Attended the NCUB Board Meeting in London.

17 July: Met with Angela Crawley MP for Lanark and Hamilton East.

23 July: Convener of Court and I met with Lord Dunlop, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Scotland Office, and Philip Rycroft.

31 July: Met with representatives of KPMG (London and Scotland) to discuss the Glasgow City Deal.

10 August: Took part in a members of Council for Economic Advisors teleconference.

20 August: Attended the Joint SFC/HIE Board Meeting.

21 August: Attended the Scottish Funding Council - Business Meeting.

24 August: Met with Professor Peter Weissberg, Medical Director and Mr Simon Gillespie, Chief Executive, of the British Heart Foundation as part of their visit to the University, the BHF Cardiovascular Research Centre and the Queen Elizabeth University Hospital, Queen Elizabeth Teaching and Learning Centre – Stratified Medicine Scotland.

25 August: Attended Universities Scotland Away Day, which this year was hosted by the University.

26 August: Gave a presentation to the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce as part of its *Glasgow Talks...* series co-run with the Adam Smith Business School. The topic was *Education* and I was asked to speak on the University and its contribution to education and the city of Glasgow today. Perspectives were also given from the College and Skills sector.

27 August: Attended the Joint Skills Committee Meeting of SFC/SDS.

27 August: Participated in a discussion meeting with Scottish Government and Universities Scotland officials.

27 August: Was invited to attend a dinner hosted by Archbishop Tartaglia on Catholic Education.

2 September: Opened and welcomed delegates to the EPIP (European Policy for Intellectual Property Conference) 2015 in the morning and later in the afternoon welcomed delegates to the European Association of Archaeologists conference.

2 September: Took part in a film relating to the University's shortlisting in the THE University of the Year.

4 September: Participated in annual visit of the MRC to MVLS and the Queen Elizabeth University Hospital.

10 September: Attended CASE Development Committee Europe in London.

11 September: Met with the Chief Economic Adviser to the Scottish Government.

15 September: Participated in NCUB Growing Value Scotland Executive Group conference update call.

15 September: Welcomed and gave an overview of the University's current activities to delegates attending the EAIE Conference and who had partnerships with the University. In the evening I welcomed delegates to a reception hosted by the university. The EAIE conference is the second biggest Education conference in the world and over 5,000 delegates came to the city.

16 September: Gave evidence to Scottish Parliament-Finance Committee on the implications of the HE Governance Bill.

23 September: Was invited to attend Top Management Programme 35 held in Glasgow, and to meet the delegates in conversation and Q&A sessions which centered on the challenges of leading a major and complex institution like the University.

29 September: Met with Patrick Grady, MP for Glasgow North, and later in the day with Jim Murphy

30 September: Hosted a discussion and dinner in the Lodging in relation to the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Programme and which involved city and academic representatives.

1 October: The University hosted the Wolfson Foundation 60th Anniversary lecture and reception in the Bute Hall. The First Minister attended and the lecture was delivered by Professor Sir David Cannadine. The celebrations are taking the form of a lecture series, all centred on one of the Foundation's main funding themes. The Glasgow lecture will focus on Higher Education.

Throughout the period of this report I met with potential supporters both in London and at the University in relation to our Campus Development plans. This activity also included a visit to New York (18 – 21 September) to meet other potential supporters.

7.4. Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

Completed the summer graduations.

27 June: Attended the General Council meeting and provided an introduction to our new Strategy: Inspiring People, Changing the World.

14 September: Delivered the Freshers address at the start of Freshers week.

25 September: Was a member of the judging panel in the Charles Kennedy GUU Memorial Debate.

28 September: Welcomed the new recruits to this year's Development and Alumni Office Telephone Campaign.

Undertook a series of presentations to staff in partnership with Senior VP, to launch the new Strategy.

8. Senior Management Group business

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

SMG Meeting of 22 June 2015

- Proposal for Extension of the Fellowship Fund
- Innovation Centre admin-hub HEIs and CENSIS
- University Nominations-Carnegie Trust Centenary Professorships Scheme

- Campus Development
- TNE
- Pricing and Discounts and Scholarships
- University Strategy Roll Out and Improvement Group Update
- Management of information on international travel by staff

SMG Meeting of 23 July 2015

- TNE Development Proposal
- Oversight of TNE
- Remit for the FEC Board
- International Payments-Credit Cards – Update
- Complaints Handling (Third Quarter)

SMG Meeting of August 2015

- Update on Campus development
- Estate Development Plan – School of Interdisciplinary Studies
- Developing *Policy Scotland* as a Brand for the University’s Public Policy Profile
- Survey Results and Issues

SMG meeting of 18 September 2015

- Campus development update, Resourcing the programme and *Update on Space Management Policy*
- REF Review Reporting
 - *UoA 8 Chemistry*
 - *UoA 18 Economics and Econometrics*
 - *UoA 19 Business and Management Studies*
 - *UoA 20 Law*
- Preparing for REF2020: Setting the Institutional Level of Ambition for Output Quality
- Counter-Terrorism & Security Act 2015 - Speakers & Events



Court - Wednesday 7 October 2015

Report from the Secretary of Court

SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 *Court Strategy Day*

Annex 1 is a report on the key points arising from the Strategy Day held on 30 September.

A.2 *Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Bill*

Publication of the HE Governance (Scotland) Bill was in June. Parliamentary scrutiny will run through until the first quarter of 2016. Calls for evidence, from the Scottish Government's Finance and Education & Culture Committees, were issued over the summer and responses to both were submitted following consideration by the Court Governance Working Group. Court members have received a copy of the submissions by email.

Annex 2 is a briefing, prepared by Universities Scotland, which updates on the current position and provides web addresses for the key documents.

A.3 *Governance of Subsidiaries*

Annex 3 is a paper on the Governance of University Subsidiaries, which follows an internal audit. The audit had four recommendations, one of which is that *'The university will implement a formal, risk-based governance structure for each of its subsidiaries. This should be proportionate to the risks posed by each entity'*. **Court's approval is sought for the approach set out in Annex 3.**

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 *Court Procedural Review Group: Library*

Court agreed at its meeting in June on changes to the remit and membership of the Court Procedural Review Group. On Court's behalf the group considers proposals on organisational change, and it now has the authority to instruct management to take forward Organisational Change proposals. Alternatively, it may decide not to authorise the proposals, and/or to refer them to Court for discussion.

Membership of the CPRG is currently: Ken Brown, Morag Macdonald Simpson, Karen Lury, David Milloy and Duncan Ross.

The Group has considered one item of business since the last meeting of Court. This was a proposal from the University Library which involves restructuring the support service offered at evenings and weekends, with a view to reducing cost and providing a better-fitting structure. The proposal involves 43 current positions no longer being required. These are part-time roles, with a total FTE value of 5.83.

Having considered the proposal, the CPRG has authorised management to take forward implementation in consultation with the relevant campus trade unions.

B.2 *Nominations Committee business*

i) Court and Committees

There are a number of Court and Court Committee vacancies, with recruitment currently taking place through the Nominations Committee. A series of interviews is being held in early October, for the following positions:

- Convener of Court, with an appointment to be made in advance of David Ross's retirement in July 2016, to give an opportunity for shadowing, to include observing at a Court meeting or meetings and observing the main Committees.
- 2 Co-opted positions on Court, one also involving membership of the HR Committee.
- A Remuneration Committee lay member to fill a vacancy that we were unable to fill last year.
- An Audit Committee external (non-Court) member from November 2015, to replace a member who is demitting office.
- An Estates Committee external (non-Court) member (recruitment for this post will be delayed until November because of annual leave).
- Two GU Holdings external members, further to Court's approval of revised Terms of Reference for this company (appointment likely in November).

ii) Equality and Diversity Committee EDSC

The EDSC is an executive group, chaired by the Principal, and up to now we have not had a lay governor present. Given her interest and expertise in this area, Lesley Sutherland has attended the Committee for the last two meetings and, following approval by the Nominations Committee, I confirm that she has now joined as a member of the EDSC, for the same period as her membership of Court, currently to 31 July 2018.

iii) Audit Committee chair

Following approval by the Nominations Committee, Dr Paul Brady has been re-appointed as chair of the Audit Committee from 1 August 2015 to 31 July 2016.

iv) Court Procedural Review Group

At Court's June 2015 meeting, it was agreed to expand the Court Procedural Review Group to include three rather than two lay members. Ken Brown and Morag Macdonald Simpson were already members and both confirmed they were willing to continue. Following approval by the Nominations Committee, David Milloy has been appointed as the third lay member of the group. The remaining two members of the CPRG are the Senior Senate Assessor (Duncan Ross) and another Senate Assessor (Karen Lury) as nominated by the Senior Senate Assessor.

B.3 *Ordinance relating to Membership of Court*

As Court has been advised, Ordinance 206 was approved by the Privy Council in July 2015. Its impact is to increase the number of co-opted positions on Court from 5 to 9, to reduce the number of Senate Assessors from 7 to 6 and to reduce the number of General Council Assessors from 5 to 2. As previously agreed by Court, this change in composition will take place in a phased manner as vacancies arise. In Session 2015/16, Court will have 7 co-opted members, 6 Senate Assessors and 4 General Council Assessors.

B.4 *Ordinance relating to Membership of the General Council*

Membership of the General Council is currently governed by an Ordinance, which lists categories of members. The Ordinance includes provisions relating to graduates whose degrees are either jointly awarded in conjunction with other institutions, or awarded by another institution whose degrees are validated by the University. These categories, which include for example specific degree programmes associated with the Glasgow School of Art, need to be updated to reflect changes that have been made in recent years to the portfolio of collaborative programmes.

It is suggested to Court that the starting point should be to amend the Ordinance to generalise such categories, so that they could cover any such joint awarding/validation arrangements in operation from time to time, meaning that future requirements for amendments would be kept to a minimum.

If Court is content with this approach, the Privy Council will be asked for an early view on the feasibility of making the Ordinance more flexible, with any formal processes to follow, to involve Court and the normal consultations for an Ordinance change.

Court's approval is sought to proceed in this way.

B.5 *Court Business 2015/16*

Standing Orders for Court are appended at **Annex 4**. The appendices include details of Court committee dates for this session.

By way of reminder, Court agreed as part of its self-assessment exercise that members of Court would be able to attend committee meetings as observers, with a maximum of two per meeting, for practical reasons. Court members are invited to contact the relevant clerks if they are interested in attending a particular meeting; contact details have been provided to Court members by email.

Annex 4 also contains the Statement of Primary Responsibilities and the Schedule of Court Business for the coming year, for reference.

The above items are also available on the Court website at <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/courtoffice/universitycourtandcourtmeetings/> along with other resources for Court members.

The attendance lists for meetings of Court and its committees for 2014/15 have been reviewed; there are no outstanding issues to report in connection with this.

B.6 *Senate Assessor on Court*

Professor Christine Forde has demitted office, at 31 July 2015. Senate is in the process of appointing an Assessor to replace her.

B.7 *Honorary Degree Nominations*

In line with the previously agreed arrangement with Senate to allow members of Court to submit observations on nominations for honorary degrees, the Clerk of Senate John Briggs will advise Court of the 2015/16 nominations on a confidential basis. Members of Court should contact the Clerk of Senate should they have observations to make.

B.8 *Queen Margaret Union – Constitutional Changes*

On Court's behalf, I have approved changes to the constitution of the Queen Margaret Union. These are minor in nature.

B.9 *Appointments of Head of School*

College of MVLS

School of Life Sciences

Professor Simon Guild has been appointed as Head of the School Life Sciences for 4 years from 1 October 2015.

College of Social Sciences

School of Social and Political Sciences

Professor Michele Burman has been appointed as Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences from 1 September 2015 to 31 July 2017

Court Strategy Day

Court's annual strategy day took place on 30 September, with a substantial session on the Campus Estates Strategy, and briefing sessions also on E-Learning and on Student Recruitment and Marketing.

The morning session focused on the Campus Estates Strategy, with briefings on:

- the overall management of the programme;
- the progress of specific projects;
- the funding strategy; and
- arrangements for ongoing review and reporting.

In the final morning session (review and reporting), Court agreed that the following arrangements should be put in place.

1. Review

A Panel of experts should be established, who will be responsible for: a) undertaking Gateway Reviews in respect of each major project; and b) conducting an annual review of the whole programme. This annual review will conclude with a report to the Principal, which will then be discussed at SMG and at Court.

In addition to the work of the Panel of experts:

- the full capital plan will be reviewed annually by Finance Committee and Court as part of the annual budget process; and
- a small panel of senior designers will undertake a design review of the Masterplan, reporting to Estates Committee

2. Reporting

Court confirmed some key points in relation to Reporting:

- As already agreed, all business cases over £25M will come to Court, after being considered by Finance Committee.
- Estates Committee will receive presentations on all major projects at key design stages, and will monitor performance in implementing the overall programme.
- A Court Working Group will be formed, including lay members, students and staff representatives and professional officers, to support Court in the ongoing work on the Estates Strategy and Capital Plan. At key points, the Working Group will discuss investment proposals, and test business cases prior to their being forwarded for committee approvals. This follows the approach adopted at the time the University was considering the possible acquisition of the Western Infirmary Site.

DN, 5.10.15

Higher Education Governance Bill: Background

Pre-legislative consultation

A consultation on the proposed Bill was launched on 7 November 2014, with a deadline for submissions 30 January 2015. Responses can be found here:

<http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2015/03/5250/downloads>

Parliamentary Stage 1: Education & Culture Committee

The Bill was published on 17 June 2015, along with a Policy Memorandum, Financial Memorandum, Explanatory notes, and other associated documents. These can all be found, along with details of the Bill's progress, here:

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/Bills/90125.aspx>

The Scottish Parliament's Education & Culture Committee (ECC) is the lead committee for Stage 1 of the Bill's progress through parliament. A record of the ECC's work on the Bill is maintained here:

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/90785.aspx>

The ECC issued a call for evidence on the Bill, which closed on 4 September. All responses can be found here:

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/91907.aspx>

Prior to this, on 9 July, **the ECC had written to Cabinet Secretary Angela Constance with a series of questions**. The Cabinet Secretary's reply was received on 22 September. Both letters can be found on the Committee's webpage:

[http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S4_EducationandCultureCommittee/Higher%20Education%20Governance%20\(Scotland\)/HEG_Bill_SM_to_Cab_Sec_OUT_20150709.pdf](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S4_EducationandCultureCommittee/Higher%20Education%20Governance%20(Scotland)/HEG_Bill_SM_to_Cab_Sec_OUT_20150709.pdf)

[http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S4_EducationandCultureCommittee/Higher%20Education%20Governance%20\(Scotland\)/Letter_from_the_Cabinet_Secretary_for_Education_and_Lifelong_Learning.pdf](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S4_EducationandCultureCommittee/Higher%20Education%20Governance%20(Scotland)/Letter_from_the_Cabinet_Secretary_for_Education_and_Lifelong_Learning.pdf)

The Cabinet Secretary's letter largely follows the Policy Memorandum, but notably clarifies certain points:

- The intention is now to replace the 'regulations' on appointing Chairs with primary legislation in Stage 2.
- The Scottish Government does not envision that anyone outside the university community would participate in the election of Chairs.

- The governing body would retain the power to eject a poorly performing Chair (notwithstanding the mandate that an elected Chair would presumably carry from a distinct electorate).

The letter also notably states that “Governance in our universities is obviously not of a low standard.”

The ECC will take oral evidence on the Bill through a ‘round table’ session on 6 October. At the request of the Committee, the sector will field one representative each from the Ancients, post-92s, chartered universities and SSIs. In addition, David Ross will participate, as Chair of the Committee of Scottish Chairs. The Government’s bill team will give evidence to the committee earlier in the day on 6 October. The Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning will give evidence separately, on 10 November.

Parliamentary Stage 1: Finance Committee

The Scottish Parliament’s Finance Committee issued a call for evidence on the Bill’s Financial Memorandum, containing specific questions on the financial implications of the Bill. This closed on 21 August. The submissions can be found here:

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/90966.aspx>

The Finance Committee took oral evidence on 16 September. The sector was represented by a three-person team including the Principal. The Bill team gave evidence in a subsequent session. Discussion centred on the threat of potential Office of National Statistics reclassification of HEIs as public sector institutions and the financial consequences of this.

Governance over subsidiaries

The internal auditor, PriceWaterhouseCoopers, undertook an audit in recent months of the governance of University subsidiary companies; i.e. Kelvin Nanotechnology, GU Holdings Ltd, Glasgow Singapore Ltd, GU Heritage Retail Ltd and UoG Utilities Supply Company Ltd.

The audit report had four recommendations. Three of these have been referred to the directors of each of the subsidiaries. Their focus is: 1. the maintenance of an annual risk register; 2. an induction programme for all new directors; and 3. a conflict of interest policy.

The fourth recommendation is for Court to consider, and is about the governance structure that should be established when a new subsidiary is created. The recommendation is that:

'The university will implement a formal, risk-based governance structure for each of its subsidiaries. This should be proportionate to the risks posed by each entity'.

To assist Court in addressing this recommendation, a risk-based framework has been prepared (see next page) which, if Court is content, will be referred to in future for guidance whenever the University is establishing a new subsidiary.

DN, 2.9.15

Risk-based Governance Framework for University subsidiaries

Tier 1: Example Criteria

Annual turnover below £1,000,000
All entity risks assessed as low to the University
Company operates in U.K only
Entity is subject to limited regulation
Entity does not engage in investment and borrowing activity
Entity operations expose University to limited reputational risk
Ongoing University investment/funding is limited

Tier 1: Governance Arrangements

All Directors appointed by Court
Submission of annual accounts for approval to the Finance Committee

Tier 2: Example Criteria

Annual turnover between £1,000,000 and £5,000,000
Entity has risks assessed as moderate to the University
Company has international operations
Entity is subject to a moderate level of regulation
Entity has investing and borrowing powers
Entity operations expose University to moderate reputational risk
Ongoing University investment/funding is expected

Tier 2: Governance Arrangements

All Directors appointed by Court
All transactions exceeding £100,000 to be approved by the Finance Committee
Management accounts submitted to Finance Committee on a quarterly basis
Risk register reviewed annually by Finance Committee

Tier 3: Example Criteria

Annual turnover in excess of £5,000,000
Entity has listed investments
Entity has risks assessed as high to the University
Entity is highly regulated
Entity operations expose University to significant reputational risk

Tier 3: Governance Arrangements

All Directors appointed by Court
Management accounts consolidated into monthly Senior Management Group Packs
Nominated University Officer responsible for ongoing monitoring operations

University of Glasgow

STANDING ORDERS FOR COURT AND COURT COMMITTEES

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

authority is exercised, the nature of and reason for the action should be reported to the next meeting of the committee.

- 12 Court has given authority to the Secretary of Court to act on its behalf between meetings on matters of routine business. The Secretary of Court shall be answerable to Court for any action which he/she takes on its behalf and a written report shall be made to the next meeting of Court detailing any such action taken for endorsement by Court.
- 13 Court has given authority to the Convener, the Principal and the Secretary of Court to act together on behalf of Court between meetings on matters of other than routine business. These persons shall be answerable to Court for any action they take on its behalf and a written report shall be made to the next meeting of Court detailing any such action taken for endorsement by Court.
- 14 Committees should determine and publicise at the start of an academic year their schedule of meetings; thereafter changes to dates/times should be kept to a minimum.
- 15 The agenda and papers for meetings of Court and its Committees should normally be circulated not less than 7 days in advance of the meeting. Papers for Court will focus on key issues requiring Court's consideration and, where applicable, will be accompanied by a summary; if necessary, background papers will be made available on-line for reference. Papers should only be tabled in exceptional circumstances.
- 16 If Court believes there may be good reason to remove an individual from membership of Court, it shall delegate the matter to the Nominations Committee, which shall consider the case, hear the member's defence and make a recommendation to Court. Criteria for removal from membership of Court shall include persistent absenteeism, medical incapacity, legal impediment and breaches of the Code of Conduct for Members of Court. ([Appendix A](#)).
- 17 Should Court members have concerns about the way Court is operating, they should in the first place raise these concerns with the Convener. The Senior Senate Assessor and the Chancellor's Assessor have joint responsibility for receiving any concern felt by a Court member about the conduct of Court business, where the member does not wish to raise this directly with the Convener, for identifying any concerns among Court members about the conduct of Court business, and for raising these with the Convener.
- 18 Court shall hold 5 regular meetings plus one Strategy Day and one Induction Day in each academic year and, if business requires it, a special meeting may be called from time to time. In addition, briefing sessions may be arranged on matters of importance. [Appendix B](#) is a schedule of meetings of Court and of its Committees in 2015/16.
- 19 Court members are encouraged to consider attendance at suitable training events, which will be brought to members' attention by the Court Office. Court members are also encouraged to observe committees where they would be interested in knowing what business the committees discuss and how the meetings are conducted.

August 2015

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF COURT

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

Members of Court should:-

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

SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC LIFE

Selflessness

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

Integrity

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

Objectivity

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

Accountability

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

Openness

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

Honesty

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

Leadership

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

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

Schedule of Meetings of Court and its Committees 2015/2016

Court

Wednesday 6 October 2015
Wednesday 16 December 2015
Wednesday 10 February 2016
Wednesday 13 April 2016
Wednesday 22 June 2016

Audit Committee

Wednesday 16 September 2015
Tuesday 10 November 2015
Tuesday 16 February 2016
Tuesday 17 May 2016

Estates Committee

Friday 28 August 2015
Friday 6 November 2015
Friday 8 January 2016
Friday 11 March 2016
Friday 13 May 2016

Finance Committee

Friday 11 September 2015
Wednesday 18 November 2015
Wednesday 20 January 2016
Tuesday 22 March 2016
Wednesday 25 May 2016

Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Tuesday 15 September 2015
Wednesday 9 December 2015
Wednesday 9 March 2016
Wednesday 1 June 2016

Human Resources Committee

Tuesday 29 September 2015
Wednesday 25 November 2015
Tuesday 19 January 2016
Wednesday 23 March 2016
Thursday 26 May 2016

Nominations Committee

To meet as required

Remuneration Committee

To meet as required

University of Glasgow

STATEMENT OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

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

General

To be satisfied that appropriate mechanisms are in place:

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

Strategic Planning

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

Exercise of Controls

13. to make clear and to review regularly the executive authority and other powers delegated to the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, to other senior

officers and to other bodies of the University including the Senate and Committees of Court, such authority and powers to be set out in a Schedule of Delegated Authorities;

14. to ensure the proper use of public funds awarded to the University, observance of the terms of the Financial Memorandum between the University and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and compliance with the University's Outcome Agreement with the SFC;
15. to establish and monitor effective systems of internal control and accountability throughout the University;
16. to oversee the University's arrangements for internal and external audit and to approve the University's annual financial statements;
17. to ensure that arrangements are in place for the proper management of health and safety in respect of students, staff and other persons affected by University operations;
18. to be the University's legal authority and, as such, to ensure that systems are in place for meeting all the University's legal obligations, including those arising from contracts and other legal commitments made in the University's name.

Effectiveness and Transparency

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

Adopted by the University Court: 9 October 2013

ANNUAL SCHEDULE OF COURT BUSINESS

- (September/*
- October)*
- October**
 - *Strategy Discussion Day)*
 - Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
 - Report on any action taken under delegated powers over summer
 - Report on Strategy Discussion Day
 - Standing Orders, Code of Conduct, Committee remits and dates
 - Statement of Primary Responsibilities
 - Scheme of Delegated Authorities
 - Schedule of Court business for forthcoming year
 - Report on previous year's attendance of Court and Committees
 - Learning & Teaching update and KPIs from Vice Principal
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
 - Nominations Committee recommendations for forthcoming year
 - Annual report to the Scottish Funding Council on Institution-led Review of Teaching Quality (ELIR)
 - Honorary Degree nominations

- (November)*
- *(Half day briefing on Governance, Funding and HE Policy) (if required)*

- December**
 - Report from Head of University Services (pre-Court briefing)
 - Audited Accounts/Financial Statements for previous year (including subsidiaries' financial statements and GU Trust statements)
 - Report on Investments (Finance Committee)
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
 - Audit Committee annual report
 - Human Resources KPIs

- February**
 - Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
 - SRC annual report
 - Draft Outcome Agreement for next year from Vice Principal
 - Finance KPIs
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)

- April**
 - Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
 - Research update and KPIs from Vice Principal
 - SFC Main Grant Allocations for forthcoming year
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
 - Annual Self-assessment, convener appraisal and Code compliance

- (May/June)*
- *(Half day briefing on University Finances) (if required)*

- June**
 - Report from Head of College (pre-Court briefing)
 - Strategic Plan (annual update) including KPIs
 - Capital Programme (annual update for approval)
 - Budget Overview for forthcoming year/Financial Forecasts/sustainability
 - Report on Investments (Finance Committee)
 - Summary Income and Expenditure report (Finance Committee)
 - Estates KPIs



Court – Wednesday 7 October 2015

Report from the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on

11 September 2015

Cover Sheet

Brief description of the paper

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

Key Items

Graeme Bissett chaired the last meeting of Finance Committee in Ken Brown's absence. As Acting Convenor, he will speak to the following items:

Remit of Finance Committee

The Remit of the Committee requires to be updated to take account of the changes agreed in approval processes for very large capital projects. Therefore it is proposed that a new section be added noting that projects requiring expenditure above £25M must be referred to Court for final decision, with a recommendation from Finance Committee.

The amended Remit is attached (Annex 1) and requires to be approved by Court.

It was also agreed that the remits of a cross-section of Scottish and Russell Group Finance Committees would be reviewed in comparison to our own. Any further amendments to our own remit would be considered at the next Finance Committee meeting and if appropriate brought to Court thereafter.

Capex applications and current programme of capital works

Finance Committee received two capex applications for additional funding for the Quantum Technology Hub (additional expenditure of £1.85M) and the Acre Road Wind Tunnel facility (additional expenditure of £222.5k). The two projects present distinct challenges but there are similarities – these can both be categorised as smaller, technically complex projects which require significant technical expertise to brief and, due to their complexity, would benefit from more rigorous scrutiny.

The Director of Estates reported on lessons learned and outlined steps taken to avoid similar issues recurring in future projects of a similar type.

To provide context, Finance Committee also received a monitoring report and commentary listing all current capital projects coded as red/amber/green.

Both applications were approved by Finance Committee, but with a request that 1) a review be performed of any other smaller projects currently underway to ensure that any signs of stress were identified and acted upon; and 2) in future the governance relating to smaller, complex projects was enhanced to avoid similar problems arising.

Overview of performance

The Committee received the overview of performance to 31 July 2015 showing an operating management surplus of £20.8m which was a £15.2m improvement against full year budget. This surplus will equate to a statutory accounting surplus of circa £45.2m after adjusting for pensions, endowments, gain on sale of property, a substantial tax refund on research, and contribution from subsidiaries.

Discussion focused particularly on salary savings of £9.6m which had been a major contributor to the increased surplus.

Action Requested

A Items – for action

Finance Committee Remit

Remit amended, **requiring Court approval**. (Item CA/2015/06) (**Annex 1**)

B Items – for noting

Endowments Investment Reports

Finance Committee noted the endowments investment reports (Item CA/2015/09)

Debtors Report as at 31 July 2015

Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 July 2015. The Director of Finance reported that total debt stood at £30.3m, representing an increase on year-on-year comparisons from £26.92m at July 2014. The level of student and sponsor debt was lower in July 2015 than July 2014, while there had been an increase year-on-year in overall commercial debt. (Item CA/2015/13)

Prepared by: Fiona Quinn

Last modified on: Wednesday 23 September 2015

University of Glasgow
Finance Committee
Minute of Meeting held on Friday 11 September 2015
in Melville Room, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:

Mr Graeme Bissett (Acting Convenor), Mr Robert Fraser, Mr Liam King, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Mr David Newall, Mr David Ross, Dr Duncan Ross, Mr Iain Stewart

In attendance:

Mrs Ann Allen, Prof Neal Juster, Ms Brenda Massie, Ms Fiona Quinn

Apologies:

Mr Paul Brady, Mr Ken Brown, Dr Carl Goodyear, Ms Margaret Morton

The Convenor welcomed Mr King to his first Finance Committee meeting as SRC President. He also welcomed Ms Massie from the Finance team.

CA/2015/01. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 27 May 2015

The minutes of Finance Committee held on 27 May 2015 were approved.

CA/2015/02. Matters arising

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

A brief update was circulated to the Committee, setting out measures which had been taken to minimise the University's liability.

Committee members were invited to direct any comments or questions to the Principal or Secretary of Court.

CA/2014/72. Bank credit ratings

The Director of Finance assured the Committee that compliance with the credit ratings policy was being maintained, following the decision to reduce the minimum required credit rating for financial organisations used by the University.

CA/2015/03. Conflicts of Interest

No new conflicts of interest were reported.

CA/2015/04. Capex application: Quantum Technology Hub (paper 5.1.1)

The Committee received a capital expenditure application requesting Finance Committee approval for a further £1.85m of expenditure, for construction, servicing and equipping the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre (JWNC) clean room. The Committee noted that the additional costs would be funded from a grant of £0.4m from the EPSRC with the remaining £1.45m met from accelerating agreed investment in the JWNC.

It was noted that the additional costs were due partly to changes in decisions about the detail of the project, for example bringing forward elements of improvements which were originally intended to be carried out later, and partly due to higher than expected tender returns with regard to construction costs.

The Director of Estates reassured the Committee in terms of governance processes, scrutiny of smaller, complex projects and accurate briefing of projects at the design stage.

Following a discussion, Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2015/05. Capex application: Wind Tunnel, Acre Road (paper 5.1.2)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure request for an additional £222,461 of funding for the Wind Tunnel facility. It was noted that there had been delays to the project and that the original planned programme dates had been over-optimistic. In addition, the project was not well matched with the contractor which had originally been appointed.

In discussing the project, the Committee touched on similar issues to those which applied in the case of the Quantum Technology Hub. Again, reassurances were given that lessons had been learned with regard to the need for rigorous briefing of technically complex projects.

Finance Committee approved the application.

The Committee requested 1) that a review be performed of any other smaller projects currently underway to ensure that any signs of stress were identified and acted upon; and 2) that in future the governance relating to smaller, complex projects was enhanced to avoid similar problems arising.

RAG Report

The Director of Estates presented a RAG monitoring report and a paper incorporating comments on the current programme of capital works. The Committee noted that a number of projects were being delivered on time and to budget, however smaller

complex projects were still presenting challenges. The Director was currently building capability within Estates & Buildings through recruitment of new staff.

Finance Committee welcomed the RAG report, noting that it was helpful to have an overview of progress across all capital works.

CA/2015/06. Finance Committee Remit (paper 5.2)

Finance Committee noted that each Committee of Court was required formally to review and approve the committee's remit annually. The Secretary of Court tabled a suggested amendment to the remit, to capture the new ruling that capital projects valued at above £25m should be approved by Court. The Committee agreed the remit should be amended accordingly.

It was agreed that some benchmarking would be useful and the Director of Finance agreed to review the remits of a sample of Scottish and Russell Group universities and raise any possible further amendments to our own remit at the next meeting.

CA/2015/08. Insurance Renewal 2015/16 (paper 6.1)

The Committee received a report on insurance activity including a note of the premium costs for the coming year. It was noted that 18 of the University's insurance policies were subject to competitive tender this year. These tender exercises resulted in a saving in premiums of just over £145,000 when compared with last year's equivalent costs. The tender for Engineering insurance and inspection covers was not yet complete and therefore these costs were not known.

The total premium costs for 2015/16 were £1.3m, a decrease of 10% on the previous year.

Taking into account the brokers' fee and the engineering costs, the estimated cost for the year would be within the insurance budget for 2015/16, which was £1.8m.

The Committee noted that, as always, the final position against budget would depend on the incidence of uninsured losses occurring throughout the year.

CA/2015/09. Endowments Investment Reports (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee noted the endowments investment reports.

CA/2015/10. Minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee 15 May 2015 (paper 6.3)

Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee from 15 May 2015.

CA/2015/11. Corporate Structure (paper 6.4)

The Director of Finance presented a paper describing the various entities which are consolidated into the University's annual accounts as well as a number of other entities which are dormant or for which the University has responsibility as a guarantor.

The Committee welcomed the paper, noting the main change which had taken place in recent times was the incorporation in August 2014 of the UOG Utilities Supply Company Ltd, which had been set up to handle the purchase of the Combined Heat and Power system.

The Committee requested clarification on governance arrangements and the membership of the various boards. The Secretary of Court noted that this information would be covered in a forthcoming discussion at Court of the governance of subsidiaries.

CA/2015/12. Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2015 (paper 7.1)

The Director of Finance provided a report on the overview of performance to 31 July 2014. The Committee noted that the University achieved an operating management surplus of £20.8m which was a £15.2m improvement against full year budget. The movements which contributed to the improved surplus included tuition fees at £0.7m higher than budget, salary savings of £9.6m, research contribution £1.2m higher than budget, and other general income £3.6m higher than budget. The Committee noted that the £20.8m management accounting surplus equated to a statutory accounting surplus of circa £45.2m after adjusting for pensions, endowments, gain on sale of property, a substantial tax refund on research, and contribution from subsidiaries.

At year end the University had £145.9m net funds. This reflects a cash outflow of £13.7m for the year to date.

The Committee noted that of the £9.6m salary savings, £7.6m was due to delays in recruitment. Finance Committee noted that some areas of the University had challenges with recruitment and retention of senior academic staff, particularly areas such as the Adam Smith Business School and some parts of MVLS in which the market for staff was extremely mobile and competitive.

CA/2015/13. Debtors Report as at 31 July 2015 (paper 7.2)

Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 July 2015. The Director of Finance reported that total debt stood at £30.3m, representing an increase year on year relative to July 2014 (£26.92m).

The level of student and sponsor debt was lower in July 2015 (£2.49m) than July 2014 (£3.08m). £2.13m was owed by individual students while £0.36m was sponsor debt. It was noted that the top ten sponsor balances represent 80% of all sponsor balances outstanding.

The Committee noted an increase year-on-year in overall commercial debt (£24.87m as compared to £20.59m in 2014). This increase was driven by a greater volume of business.

CA/2015/15. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 18 November 2015, 2pm.

Finance Committee Remit – amended September 2015

- To monitor the income and expenditure of the University.
- To consider financial policies and issues and to make recommendations to Court on:
 - the annual revenue and capital budget;
 - banking, borrowing and lending
 - the investment of endowment funds; and
 - other financial matters, always having regard to the importance of financial sustainability.
- To advise Court on the financial implications of policy decisions being considered by Court.
- To consider the financial statements of the University and make recommendations to Court thereon.
- Having received a report from the Capex Committee:
 - to make recommendations to Court on the budget for capital projects;
 - to decide on all capex proposals involving expenditure of ~~between~~ £500,000 ~~or above~~ and £25M, subject to these proposals being included in the Court approved capital plan and, where appropriate, having been approved by the Estates Committee;
 - to make recommendations to Court on all capex proposals involving expenditure of £25M or above, subject to these proposals being included in the Court approved capital plan and, where appropriate, having been approved by Estates Committee; and
 - to decide on all requests for capital budget variances of £500,000 or above.
- To authorise individual items of revenue expenditure costing £1M or more.



Court - Wednesday 7 October 2015

Report from the Audit Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 16 September 2015 are attached for information. **There are no specific matters requiring Court's approval or decision.**

Ahead of the meeting, the Committee members received a private briefing on the new University Strategic Plan, from Senior Vice Principal Professor Neal Juster. The Committee recorded its strong support for the Plan and looks forward to working with the University during the Plan's implementation.

The Committee was updated on the new Statement of Recommended Practice and on the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Bill, where the Committee heard that the sector is making representations against a number of aspects of the proposed legislation affecting HEIs which could have an adverse impact on their independence, finances and charitable status.

The Committee received reports on recent internal audits. No reports were classified as critical or high risk. The main points were contained in reviews relating to:

- Corporate Governance: Estates Strategy, where the review was positive overall, but included two Medium risk findings about control design and project control logs. Finance Committee is overseeing the financial plan associated with strategy delivery, including regular monitoring of revenue projections and profile of expenditure commitments; assessment of affordability; and approval of borrowing strategy.
- Risk Management: Estates & Buildings, where the review noted good practice in relation to larger value projects. Some issues were identified in relation to lower value projects (less than £500,000).
- Budgetary Compliance & Departmental compliance: Course Development & Approval, where the review identified aspects of the current process for course development and approval, which were not operating adequately, with three Medium risk findings made.
- Facilities Management, where the review focused on workforce planning and overtime management, within three services. One Medium risk finding was made, regarding the absence of contractual call-out arrangements at the University. The Committee agreed that an 'advisory' recommendation, relating to the University considering whether inclusion of contractual overtime within staff contracts remains necessary for business needs, would more firmer recommendation.
- IT Structure & Governance: IT Strategy, where One Medium risk finding was made, relating to the absence of an underlying long-term action plan, defining the key activities and milestones expected to achieve the visions set out in the IT Strategy.

The Committee received an update on IT Penetration Testing, noting an assessment (re-test) based on an exercise undertaken in 2014, covering threats posed to the University's internet-facing infrastructure. The large majority of actions have been satisfactorily addressed. The exercise will be repeated annually.

The Committee received a report on Research Misconduct cases, noting that two formal investigations relating to research misconduct were undertaken during the 2014/15. The Committee also noted that a review of the University's policies and procedures for promoting good research practice and investigating breaches of research integrity is being undertaken.

Prepared by Deborah Maddern, 28.9.15

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Audit Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 16 September 2015 in Room 656A Main Building

Present:

Dr Paul Brady (Chair) (PB), Ms Heather Cousins (HC), Mr Jo Elliot (JE), Mr Neil Menzies (NM), Ms Lesley Sutherland (LS), Mr David Watt (DJW)

In attendance:

Mr Colin Campbell (PWC) (CC), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance) (RF), Ms Denise Gallagher (PWC) (DG), Ms Kelly MacFarlane (PWC) (KMacF), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk) (DM), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal) (AM), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court) (DN), Mr Stephen Reid (Ernst & Young) (SR), Ms Carolyn Timar (Financial Accountant) (CT), Dr Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary) (DAW)

Apologies: Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young) (KB), Ms Lindsey Paterson (PWC) (LP)

AUDIT/2015/1. Announcements

Kelly MacFarlane PWC was welcomed.

AUDIT/2015/2. Minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2015

The minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2015/3. Matters Arising

.1 2015/16 Audit Plan

The Plan had been approved at the previous meeting, subject to minor changes, which had subsequently been made in agreement with the chair, and the revised plan emailed to the Committee in the summer.

It was noted that under the B3 *Staff Recruitment, Retention and Support* heading, PWC and the University executive had since discussed a refocus of the audit away from P&DR aspects and more towards recruitment, and, with the Committee's agreement, this would now be taken forward under the plan.

Under the D12 *Student Experience* heading, it was noted that staff experience of MyCampus would be a focus of the audit on process efficiency.

With regard to the previously agreed position that the Committee would be involved in agreeing any major changes to proposed audits, it was noted that the point of contact for the auditors and executive would be the Committee chair, who would involve the other members of the Committee if he judged it necessary. The chair would also be the initial point for consultation about the proposed remits for major audits.

It was agreed that the next year's plan should reflect both the new University Strategic Plan and the associated revised Risk Register, which register should reflect opportunity costs associated with the plan. The auditors would consider commercial drivers linked to the plan, to help the Committee focus on major strategic issues affecting the University.

ACTION PWC

.2 New SORP - update

RF updated the Committee about the new Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP), which would apply to the 2016/17 accounts and beyond, and which reflected changes to UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (GAAP). The main changes included: staff cost accruals connected with holidays and sabbaticals; revaluation of investments related to endowments; treatment of deferred capital grants; treatment of pension liabilities.

It was noted that the University's capital plan would not be affected by the changes.

The Committee would be kept updated.

.3 Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Bill

The bill had been published in June. It included references to ministerial powers relating to HEIs, that had not been included at the consultation stage. There were provisions relating to the appointment of chairs of governing bodies and to the composition of those bodies. Parliamentary scrutiny would run through until the first quarter of 2016. Calls for evidence, from the Scottish Government's Finance and Education & Culture Committees, had been issued over the summer and responses to both had been submitted following consideration by a Court Governance Working Group. The responses had included references to the need for independence and autonomy for HEIs, and to concerns that the Bill's provisions might lead to universities being categorised as Non Departmental Public Bodies, resulting in their funding becoming part of the PSBR, and might also threaten their charitable status, developments that would have a major detrimental impact on university finances. The sector as a whole was engaged in making representations to the Government.

The Committee would be kept updated.

.4 Risk Management workshops - update

College workshops were all complete and implementation would be monitored by the auditors, with the Committee being kept updated. The auditors advised that progress was being made in embedding risk management in the Colleges.

AUDIT/2015/4. Internal Audit Update

The Committee noted that progress relating to an audit of the University's subsidiaries would be reported at the November meeting.

The Committee requested that the Management Response to audits be included in all reports.

ACTION PWC

The Committee noted a status update on reviews being undertaken during 2015/16. Seven reviews had been completed since the last Audit Committee. No reports had been classified as critical or high risk. The key messages for the Committee on the completed reviews were as follows:

4.1 Corporate Governance: Estates Strategy

The review has been positive overall, but had included two Medium risk findings about control design, that were being addressed. These related to implementation of Project Management standards and guidelines that communicated project management expectations and ensured consistency across the portfolio; and to project control logs that would centralise the identification and monitoring of areas including risk.

With regard to governance of the Estate Strategy, it was noted that for projects within the strategy, Finance Committee would see and approve all of them, and those of £25M or above would, additionally, be presented to Court for approval. Court would also see the context relating to all projects. The Finance Committee was overseeing the financial plan associated with delivery of the strategy; this would include regular monitoring of revenue projections and the profile of expenditure commitments; assessment of affordability; and approval of the borrowing strategy, details of which would be finalised over the coming few months. On occasions, Finance Committee might meet jointly with the Estates Committee. The Audit Committee would be kept informed.

4.2 Risk Management: Estates & Buildings

The review had noted good practice in relation to the larger value projects and good risk management and governance arrangements in relation to the Estates Strategy, with an active Estates Strategy Risk Register. Some issues had been identified in relation to lower value projects (less than £500,000 in spend), resulting in four Medium risks, including: not all lower value projects having risk registers, and a need for a process for review of project interdependencies within the wider portfolio. All points were being addressed.

4.3 Student Experience: Competition & Markets Authority Compliance

The review had been positive, with one Medium risk finding, relating to making offer letters more ‘user friendly’ about fees payment details and University Calendar information.

4.4 Budgetary Compliance & Departmental compliance: Course Development & Approval

The review had identified areas where the current process for course development was inadequate, with three Medium risk findings relating to: reviewing the range of existing courses within Schools; ensuring the viability of new courses; and formalising the course approval process within Schools.

It was noted that the course approval system was being simplified in terms of the numbers of permissions required. Colleges were required to manage overall provision in the context of their budgets and strategic plans, which it was noted should be allied to the University Plan. The importance of quality of courses remained, and this area would continue to be subject to the University’s quality assurance processes, managed through the Senate Office.

4.5 Complaints Handling

The review had been positive, with some low risk areas recommended for improvement, relating to timescales and improvement/merging of management information related to this area of activity.

4.6 Facilities Management

The review had focused on workforce planning and overtime management, for the following service areas: Janitorial and security services within University Services; Operational staff (including craft operatives) within Estates and Buildings; and Museum services. One Medium risk finding had been made, regarding the absence of contractual call-out arrangements at the University.

The Committee commented on an ‘advisory’ recommendation, relating to the University considering whether the inclusion of contractual overtime within staff contracts remained necessary and appropriate in relation to the business needs required to deliver the service. Members felt a firmer recommendation on action would have been appropriate. It was agreed that the classification of recommendations as ‘advisory’ would be revisited, to establish if refinements should be made to reflect the fact that

some issues might not be financially material using cross-University comparisons, but might be material in terms of best practice and value for money

ACTION PWC/DN

4.7 IT Structure & Governance: IT Strategy

One Medium risk finding had been made, relating to the absence of an underlying long-term action plan, defining the key activities and milestones expected in order to achieve the visions set out within the IT Strategy, beyond the annual roadmaps and specific project plans.

It was noted that action against the recommendation would be taken forward by the specialist IT function within the University, reporting to the Information Policy and Strategy Committee, now being chaired by Vice Principal (Academic and Educational Innovation) Professor Frank Coton, and thereafter to SMG.

AUDIT/2015/5. Information Security - IT Penetration Testing

The Committee noted an assessment, which had been a re-test based on an exercise undertaken in 2014, and had covered threats posed to the University's internet-facing infrastructure. The large majority of actions had been satisfactorily addressed.

An update would be undertaken annually, and consideration would be given to use of other providers to undertake the testing, to provide as wide as possible a range of tests.

ACTION DN/DAW

AUDIT/2015/6. Implementation of Outstanding Audit Recommendations

Finance Office

Since the last meeting, four new audit actions had arisen, nine actions against audit reports had been completed, seven partially implemented, 11 were being progressed (a large number of which related to the Research Management System, where training was ongoing ahead of roll-out) and there were no recommendations where action had not yet commenced.

Departments other than the Finance Office

Key points to note from audit reports, relating to Medium risk (or above) recommendations having been made, were:

6.1 Professorial Zoning

Report Classification: High Risk. There had been two High risk findings made in relation to the award of market supplement payments. In relation to the first, discussions were ongoing with the Business School, which had applied its own local policy to the award of market supplements, not aligned with University policy. The Committee expressed its wish for the matter to be regulated in line with the University's policies as soon as possible. The second recommendation had related to the University-wide market supplement policy not always operating in practice, with processes for annual review of supplements (evidenced by market research), and the required approval processes for the award of market supplements, not always being followed. This was being addressed.

6.2 Risk Management

Report Classification: Medium Risk. The audit had identified five Medium category

findings: the format and timing of annual risk workshops; risk to be placed on the agenda of all College Management Group meetings; update of the University's risk management policy; review and collation of College risk registers; and central oversight of College risk management practice. All recommendations had now been addressed.

6.3 Contract Management – Estates & Buildings

Report Classification: High risk. The audit had identified nine findings, including one High and five Medium. The recommendation categorised as High had been implemented, as had four of the Medium risks. The remaining Medium recommendation was in the process of being implemented (relating to document retention) and would be fully implemented once the current process review exercise was complete, over the next 6-12 months.

6.4 International Activity

Report Classification: Medium risk. The four findings categorised as Medium priority had now been implemented: review of reporting arrangements; reminder to staff on the importance of completing risk assessments; establishment of a clear strategy and SMART objectives; and review of criteria for monitoring the success of partnerships.

6.5 Project Management: Estates and Buildings and IT

Report Classification: Medium Risk. There had been four Medium category recommendations, two of which had been implemented: central oversight and portfolio management of significant University Projects; and standardised templates for projects. The other two medium category recommendations had been partially implemented: establishment of a central project management office and project management; monitoring arrangements for projects under £100,000.

6.6 Governance over Subsidiaries

Report Classification: High Risk. The review had identified one High category risk in relation to the overarching governance framework over subsidiaries, and three Medium risks in relation to the following areas: lack of risk management arrangements in place surrounding the risks posed by each subsidiary entity; absence of a formal induction programme for new directors/charity trustees; and absence of a conflict of interest policy relating to the Boards of subsidiaries. Work had commenced on the three Medium risks, with Directors addressing the matters. Court would be asked to approve the governance framework at its meeting in October.

6.7 International Activity (University of Electronic Science and Technology China)

Report Classification: Medium Risk. The overall objective of the review had been to review the design and operating effectiveness of key controls relating to the joint programme with UESTC. One Medium level finding had been made in the area of the monitoring of programme aims and objectives for the Joint Educational Programme and a workshop would be held in November with School staff to consider this.

6.8 Health and Safety

Report Classification: Medium Risk. There had been four Medium risk findings, with a recommendation made about listing of all individuals working offsite (Overseas and UK) having been superseded by the second recommendation (Quality of Risk Assessment Forms), which would provide a centralised approach to monitoring, and which was partially implemented. The third recommendation (Annual Lab Inspections) was partially implemented; the fourth, relating to timely filing of incident

reports had been implemented, with staff being reminded of the importance of reporting accidents as soon as possible.

AUDIT/2015/7. Risk Register

The University Register was noted. Actions in mitigation were ongoing via SMG and an updated register would be provided at the next meeting.

AUDIT/2015/8. Corporate Structure

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

AUDIT/2015/9. Research Misconduct 2014/15/Related University policies

A report had been provided to the Committee, as required by the Research Councils. Two formal investigations relating to research misconduct had been undertaken during the 2014/15 academic year.

The Committee noted that a review of the University's policies and procedures for promoting good research practice and investigating breaches of research integrity was currently being undertaken

AUDIT/2015/10. Any Other Business

There was no other business

AUDIT/2015/11. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 10 November 2015 at 2pm in the Melville Room
Pre-meeting briefing for Committee members, on Learning & Teaching, at 12.30pm

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



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday 7 October 2015

Report from the Estates Committee

The Minutes of the meeting of the Estates Committee held on 28 August 2015 are attached.

Action Requested of Court

Court is asked to:

Note the progress made in respect of the Estate Strategy and Capital Programme (EC/2015/4.1 refers);

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

Supersonic Wind Tunnel, Acre Road (CP13/570) in the additional sum of £222k (EC/2015/5.2.1 refers); and

Quantum Technology Hub (CP13/621) in the sum of £1.85m (EC/2015/5.2.2 refers)

Note the remainder of the minute.

Lynn Duncan
Clerk to Estates Committee
29 September 2015

UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW
Estates Committee
Minute of the meeting held in the Conference Room, Isabella Elder Building on
Friday 28 August 2015

Present: Mrs A Allen, Mr R Fraser, Professor N Juster, Mr L King, Professor K Lury, Mr D Milloy, Ms M Morton (Convener), Professor A Muscatelli (Principal), Mr A Seabourne

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

Apologies: Mr D Newall, Professor P Younger

EC/2015/1 Minute of the meeting held on 15 May 2015

The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2015/2 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

EC/2015/3 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2015/4 Strategies and Performance

EC/2015/4.1 Estate Strategy and Capital Programme

EC/2015/4.1.1 Monitor Report

The Committee noted that the Delivery Programme consisted of six work streams: Master planning and Infrastructure Development; Capital Building Programme; Procurement and Appointment of Lead Contractor; Transfer of Western Infirmary site; Effective and Efficient use of Space; and Effective and Efficient Management of Assets.

It noted the Monitor Report would be used as an information and reporting tool. Where the Committee was being asked to make a decision it would be provided with specific, detailed reports to aid decision-making.

The Committee noted a suite of exemplar reports, each of which was focused on a specific work stream setting out the current position in relation to financial status, risks and issues. The programme and risk register would be reported separately.

Whilst supportive of the reporting format and the level of information provided, the Committee was concerned about the interface between key critical dates across all elements of the programme. It was agreed that a route map for the overall programme would be provided at the meeting scheduled to take place on 6 November 2015. Additionally, all Development Boards would be contacted with a view to establishing a joint working group to ensure consistency and to maximise opportunities for information-sharing.

The Committee supported the proposal to hold a workshop with the master planners in December 2015.

The Committee noted updates in respect of:

Communication: The engagement process would begin in Autumn 2015 and would be inclusive to the whole University and West End communities. To date presentations had been given to Principal's Advisory Group and University Services Senior Management Group and it had been agreed that there would be a monthly feature in Campus e-News to ensure a continuous flow of information to staff.

Procurement: Following approval of the principal contractor there had been independent review by an industry expert who was also supportive of the approach and had identified three risk areas.

Reporting Process: A suite of dashboard reports had been prepared. Whilst these were in a standard format in use for all projects, they could be tailored to suit the Committee's requirements.

Appointment of Consultants: Following Committee's approval of delegated authority to the Convenor and the Secretary of Court for the appointment of master planning design and infrastructure teams, both appointments had been concluded.

The Committee noted the key activities scheduled over the next two months: Development of strategic project briefs; Appointment of design teams for Research Hub and potentially Institute of Health and Wellbeing/College of Social Sciences; Development of investment strategy; Launch of Engagement process; Development of master planning proposals/embedding Smart Campus principles; Appointment of technical advisors; and Appointment of principal contractors.

A Gateway process was being developed and a proposal would come to the next scheduled meeting on 6 November 2015.

EC/2015/4.1.2 Programme

The Committee noted the Estate Strategy Master Programme. It noted some inconsistencies in relation to project stages and that some projects had yet to have outline or detailed business cases approved. The content and format of the document would be reviewed and an update provided to the next scheduled meeting.

EC/2015/4.1.3 Risk Register

The Committee noted the Risk Register which detailed key risks to the overall programme and those which were anticipated within the next twelve months.

EC/2015/4.1.4 Market Statement on Construction Tender Inflation

The Committee noted the report outlining the current five-year tender price inflation forecast in respect of the Capital Plan which was approved in February 2015 and which identified a number of major new and strategically significant projects: Learning and Teaching Hub (all phases) (£69m); Research Hub (£63m); Data Centre (£20m); Institute of Health and Wellbeing and Social Science Building (£62m); Gilbert Scott Building to support Adam Smith Business School (£10m); College of Arts co-location (£40m); Infrastructure (£50m); Major refurbishments (Physics and Astronomy, Chemistry and Life Sciences) (£20m); Clean Animal Holding Facility (£5m); College of Science and Engineering (£80m); Refurbishment for University Services return to campus (£8m).

The Committee noted that whilst there was currently a mixed picture across the sector, a consensus of tender price predictions for the next five years is available from BCIS (Building Cost Information Service). Their latest briefing states that whilst there had been strong increases in annual tender prices in the last three quarters of 2014, this was expected to moderate in 2015. BCIS indicates that over the first year of the forecast period, tender prices were expected to rise by 4.2%, with relatively moderate increases in input costs. Moving forward, with workload continuing to grow, and with rising pressure from input cost increases, tender prices were expected to rise between 4.5% and 6% annually over the remainder of the forecast period.

Estates and Buildings would continue to monitor market trends at quarterly intervals and would provide six monthly progress reports to Estates Committee. Outputs would be reflected in the Risk Register and any budget updates would take cognisance of the degree of uncertainty associated with the pressures from inflation. Mitigation would be provided through the selection of the most appropriate procurement route, more use of NEC contracts and an emphasis on clear and unambiguous Employer's Requirements. The Committee requested that a section be added in respect of changes to building regulations which could potentially impact on building costs.

EC/2015/4.1.5 Procurement of Principal Partner

The Committee noted the update on the development of the proposed construction procurement and delivery strategy. In recent months, a number of procurement options had been reviewed and at its last meeting the Committee had approved the preferred option, subject to independent review. A review was undertaken by an industry specialist. The Committee noted his observations and the actions being taken to address these.

The Committee noted Estates and Buildings recommendation that a Competitive Dialogue procedure be adopted for Construction Delivery Partner procurement. This would enable detailed dialogue with bidders during the tender period and whilst this could prove to be resource-intensive it would provide more informed, complete and better-value bids.

The Committee noted the proposal, following pre-selection, to undertake the Tender (Dialogue) in two stages: Stage 1: Four bidders invited to participate in the initial bid, to develop phasing, programme and methodology proposals; and Stage 2: Following evaluation, two bidders invited to participate in the second stage - to submit final commercial bids, based upon target costs for the initial developments and infrastructure works.

The Committee approved the proposal that a competitive dialogue approach be adopted and that a Prior Information Notice (PIN) be advertised immediately, with the Contract Notice (OJEU) advertised late October, followed by the tender in Q1 and 2 2016 with Contract award in October 2016.

EC/2015/4.1.2 Approvals

EC/2015/4.1.2.1 Planning and Engagement Strategy

The Committee noted that stakeholder and community support would be key factors to the success of the Estate Development objectives and to securing necessary statutory consents.

Planning Consultants, Muir Smith Evans, part of the team who delivered the Campus Development Framework had been appointed as part of the Masterplan team and would manage and coordinate the process, in conjunction with the University. This would drive forward the process of securing Planning Permission in Principle and statutory consents for the Masterplan.

The Committee noted and supported the report and appendices and the proposed approach.

EC/2015/4.1.2.2 Programme KPIs

The Committee noted the content of the paper and approved the proposed KPIs which had been grouped in four sets (Efficiency; Effectiveness; Sustainability; and Delivery). It noted that these would be used to measure the success of the Estate Strategy and ten-year Capital Investment Plan performance and programme and would be focused on the indicators of Time; Cost; and Quality. The KPIs would also allow benchmarking of the estate against both Russell Group Universities and other Scottish Universities.

It was agreed that targets would be developed by Estates and Buildings and brought to Estates Committee for approval in January 2016.

The Committee requested that all agreed KPI groupings and the actual KPIs be reflected in each of the business cases along with a community engagement statement.

EC/2015/4.2 Carbon Management

EC/2015/4.2.1 Carbon Management Plan Update

The Committee noted the updated Carbon Management Plan.

EC/2015/4.2.2 Minute of Carbon Management Committee (24 July 2015)

The Committee noted the Minute of the Carbon Management Committee.

EC/2015/5 Projects

EC/2015/5.1 Approved Projects Status (RAG) Report

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

It noted that since the last meeting in May 2015 a number of project had been completed: Refurbishment University Corridor at Queen Elizabeth University Hospital; CRF and Imaging Queen Elizabeth University Hospital; Teaching and Learning Centre Queen Elizabeth Hospital; and Aquaria Graham Kerr Building.

EC/2014/5.2 Project Approvals

EC/2015/5.2.1 Supersonic Wind Tunnel, Acre Road (CP13/570)

The Committee noted and approved the CapEx application in the sum of £222k. It noted that this sum is an additional requirement over and above the initial sums approved of £200k (February 2014) and £50k (May 2014) bringing the total investment to £472k. The Committee noted that the project had suffered from a number of delays, both to award of contract and construction works. There were also a number of factors in relation to the unique and specialist nature of the work and the facility.

EC/2012/5.2.2 Quantum Technology Hub (CP13/621)

In 2014 the University was successful in securing £29m of research investment from the UK Quantum Technology Hub, supported by £4.1m in capital grants from EPSC and SFC to be invested in the provision of: an SFC-funded Industry Innovation Space for technology translation in the James Watt South (JWS) building (£1.25m); and expansion and additional equipment of the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre (JWNC) cleanroom facilities (£1.5m construction and £0.5m equipment). To enable this work an Engineering workshop had to be relocated (£850k).

The Committee noted that the CapEx application was seeking additional funding of £1.85m to construct, service and equip the JWNC clean room. The £1.85m expenditure would be funded: £0.4m from an EPSRC grant; and £1.45m from the capital budget, with remaining expenditure to be met through prioritising the University's investment in JWNC.

The project proves an opportunity to bring together areas of research and teaching previously undertaken in multiple locations and would meet the University's legal obligation to bring the MRC Institute for Social and Public Health Sciences Unit (SPHSU) back to Gilmorehill.

The Committee approved the application in the sum of £1.85m.

EC/2015/5.3 Adam Smith Business School (ASBA) Revisioning Update

The Committee noted the progress summary of key activities undertaken by the Project Development Board undertaking the revisioning of the ASBS ahead of submission of the associated business case later in the year.

EC/2015/5.4 Proposed Disposal of Student Residential Properties

The Committee noted the progress report in relation to six residential properties which it had approved for disposal in November 2014. All six properties have now been sold.

The Committee requested that it be provided with a running total of disposal receipts for its information.

EC/2015/6 Estates Operating Matters

EC/2015/6.1 2015/16 Operating Plan

The 2015/16 Plan was noted.

EC/2015/6.2 Critical Path

The Critical Path was noted. It was agreed that going forward there was no longer a need for the Critical Path to come to Committee as the information was otherwise provided within the Estate Strategy Programme.

EC/2015/7 Any Other Business

EC/2015/7.1 Transfer of Western Infirmary Site

The Committee note the transfer was scheduled to take place in April 2016. It requested that a transfer and transition programme be provided to enable the Committee to have an overview of progress.

EC/2015/8 Schedule of Meetings for 2015/16

Friday 6 November 2015

Friday 8 January 2016

Friday 11 March 2016

Friday 13 May 2016



Court – Wednesday 7 October 2015

Report from the Human Resources Committee

Brief description of paper

The draft minute of the meeting of the Human Resources Committee held on Tuesday 29 September 2015 is attached, **for information/noting.**

Action requested

No action required.

The HR Director's report provided an update to the Committee highlighting a number of substantive areas including the National Pay negotiations, the USS consultation, this year's Performance & Development Review process, the University's application for accreditation as a Living Wage employer and initiatives underway within reward and diversity.

The Committee received two presentations. The first was from Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice Principal and Deputy Vice Chancellor providing an update on the launch of the new University Strategy and the progress being made in relation to the three central work streams. The second presentation was from Mr David Tedman, Deputy Head of HR for the College of MVLS who gave an update on the activities of the HR function within the college and the strategic challenges within their people agenda. Both presentations were well received and generated good dialogue amongst the members.

The Committee also received an update of the key HR data and in particular information about absence management. This prompted timely debate and questions as this is a policy currently under review by HR and the Trade Unions.

*Richard Cloughton
Deputy Director of HR & Clerk to the HR Committee
1 October 2015*

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Human Resources Committee

Minute of meeting held in the Melville Room, Main Building
on Tuesday 29th September 2015

Present: Mr D Newall (DN), Mr R Cloughton (RPC), Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson (MMS), Professor R O Maolalagh (ROM), Professor G Baillie (GB), Ms Susan Campbell (SC), Ms Susan Ashworth (SA), Dr Duncan Ross (DR), Professor E Cameron (EC), Mrs J Shepherd (JMS) (Notes)

By Invitation: Professor Neal Juster (NJ) and Mr David Tedman (DT)

Apologies: The Principal (AM), Mrs A Allen (AA) and Mrs C Barr (CB)

HR/15/01 Opening Remarks & Apologies

DN opened the meeting and welcomed Ms Susan Ashworth and Dr Duncan Ross to the Committee. Apologies were noted as above.

DN asked for it to be recorded in the minute that Mr David Anderson had sadly passed away and would be missed as an excellent convener of the Committee and he wished to note the wider contribution he had made to the University as a member of Court over the last 7 years. DN agreed to continue as Convener for the time being.

HR/15/02 Minute of the Meeting held on 28 May 2015

The Minute was taken as read and approved by the Committee.

HR/15/03 Matters arising from meeting held on 28 May 2015

The Committee noted that there were no outstanding actions which were not covered in the HR Director's Report or other agenda items. DN confirmed that the Management of Organisational Change Policy had been approved by Court and the membership of the CPRG had now been increased in recognition of its new remit.

HR/15/04 HR Director's Report

In CB's absence, RPC spoke to the report. He reported on the launch of the new University Strategy and advised that the HR function would be central to the delivery of the plan and he was delighted that people were at the heart of the strategy. He noted that HR now has a responsibility to work with management on the evolving agenda. As a result of the Strategy HR were now looking at the People and Organisational Plan and HR priorities.

HR/15/05 RPC advised that there was still a dispute over the national annual pay negotiations and two meetings had been held involving the relevant parties. Three of the Unions had rejected the 1% offer but at this stage it remained unclear what action they may take. While the process remains ongoing Universities are unable to implement the final offer. RPC was asked what the main objection was to the negotiations and he confirmed that the key issue was the basic level of increase, coming after several years of perceived pay restraint.

HR/15/06 Following a long consultation exercise, the proposed reforms to USS had largely been agreed with only the finer details subject to confirmation. RPC advised there was a certain lack of clarity with regard to timing and phasing and HR were working to support staff who would be impacted. A comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment had been conducted with relatively few concerns arising. RPC advised that when the changed scheme is launched full details of the new options would be communicated. RPC also advised that the £55,000 threshold would be periodically reviewed by USS.

HR/15/07 RPC advised that the annual Performance & Development Review process was coming to a close and due to finish on Wednesday 30 September. This would be followed in October by the moderation meetings across the Colleges. RPC would be able to provide statistics on the completion rates at the next HR Committee in November. RPC advised that completion rate would be a little short of 100% due to various factors including exemptions due to start dates, absence etc. DN advised that over the last three years looking at completion by College, the completion rate had never fallen short of 90% and had averaged around 96%. SC asked if there was a link to pay in the process ie if staff did not complete their P&DR, did they not get a pay rise? RPC stated that nobody would be unfairly penalised if they had

been unable to complete their PDR. MMS asked why moderation was required. RPC advised that it was needed to ensure that all assessments were consistent between schools, departments and line managers. SC was interested to see how many reviews were changed after moderation and ROM noted that there would always be some changes. DN advised that the review point for the new approach being piloted in University Services would be after November. RPC also highlighted that a 360 feedback exercise had been introduced for SMG members conducted through a third party provider.

- HR/15/08** RPC advised that the University had received confirmation that it had achieved accreditation as a Living Wage Employer. This would not be formally announced until 2 November 2015 when the University would be hosting a joint event with the Scottish Government, the Living Wage Foundation and the Poverty Alliance to coincide with the annual announcement of the new Living Wage rate and the University's new status. There would be a phased implementation as there were a number of contractors with the University who did not currently pay the Living Wage.
- HR/15/09** RPC advised that the University was also committed to making the Scottish Business Pledge. This was a Scottish Government initiative which was looking to encourage employers to commit to various activities that characterise good employers. There were nine elements to the pledge which included the living wage, use of zero hours contracts, staff engagement, innovation etc. RPC agreed to circulate the link to the Scottish Business Pledge website to the committee members for information. **(Action RPC)**
- HR/15/10** RPC advised that the Performance, Pay & Reward team were looking to introduce a different form of recognition scheme to the University. Work was continuing on the further development and review of the academic promotion and professorial zoning criteria and the thorough overhaul of the Learning and Teaching criteria. The committee asked to be kept informed on both initiatives as they progressed through the approval processes. **(Action RPC)**
- HR/15/11** Work was well underway on the development of the Leadership Behavioural Framework and there had been a number of interviews, discussions and forums to build the key leadership criteria.
- HR/15/12** RPC reported that preparatory work had begun on the renewal application for the Athena Swan Institutional Gender Equality (Bronze) Award and that RI Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences, RI Infection, Inflammation and Immunology and the School of Medicine are preparing for possible participation in the November 2015 Athena Swan application round.
- HR/15/13** RPC advised the Committee that the presentation of HR data both within the function and to senior managers had been significantly enhanced using a front-end analysis tool called Qlikview, the same technology already used by the University for student data. Separately work continued to introduce three new modules within the Core HR system though this had been slightly delayed.
- HR/15/14** RPC advised that following Fiona MacLachlan's retirement as Head of HR in MVLS, Fergus Brown would join from the University of Strathclyde on 26 October 2015. In addition, Kirstine Adams was covering Mhairi Taylor's maternity leave.
- HR/15/15** **University Strategy Update and Next Steps**
NJ firstly shared the University Strategy video with the members.

NJ then gave an overview of the University Strategy 2015-2020, Inspiring People, Changing the World. NJ explained that the University was proud of its roots in Glasgow and what it did for the local community and wanted to attract the best people and students based on their talent and not their background. There were three values highlighted within the strategy, that we are passionate, professional and progressive. Within the strategy there were three work streams: Empowering People, Focus and Agility and each of these were led by a member of the SMG and a Head of Function. In addition to these were a number of KPIs which would assist the University to measure its progress. NJ highlighted nine of these including staff engagement which he felt were central to the strategy. NJ was in the process of presenting the Strategy to all staff over a number of weeks across all locations. The members of the Committee commended NJ and those involved in the creation of the strategy for both the document itself and also the process followed which had engaged a wide range of staff, students and other stakeholders.

ROM commented that the work streams would take a number of years to deliver recognising the change in organisational culture required to underpin these. SC commented on the reference to a Project Management Office (PMO) and gave a recent example of a major initiative in her workplace, where the creation of a short-term PMO helped maintain focus on the actions required through a rigorous approach to planning and reporting.

HR/15/16 MVLS HR Strategic Update

DT gave a presentation on the HR Strategic issues within the college of MVLS. His presentation provided facts and figures, stakeholder information and future challenges which are unique to the college. Following the presentation DN asked DT about the relationship between MVLS HR and NHS HR when it came to staff recruitment and HR management. DT advised that on a local level the relationship was very good and there were joint appointing panels for appointments.

DN advised the members that all the Heads of HR would be attending the HR Committee over the coming year to ensure the committee has a full picture of the strategic people issues. He invited the members to provide feedback on the presentation and to consider what aspects they may wish to focus on for future presentations. DN noted that he would be keen to ensure the presentations focus on the main themes which would link to the wider University HR agenda.

HR/15/17 Data Analytics and Benchmark Measures

RPC summarised the paper and reported that headcount had increased slightly to July 2015 together with an increase in FTE. He noted that whilst it had since reduced it was anticipated that both FTE and especially headcount were expected to increase during the current academic year as a numbers of casually employed staff are moved to employment contracts in line with the Extended Workforce Policy. Recruitment volumes had decreased slightly but remain high whilst voluntary staff turnover had been consistently reducing since 2012 and absence had dropped very slightly in the current period with mental health issues dropping from first to third in terms of the cause of absence. SC asked RPC if he could represent the run rate on the Recruitment Activity slide in future (**Action RPC**). DN asked RPC if he could do analysis on Grade 5 in the slide on Gender Pay Review – Grades 1-9 to assist in understanding why salaries were moving in favour of male staff (**Action RPC**).

DN thought it would be useful to have a session on Gender Equality and the wider University agenda in this regard at one of the future meetings and asked RPC if Professor Anne Anderson could be invited to attend.

HR/15/18 Review of Absence Data

RPC summarised the paper and reported that a number of the slides included extracts from the new Qlikview tool referred to in the HR Directors report. This enabled managers and HR to now drill down on data and to toggle and filter the data to produce reports that would identify potential issues, gaps in the data and differences between schools/colleges for comparison purposes. RPC highlighted the work being done by managers and HR to maximise attendance and noted that there had been 246 management referrals to Occupational Health for the whole year. DR asked RPC if he was comfortable that there was enough resource in Occupational Health to cover the referrals. RPC indicated that he felt there was and that he and other members of HR worked closely with the OH team. MMS asked RPC if he was happy that absence levels appeared to be at a flat level. RPC advised that he would always wish absence levels to be lower but that the current average levels did not cause significant concern and were consistent with external benchmarks.

HR/15/19 Sub-Committee Update

The Draft JCCN minutes of 9 June 2015 were noted.

HR/15/20

AOB

JN advised that the University was currently recruiting for a new member of Court and interviews were taking place in early October.

HR/15/21

Date of next meeting

The next meeting would take place in the Principal's Meeting Room on Wednesday 25 November 2015.

DRAFT



Court – Wednesday 7 October 2015

**Report from the Meeting of the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee
held on Tuesday 15 September 2015**

Cover Sheet

Brief description of the papers

In September, the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee covered its usual range of business. It reviewed standard reports on Occupational Health activities and on accidents that have occurred in recent months. There is nothing of note arising from these reports that need be brought to Court's attention.

The Committee also received an update on departmental health & safety management audits, and on the extent to which recommendations from these have been addressed by departments. These audits, which are undertaken by the Safety & Environmental Protection Service, are an important tool in ensuring effective safety management across the campus. The Committee noted that certain departments had several recommendations still outstanding, and the relevant members of the Committee agreed to speak in each case with the department head to stress the importance of addressing these promptly.

There is one recommendation within the minute relating to e-Cigarettes, i.e.:

HSWC/2015/2.1 E-cigs

The Committee discussed whether Glasgow should follow the lead of most other UK universities in banning the smoking of e-cigarettes within university premises. It was noted that e-cigarettes were not covered by legislation banning smoking in public places. Scientific evidence suggested that they were less harmful to smokers than conventional cigarettes, and indeed might be useful in helping people stop smoking.

The Committee discussed the possible concerns of staff and students who might find a colleague's e-cigarette vapours unpleasant and who might have anxieties about the consequences of inhaling them. The Committee agreed that in order to maintain an enjoyable and comfortable working environment for staff and students, the Committee would recommend to Court that it prohibit the smoking of e-cigarettes within University buildings

Action required

The Committee recommends that Court prohibit the smoking of E-Cigarettes within university buildings (see Minute 2015/2.1)

Otherwise, for information.

*Author's Name: Debbie Beales
Title: Clerk to HSW Committee
Date 17.09.15*

University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Tuesday 15 September 2015 at 10:00 AM in the Melville Room

Present:

Mrs Ann Allen, Ms Louise Bowden, Mr James Gray, Mr David McLean, Mr John F Malcolm, Mr David Newall, Ms Julie Ommer, Mr Paul Phillips, Mr Deric Robinson, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Selina Woolcott, Ms Una Marie Daragh, Ms Gillian Shaw

In Attendance:

Ms Debbie Beales, Mr David Harty

Apologies:

Mrs Christine Barr, Dr Gordon Duckett, Mr David Somerville, Dr Louise Doyle

Convenors Business:

The Convenor welcomed Ms Una Marie Daragh (SRC rep) and David Harty (Chemical Safety Adviser at SEPS) to the Committee.

HSWC/2015/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 3 June 2015

The Minute from the previous meeting was approved.

HSWC/2015/2 Matters arising

HSWC/2015/2.1 E-cigs (verbal update DN)

The Committee discussed whether Glasgow should follow the lead of most other UK universities in banning the smoking of e-cigarettes within university premises. It was noted that e-cigarettes were not covered by legislation banning smoking in public places. Scientific evidence suggested that they were less harmful to smokers than conventional cigarettes, and indeed might be useful in helping people stop smoking.

The Committee discussed the possible concerns of staff and students who might find a colleague's e-cigarette vapours unpleasant and who might have anxieties about the consequences of inhaling them. The Committee agreed that in order to maintain an enjoyable and comfortable working environment for staff and students, the Committee would recommend to Court that it prohibit the smoking of e-cigarettes within University buildings.

HSWC/2015/2.2 Staff counselling, in house (verbal update SW)

Ms Woolcott **informed** the Committee that, due to lack of resources, the pilot for in house counselling had not yet started. She agreed to update the Committee at the December meeting.

HSWC/2015/2.3 Fire alarm weekly testing (verbal update SW)

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that there was currently nothing to report on this item and agreed to update the Committee at the December meeting.

HSWC/2015/2.4 Safety for overseas workers (verbal update SW/DN)

Mr Newall informed the Committee that the working group had met and recommended to SMG a more robust process for risk assessing and authorising overseas travel. Further work was being done on this with a view to introducing an efficient on-line process. In the meantime SMG had agreed to put the following support in place:

- A system for advising/supporting staff and students working in high risk overseas locations. The facility chosen for this task was AON WorldAware.
- Insurance cover for UG students who were based overseas as part of their university studies.

HSWC/2015/3 OH Report (Paper 1)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that, due to the reorganisation of the administration of respiratory health surveillance, compliance had improved. Although it had taken time to reinforce communication through the safety co-ordinator structure, it was now working well with only 26 out of 422 people not returning their forms (10 of these were unable to do so due to maternity leave or long term absence). The Committee thanked OH and colleagues from MVLS for working to ensure that respiratory health surveillance was provided for all staff that required it.

HSWC/2015/4 SEPS Report (Paper 2)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean agreed to reword the fire categories within the accident stats and reported that there were no unusual anomalies within the stats. Mr McLean distributed copies of the latest audit programme update, which provided an overview of the progress being made by Schools and Services in implementing recommendations arising from the audits of H&S management. There had been satisfactory progress in most units and it was agreed that SEPS would chase up the Schools and Services who had been slow to implement their actions, copying in the relevant College/US rep on the Committee. These included Forensic Medicine, Vet Medicine, Learning & Teaching, IT Services and Hospitality Services.

Mr McLean introduced Mr Harty (Chemical Safety Adviser for SEPS) to the Committee. Mr Harty explained that he was currently spending 2 1/2 days per week in the role of H&S Manager for E&B to assist them in moving forward with their audit actions. This would continue until more permanent H&S support arrangements were in place within E&B.

HSWC/2015/5 Employee liability activity Report (Paper 3)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that this report was generated annually to show how much the University paid out per year through insurance pay-outs due to accidents.

HSWC/2015/6 EAP Report (Paper 4)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that utilisation of the Employee Assistance Programme had remained static year on year with a slight reduction from the previous quarter. This was to be expected during the summer period as many staff were on annual leave. The current contract was due to expire in December 2015 and Ms Woolcott would be working to ensure that this service continued, whether by extending the contract with the current provider or through a re-tender. The drop

in service at CaPS was continuing with its current operation of 2 'drop in' days per week but it was hoped that this would be expanded over time to include additional mental health support.

HSWC/2015/7 Lone study draft Policy (Paper 5)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. This draft policy had been developed in response to a request from Graduate Schools, and borrowed from the Lone Worker Policy that had been developed by the Committee in 2014. Ms Woolcott thanked the Committee for comments received on the draft and asked that additional comments be emailed to her by Friday 25 September. The Student Support & Development Committee and Deans of Graduate Schools would also be invited to provide feedback before the policy was published.

HSWC/2015/8 Draft Minute from US H&S Committee admin/office (Paper 6)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated.

HSWC/2015/9 Any Other Business

The Convenor thanked Ms Woolcott and the Barclay Practice for organising free flu jabs being offered to staff in November.

HSWC/2015/10 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Wednesday 9th December at 10am in the Melville Room.

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday 7 October 2015

Report from the Remuneration Committee

Minutes of the Remuneration Committee meeting held on 25 June 2015 are attached.

Action Requested

The Remuneration Committee considered a paper from the Director of HR, seeking to establish the Voluntary Severance (VS) Scheme on a fresh footing, creating a Voluntary Severance Panel to consider all cases for VS, and addressing the governance requirements that have emerged over the last 2 years through the Scottish Code of Good Governance in Higher Education and the Scottish Funding Council's revised Financial Memorandum.

The Committee agreed to recommend to Court that it approve the terms of the Voluntary Severance Policy. (**Annex 1**)

Court's approval of the terms of the policy is sought.

The remainder of the minute is **for noting**.

Remuneration Committee will meet again on 7 October, at which meeting it will conduct the annual review of the SMG salaries. The proposed method of reviewing senior management salaries was included in the paper for the EGM of Court to be held on 30 September, and will be adopted subject to Court's approval at that EGM.

Prepared by Deborah Maddern

29 September 2015

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Remuneration Committee

Notes of the Meeting held on 24 June 2015

Present Ken Brown (acting convener)
Brian McBride
Anton Muscatelli
David Ross

Attending Christine Barr
David Newall

1. David Anderson

Everyone present had been deeply saddened by the death of David Anderson. The Committee asked that the minute record its appreciation of David's skilled chairmanship of Remuneration Committee and of the immense contribution he had made to the University in 7 years as a member of Court.

2. Notes of the meeting on 6 October 2014

These were approved.

3. Voluntary Severance Policy

The University had last invited applications to a voluntary severance scheme in 2011, with a view to achieving a reduction in salary costs. Since that time, voluntary severance (VS) terms had on occasion been offered by management to members of staff where this served the University's interests. VS proposals in all cases required the approval of a business case by the Principal and by either the Secretary of Court or the Senior Vice-Principal, and Remuneration Committee had received a report at each meeting on the number and cost of voluntary severance arrangements approved since it has last met. Court had agreed that, in certain circumstances, a VS payment would require the explicit approval of the Remuneration Committee itself. Payments requiring Remuneration Committee approval were: those involving a member of SMG; those costing over £100,000; and those which breached the standard terms of the scheme, by involving a payment equivalent to more than one year's salary.

The Committee now considered a paper from the Director of HR which sought to establish the VS Scheme on a fresh footing, creating a Voluntary Severance Panel to consider all cases for VS, and addressing the governance requirements that had emerged over the last 2 years through the Scottish Code of Good Governance in Higher Education and the Scottish Funding Council's revised Financial Memorandum.

Having discussed the contents of VS Policy and agreed certain amendments to it, the Committee agreed to recommend to Court that it approve the terms of the Voluntary Severance Policy, as annexed to these minutes. (**Annex 1**)

4. Professorial / Grade 10 Performance and Reward

Remuneration Committee had approved the introduction of a professorial reward strategy in October 2014. This involved the application of a points-based approach to performance-related pay for senior staff, informed by individual performance assessment in the annual Performance & Development Review (P&DR) process.

Introduction of the points-based approach had been criticised by members of Court in December 2014, and had not been well received by senior staff. Court had raised a concern regarding the apparent disparity between the treatment of SMG members, who received consolidated awards based on performance, and the treatment of professorial staff, for whom a consolidated award could only be achieved after 3 years. Senior staff had been concerned that the points-based formula made it difficult for staff to progress in salary terms in any significant way and that, where performance outcomes did justify consolidated reward, the sums were perceived to be small, and would only be made available, at most, every three years. The reception of the reward strategy was now presenting challenges for the University with regard to retention, with some senior academic staff perceiving that salary progression would be more easily achieved by seeking employment at other universities.

In this context, SMG had now proposed a revised approach to professorial reward. This involved the remuneration practice applicable to SMG members being applied more widely to senior staff at professorial and Grade 10 Level. It also allowed greater flexibility and autonomy at College level within a recognised P&DR framework, while ensuring that high-performing staff were recognised and rewarded within predetermined budgetary provisions.

The elements of the proposed policy were:

- i. provision for consolidated salary uplifts on an annual basis where it was justified on the basis of performance consistent with remuneration practice applicable to members of the senior executive team.
- ii. retention of the norm referenced distribution across five performance assessment outcomes as follows:

<i>Performance level</i>	<i>% Distribution</i>
Improvement Required	0 - 5
Inconsistent	5 - 10
High Quality	60 - 70
Excellent	up to 20
Outstanding	up to 10

- iii a maximum budgetary sum available for reward and recognition purposes at grade 10 level for academic session 2014-15 being provided to each College and University Services, based on their headcount of Level 10 staff. As this was a fixed sum, the level of any individual award would ultimately be determined by the number of individuals assessed as excellent and outstanding, and would be recommended to Remuneration Committee once the P&DR exercise was complete. Given that the sum available for reward and recognition in each College would be

capped, then, should numbers exceed the norm referenced percentage distributions indicated, the sum of any individual award within that College would reduce accordingly.

- iv an expectation that those with leadership responsibilities for managing staff would have at least one performance objective that related to leadership and effective staff management/engagement for the forthcoming year.

Having discussed the proposed policy, Remuneration Committee agreed that this approach should be adopted for 2015. The Committee would consider a report on the experience of implementing the policy before making a decision on its continued use beyond 2015.

5. Voluntary Severance Approvals

Since the last meeting of the Remuneration Committee, on 6 October 2014, University officers had approved 12 severance packages within the standard terms of the University's VS scheme. 9 of these had been in University Services, 2 in MVLS, and 1 in Arts. The total cost of the 12 packages had been £289,664.

Whenever voluntary severance proposals departed from the standard terms approved by Court, or cost more than £100,000, or involved a member of SMG, the matter required to be referred to Remuneration Committee for its decision. There had been no proposals in this category since the last meeting of the Committee.

6. Vacancies on Remuneration Committee

It was noted that Nominations Committee was currently overseeing the recruitment process to identify an external expert to serve on Remuneration Committee. In addition, the University would soon be recruiting new lay members of Court, and it was intended that one of these would have a strong HRM background and would therefore be well-placed to serve on HR Committee and Remuneration Committee. Pending these appointments, and at the request of the other Committee members, Ken Brown indicated that he was willing to act as chairman of Remuneration Committee.

7 Pension issues

The Committee agreed that at a future meeting it should review the potential impact on professorial and senior management pay of changes in pensions taxation policy, as these might have an impact on staff retention.

8. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting would be arranged for late September / early October.

DN, 27.6.15

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE POLICY

1. Introduction

The University may, at its sole discretion, offer a severance arrangement to an employee on the termination of their employment. The objectives of the policy are aimed at facilitating the delivery of university strategic imperatives and maximising institutional efficiency in a globally competitive environment, the changing funding landscape and shifting regulatory context. The policy is designed to augment our effective employee relations culture and enable individuals, where appropriate, to pursue their ambitions outwith the University. The severance policy may be applied in situations where it provides the most effective and economical solution in the interests of the institution. It must be applied fairly and defensibly.

It should be noted that the University's Disciplinary, Grievance, Capability and Competence Procedures, exist to support employees and oversee matters that occasionally arise in the course of employment, such as addressing poor performance. The policy is not a substitute for any other procedure to which reference has been made and this mechanism will not be utilised to facilitate early termination of employment in the event of poor or unacceptable performance. On occasions, the policy may be applied in conjunction with the University's Policy on the Management of Organisational Change.

The policy, associated procedure and practice, complies with the SFC Financial Memorandum and other obligations as set out in the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance. This includes reporting severance related information in the University's annual accounts and the submission of an annual report containing information on severance agreements granted in the preceding financial year, in accordance with the terms of the scheme to the Remuneration Committee of Court. The policy may be revised at any time to take into account revisions to SFC guidance.

This document does not form part of an individual's terms and conditions of employment and it may be amended by the University Court at any time. It must be noted that employees do not have a contractual right or entitlement to a severance payment and in general it is not good practice for University funds to be expended for purposes other than those associated with fulfilling contractual obligations alone. However, the circumstances under which severance arrangements apply tend not to be covered by contractual entitlements. Any payments made over and above any contractual entitlement will be made as compensation for loss of employment.

2. Definition of Voluntary Severance

Voluntary severance (VS) provides an exit strategy for staff that may be displaced or potentially at risk of redundancy and/or where there is a need to achieve savings and/or reduce staff numbers, which may or may not result in the closure of a post(s). Potentially affected staff may be eligible for voluntary severance and, where approved, receive a voluntary severance payment. In this event, staff may elect to utilise this payment to access their pension by financing an early retirement funding shortfall (pension strain cost) or to purchase additional pensionable service.

3. The Voluntary Severance Scheme

The scheme is discretionary and voluntary severance will only be granted, against set and predetermined criteria that support the objectives of the policy aligned with and to the delivery of strategic imperatives. The scheme is open to core funded staff employed on an open-ended contractual basis. It is not available to those employed on externally funded posts on a time limited basis.

An application must be completed and signed by the applicant and the appropriate HoS, DRI, or Service Head and supported by a business case (Appendix 1) completed by the relevant HoS, DRI or Service Head, covering the rationale, alignment with strategic imperatives, outlining the anticipated benefits, risks and related costs (including anticipated payback period).

It is normal practice for the anticipated payback period to be no more than one year, although cases with a longer payback period may be considered.

Each application will be considered by the Voluntary Severance Panel. The panel reserves the right to agree or reject any proposal for severance. Where an application is approved, there is no obligation for the individual to proceed with the application. Where an individual proceeds with an approved application, any voluntary severance offer will only be deemed accepted on receipt of a duly signed Settlement Agreement.

In the event of a severance arrangement including a payment for compensation for loss of employment (and there is no contractual right or entitlement to such payment), such payment shall be conditional on the employee entering into a settlement agreement with the University. The payment will be in full and final settlement of all claims which an employee may have against the University arising from the contract of employment or its termination, excluding any claim for accrued pension rights or damages for latent personal injury. This includes any claim under contract and current employment legislation, European Law or at common law.

It is a requirement of a settlement agreement between an individual employee and their employer that the employee has received legal advice on the terms and effect of the settlement agreement. To facilitate this, the University makes a standard financial contribution direct to the legal service provider chosen by the employee in respect of the fee for advising on the terms and effect of the settlement agreement. Such proposed agreements are discussed with an employee 'without prejudice', and where an agreement is not reached the employee will continue in employment with the University.

Where an application is declined, there is no right of appeal. The panel will however provide the relevant senior manager with the rationale for its decision. This need not preclude the applicant from submitting a further application in the event of a change of circumstances.

Where an offer is accepted, a termination date will be agreed, consistent with the relevant period of notice. However, on occasion, subject to mutual agreement, an earlier release date may be set, which may involve working part of the period of notice with any balance paid in lieu of notice.

Staff considering Voluntary Severance should be aware that any pension benefit, if being accessed prior to normal retirement age, will be reduced by the Scheme to take account of the benefit being paid early. Staff may, at their discretion, use their VS payment to fully or partly mitigate the impact of any pension reduction¹ imposed by the relevant scheme.

¹ Note - For staff in the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) this 'reduction' needs to be made good by the employer (typically through a reduction in the Voluntary Severance payment) and associated costs should be factored into the business case described above.

4. Voluntary Severance Payment

Severance payments will include any relevant statutory redundancy payment entitlement. All severance payments will require to be supported by a business case demonstrating that the the severance payment will serve the University's interests and involve a prudent use of its money. The level of salary compensation on offer will not normally exceed 12 months pay. In exceptional circumstances, and at the sole discretion of the Remuneration Committee, payment may exceed the 12 months payment limit.

Lump sum payments will be payable having regard to the relevant tax legislation in accordance with HMRC regulations which currently provide for the payment of up to £30,000 without any income tax or national insurance contributions deduction.

The University will contribute up to £300 plus VAT towards the cost of any personal legal advice that must be taken to progress a Settlement Agreement prior to signing such an agreement.

The Remuneration Committee will consider any proposal costing more than 12 months' salary, any proposal relating to a member of the Senior Management Group, and any proposal with potential voluntary severance cost in excess of £100,000.

5. Voluntary Severance Process

Where a potential severance arrangement is raised for consideration, initial discussion should take place between the appropriate Head of School, DRI or Service Head, the relevant Head of HR and the:

- Vice-Principal/Head of College for College based academic roles and related support roles
- Deputy Secretary of Court for US based professional services support roles

A proposal will be written by the Head of School, DRI or Service Head with the support of the relevant Head of HR, which will reflect the views of the VP/HoC or Deputy Secretary of Court. The proposal will then be submitted for consideration and approval by the VS panel.

The proposal should outline the business case (i.e. justification) for the application including the following:

- Potential costs and financial boundaries, including details of any enhancement to pension rights, out-placement counselling, etc. The relevant contractual obligations upon which the proposed severance arrangement is based. (This should include reference to and consideration of any increase in salary in the previous 3 years, over and above any annual pay award);
- Alternative duties or work that may be available for the individual, as an alternative to severance;
- Potential savings that may result from such a severance agreement;
- Potential benefits to the University, School/RI/Service;
- Potential timeframe, effective termination date accounting for the relevant contractual notice period;
- Any specific circumstances that may merit further consideration.

6. Voluntary Severance Panel

The Severance Panel will consist of:

- Principal & Vice-Chancellor (or his/her nominee) as Chair
- Senior Vice Principal
- Secretary of Court

All applications should be submitted to the panel via the Director of Human Resources who will attend as an observer at Panel meetings.

The Severance Panel will give due consideration to the circumstances of each proposal to ensure that all decisions are:

- in the best interests of the University and satisfy the set and predetermined policy criteria;
- consistent with fulfilling University obligations to students and other stakeholders;
- consistent with the University's Equality & Diversity Policy, and deemed to be proper and appropriate application of University funds;
- consistent with SFC Guidance on Severance Arrangements.

The severance panel as part of its consideration in relation to each proposal will:

- Clarify any financial boundaries/elements of the proposed severance arrangement considering cost/benefit analysis of releasing the employee.
- Clarify the timeframe boundaries of the proposed severance arrangement.
- Clarify the degree to which the specific expertise of the individual matches the current/anticipated needs of the University and/or School/Service.
- Clarify the match between the current and expected future contribution of the employee to the University and/or School/Service.
- Identify any specific circumstances that may merit consideration.
- Specify the overall justification to offer or reject the proposed severance arrangement.

Where a proposed severance arrangement includes an element in excess of or otherwise not conducive within the terms of the policy, the Severance Panel should seek formal approval from the Remuneration Committee of Court, taking into account the level of any enhancement and the associated business case.

7. Scottish Funding Council Obligations

The SFC Financial Memorandum with Higher Education Institutions requires institutions to be governed by the standards of personal conduct set out by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (the Nolan Principles) regarding the use of public funds. Further, the institution will ensure that there is a regular review of systems for the determination and payments of severance settlements in accordance with strategic audit plans and will be reported to the Remuneration Committee for noting purposes.

The Financial Memorandum does require that where severance payments exceed the maximum threshold agreed by the Remuneration Committee (in excess of £100,000), the University will consult its external auditors and the Chief Executive of SFC in his/her capacity as Accountable Officer prior to approving the proposed severance package.

Strictly Confidential

**UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Voluntary Severance Scheme
Non-standard Business Case**

All proposals for releasing individuals in accordance with the University's Voluntary Severance Policy with effect from January 2012 onwards will require the approval of The Principal, Senior Vice Principal and the Secretary of Court. Further approval may be required by the Remuneration Committee in some circumstances.

The rationale for such cases should be set out below and should be submitted by Head of School/Director of Research Institute/Service Head. These should also be signed off by the appropriate VP/Head of College or the Secretary of Court.

Approved cases will normally be funded by Colleges/University Services.

Case submitted by:	
School/Research Institute/College/US Area:	Name(s) of Applicant(s):
Position(s):	

Background – please give details of and rationale for the proposal:
--

Financial Case – please indicate below the payback period for the proposed cost of severance using the formula below. Include any other relevant financial implications, e.g. impact on income generation, opportunity costs or other intangibles, additional savings associated with this case:		
A Current employment costs:	B	C
Payback Period (months) = (C/(A-B)) x 12		

Financial Business Case:- based on the figures below please give any relevant background and information on the financial case.

Business Impact – please indicate the non-financial benefits to the University; explain how the proposed arrangement supports your strategic objectives; give details of risks or issues associated with the proposal.

Submitted by:

Signed

Date

VP/Head of College/ Deputy Secretary of Court approval:

Signed

Date

Decision:

Approved

Rejected

Refer to Remuneration Comm

Signed
(Principal)

Date

Signed
(Senior Vice-Principal)

Date

Signed
(Secretary of Court)

Date

Comments:

University of Glasgow

University Court – Wednesday 7 October 2015

Communications to Court from the meeting of Senate held on 1 October 2015

(All matters are for noting)

1. Clerk of Senate appointment

It was reported that at its meeting on 22 September, the Council of Senate Business Committee had noted that Professor Briggs was scheduled to complete his 4-year period of appointment as Clerk of Senate in 2016. The procedure for the selection of Professor Briggs' successor would normally be initiated at the October meeting of the Council of Senate.

In view of the draft Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act, and the expectation that the Bill will become law in approximately one year from now. The implications for Senate are very significant. Senate comprises all professors of the University, a number of elected members and a number of other members ex officio. There are presently c. 600 members in total. The Government's proposals entail replacing this with a much smaller body (120 max), with an elected majority and student members and a small number of members ex officio. While the Council of Senate mainly follows the constitution of 'academic boards' in the draft legislation, Senate itself as it has been constituted for over 150 years would be abolished. Other proposed measures include changes to the composition of universities' governing bodies. It may be anticipated that there will be an appreciable amount of work involved as the changes and their ramifications come into effect.

The regulations governing the appointment of the Clerk of Senate (established in 2001) permit the period of appointment of the Clerk to be extended in exceptional circumstances. In its capacity as advisory committee to the Council of Senate, the Council Business Committee took the view that continuity in managing the interests of Senate would be extremely valuable during the transitional period following new legislation. Therefore, the Business Committee and Principal jointly proposed that Professor Briggs' period of appointment be extended by two years – until 31 July 2018. In submitting its recommendation, the Business Committee was mindful of equality of opportunities considerations. The judgement of the Committee, however, was that, at such a critical time, the continuity and experience Professor Briggs would bring - not least, having seen through the creation of the Council of Senate - would be highly beneficial to Senate.

It is within the remit of the Council of Senate, acting on Senate's behalf, to approve the appointment of the Clerk of Senate. However, in view of the importance of the position of Clerk for Senate, members of Senate were invited to submit observations on the joint proposal. Views were received from 24 members of Senate across the four Colleges, both elected and professorial members, from 14 Schools and 3 Research Institutes. All comments received were supportive of the proposal. Council of Senate approved the extension of the appointment of Professor Briggs in the role of Clerk of Senate until 21 July 2018.

2. Internationalisation Strategy 2015-20

Vice Principal for Internationalisation, Professor Jim Conroy, presented the University's Internationalisation Strategy for 2015-20, details of which had been received by Court at its meeting on 24 June. Professor Conroy reported that in the five years since the Strategy was first introduced in 2009/10 substantial progress had been made across the full range of the University's activities, with seven out of the eight key indicators demonstrating transformational progress. The Strategy was endorsed by Council of Senate.

3. Learning and Teaching Strategy 2015-20

Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation, Professor Frank Coton presented the new Learning and Teaching Strategy for the period to 2020. Professor Coton reported that the new Strategy was the result of a long term consultation process beginning in October 2014 gathering input from staff and students across the University.

The Strategy set out the ambition for the University:

- Focused on enhancement – to ensure a world-class student learning experience
- Fostering critical thought and investigative learning – through the relationship between teaching and cutting-edge research
- Inclusive, promoting access and opportunity – nurturing the talent of the diverse group of individuals who enter the University
- A supportive environment – which engenders positive behaviours and creates a learning experience and student support and engagement culture that is sector leading, supported by virtual and physical infrastructure of the highest quality.

The strategic objectives were identified to build upon and recognise progress against those in the 2011- 2015 strategy and were consistent with the objectives set out in the University E-Learning strategy. They also align to the key themes that underlie the University Strategy:

Theme 1: Empowering People

The strategy sets out to empower the University community to invest in talent and expertise in its world-class Learning and Teaching environment through:

- Recognition and Reward of Teaching
- Development and Professional Recognition of Staff
- Improved Administrative Support of Teaching and the Student Experience
- Deeper Student Engagement

Theme 2: Agility

There has been an unprecedented period of change over the last ten years as the use of technology has become more pervasive in personal and formal learning spaces. Which increases the opportunity for innovation in the approach to teaching but, in turn, places considerable demand on physical infrastructure and student support systems. A world-class Learning and Teaching Environment would be characterised by robust and agile approaches to both the delivery and support of teaching, enabled through:

- Improved Teaching and Information support systems
- Effective IT and the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)
- Innovative and Appropriate Pedagogy
- Developing Physical Infrastructure

Theme 3: Focus

Within any learning environment, there are specific challenges associated with the range and diversity of provision. Some of these impact on administrative complexity, quality of provision and student choice whilst others affect the ability of students to achieve success within the environment. Well-structured academic provision will lie at the heart of the world-class Learning and Teaching environment. Enable through:

- Curricular Innovation
- Embedding Graduate Attributes and Employability
- Supporting Transitions
- Internationalisation of the Curriculum

Council of Senate approved the Strategy for 2015-20.

4. Update on University Strategy 2015-20

Senior Vice-Principal, Professor Neal Juster presented an update on the University Strategy and the implementation of the improvement programme that had been developed. It was noted that launch events for the Strategy were taking place across campus.

Council of Senate were reminded that there were three main themes to the strategy and that a Vice Principal and Service Lead were leading each theme with involvement from approximately 15 additional members of staff.

Empowering People, led by Professor Roibeard O Maolalaigh, Vice Principal and Dean of College of Arts and Ms Christine Barr, Director of HR. It was reported that the key activities being undertaken were:

- Cultural diagnostics, which involved consideration of a range of tools to map activities to review the extent to which the University was bureaucratic compared to where it wanted to be and to determine actions for achieving its aims.
- Consideration of Leadership Behaviours of all staff with leadership roles, in order to develop a framework.
- Consideration of the visibility of the Senior Management Group (SMG) and others in senior management positions in response to concerns highlighted in the staff survey.

It was reported that there was also a fourth theme being led by the Principal in relation to SMG and that 360 appraisals had been implemented as part of the P&DR process for Senior Management Group.

Professor Neal Juster, Senior Vice-Principal and Ms Ann Allen, Director of Estates and Buildings were leading the second theme - Focus. It was reported that there were 23 KPIs, 9 focused in Schools and Research Institutes and consideration was currently being given as to how to cascade these. The annual planning round would involve more staff than it had previously and would focus on looking at how best to use resource. This group was also reviewing how other Higher Education Institutions and other organisations operated, particularly in relation to planning when resources were from multiple sources.

Professor Frank Coton, Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation and Mr Robert Fraser, Director of Finance were leading the Agility theme. This group was carrying out a process mapping exercise to identify where inefficiencies were in order to devise a change programme. This review including a survey of the administrative profile of the University comparing our activity on a range of different tasks that were being benchmarked with other Russell Group institutions.

In addition to meetings of each of the theme groups, the six co-chairs also meet every 6 weeks. There were plans to engage consultants and to establish a programme office to provide better coordination and structure around processes, programmes and project drafts. It was reported that the action plan had been communicated widely and that further updates would be received by Council of Senate.

5. Convener's Business

5.1 HE Governance (Scotland) Bill Scottish Parliament Finance Committee

The Principal reported that he had been asked to give evidence to the Scottish Parliament Finance Committee regarding the HE Governance Bill. It was acknowledged that although there were different views both within the University of Glasgow and across the sector, there was also substantial agreement on some key aspects. The Principal had pointed out to the Committee that there was an understanding of the drive behind the HE Bill, but that the main concern was the potential for unintended consequences in relation to how universities were treated as organisations. The Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) had responded with independent evidence with regard to concerns around retaining charitable status. There was also substantial concern about the risk that universities would be reclassified as public bodies, the consequences of which would have significant implications for the financial management of the University. The Principal reported that the Bill threatened the autonomy of institutions, which could have significant consequences across the sector. While the Government had indicated that there had been no intention for universities to be reclassified as public bodies, the concern remained that the proposed legislation would enable this to happen in the longer term. The Finance Committee was advised of this view and the need to diffuse this area of concern.

Concerns were expressed about the future implications of the proposed legislation. It was noted that it was important that stakeholders worked collectively on the elements where there was agreement, where appropriate. It was acknowledged that the risks were different for different stakeholders and that there needed to be improvement to the Bill rather than resistance to it.

5.2 Times Higher Education Shortlist

The Principal reported that the University had been shortlisted for the THE University of the Year for the second year running and had also been shortlisted in three other categories. Congratulations were extended to all staff and students concerned. It was also reported that the University of Glasgow has been rated amongst the top 100 universities in the world, according to Times Higher Education World University Rankings. The University of Glasgow ranked 76th, up 18 places from 94th the previous year. In the QS World University Rankings, the University was ranked 62nd, a drop from 55st the previous year but had also attained a five-star plus award in the QS World Rankings.

5.3 Spending Review

The Principal highlighted that the Spending Review was a considerable threat to the University. The UK Government had announced that there would be spending cuts and had indicated that this would result in a reduced block grant for Scotland. It was noted that this would likely have implications for Higher Education, particularly given that spending in areas such as the NHS and Schools was to be protected. The Principal highlighted particular concerns in relation to funding for Science and the Scottish Funding Council. It was reported that the budget would be set in January 2016 and that a case needed to be made to ensure that the resourcing levels in Scotland would be maintained in order to keep pace with the funding in rest of the UK and Europe.

6 Clerk of Senate's Business

6.1 Senate Guest Night Dinner

The next Senate Guest Night Dinner would be held on Thursday, 12 November 2015 at 7.00pm in the Senate Room. Members of Senate or Court who wish to nominate persons for consideration as official guests of the Senate at this or subsequent Senate Guest Nights should write to the Clerk of Senate. Members of Senate and Court are also encouraged to contact the Clerk of Senate with suggestions for speakers at subsequent Senate Guest Nights.

6.2 Remembrance Sunday

The Clerk of Senate advised that this year's Remembrance Service would be held in the Bute Hall on Sunday, 8 November at 10.45am.

The University marked Remembrance Sunday each year. There will be an academic procession at the event. Those who wish to join the procession were requested to assemble in the Hunterian Museum by 10.30am. Academic Dress would be required for those in the procession - gown and hood plus dark tie (conventional, not bowtie) for men. Members wishing to attend were asked to advise Michelle McMahan, ext 3292, e-mail: Michelle.McMahan@glasgow.ac.uk by 12 noon on Monday 2 November.

6.4 Honorary Degrees 2016

Senate received the oral report from the Honorary Degrees Committee concerning recommendations for the conferment of honorary Degrees in 2016. The Clerk of Senate will provide a report to Court at its meeting on 7 October 2015.



University
of Glasgow

Court - Wednesday 7 October 2015

Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Institution-led Review of Quality and Governing Body Statement of Assurance for AY 2014-15

Cover Sheet

Brief Description of the Paper

A copy of the University's draft annual report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) on institution-led review of quality for AY 2014-15 is attached. The contents are specified by the SFC. The statement summarises review activity undertaken by the University of its provision for students, i.e. Periodic Subject Reviews (PSR), Graduate School Reviews and the University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP) carried out in respect of student-facing University services. Information concerning review activity carried out at the University by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies is also included.

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

Court has duly approved the annual report for the last several years. Court will recall that a new requirement, the 'Statement of Assurance' was introduced in 2013. The prescribed text is quoted below and should be signed off by the Chair of the Governing Body with an indication of when it was endorsed.

“On behalf of the governing body of [University of Glasgow], I confirm that we have considered the institutions arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for AY 2014-15, including the scope and impact of these. I further confirm that we are satisfied that the institution has effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision. We can therefore provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and the quality of the learning provision at this institution continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.”

Action Required

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

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

Under the terms of its constitution, at the University, Senate has responsibility for teaching. This has been understood as meaning responsibility for academic standards and quality. Senate employs a range of mechanisms to ensure standards and quality are maintained. The main methods used are:

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

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

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

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

Compliance with the Quality Enhancement Framework is assessed at the four-yearly Enhancement-led Institutional Reviews (ELIRs).

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

The University has received the best result possible in each of the reviews it has undergone. Court will be aware that the most recent ELIR took place earlier in 2014. This exercise resulted in an excellent outcome. The reports from the 2014 ELIR may be found at: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews-and-reports/provider?UKPRN=10007794>

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

As a separate measure, the Secretary of Court also maintains a rolling programme of reviews of service departments within University Services. In compliance with the requirements of the Scottish national Quality Enhancement Framework, the panels for these reviews include a student member as well as external representative(s).

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



Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Progress of Institution-led Reviews conducted in 2014-15

1. Introduction

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

2. Periodic Subject Review (PSR)

The University's process of internal subject review is known as Periodic Subject Review (PSR). The process for PSR is consistent with the SFC's guidance on the characteristics of institution-led review (e.g. they are conducted on a cycle of not more than 6 years; include a student member and at least one external member on the review panel). The outcome of the review is a report which commends the strengths and achievements of the subject and includes recommendations aimed at enhancing and strengthening teaching provision and the student experience.

The University's Academic Standards Committee (ASC) review and endorse the report and monitors the responses to the recommendations made.

More detailed information on the PSR process is available at: <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/periodicsubjectreview/>

The PSR process is regularly reviewed since it was first established in 2002—3. During Session 2013-14, the PSR process underwent a major review, following the end of its second six-year cycle (2008-14). The conclusion of the evaluation was reported to the Funding Council in last year's report. For Session 2015-16, one minor amendment has been made to the recommendations made by the ASC in relation to the estimated length of the Self Evaluation Report: it was originally proposed that this should be approximately 15-20 pages in length. This proved to be too limiting during Session 2014-15 and ASC has therefore increased the length to 30-35 pages.

2.1 Subject Areas Reviewed in Session 2014-15

Seven reviews were conducted during 2014-15, as follows:

Classics	4 December 2014
Geographical and Earth Sciences	16/17 February 2015
Chemistry	5 March 2015

Urban Studies	4/5 March 2015
History	13 March 2015
Theatre, Film and TV Studies	16/17 March 2015
Economics	19/20 March 2015

Details of the programmes covered by the reviews are included in Appendix 1. The University's confirmed PSR review reports are publically available at: <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/periodicsubjectreview/#tabs=3>

2.2 Update on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2013-14

One year on, Progress Reports were considered by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for the following subject areas that were reviewed in 2013-14:

School/Subject	Outcome
Centre for Open Studies	ASC was satisfied with responses made to 16 of the 17 recommendations, although sought updates on progress made in relation to four other recommendations. The recommendation requiring further attention concerned an agreed timescale for the refurbishment of the Art Room. The Director of Estates and Buildings is to provide an update for the October 2015 meeting of ASC.
Nursing and Health Care	ASC commended the Subject Area on their engagement with the 14 recommendations with a number of the responses positive and imaginative. Further updates on progress on 6 of the recommendations had been requested for the November 2015 meeting of ASC.
Economic and Social History	All but 1 recommendation were considered to be satisfactorily addressed. A further update has been requested for the October 2015 meeting of ASC.
Computing Science	All but 3 of the 14 recommendations were considered to be satisfactorily addressed. One of the responses was deemed as good practice, worthy for wider dissemination A further update has been requested by ASC for the November 2015 meeting.
Sociology	Out of 17 recommendations, all but 2 were considered to have been well addressed. A further update has been requested by ASC for the October 2015 meeting.
Theology & Religious Studies	All but 3 of 14 recommendations were considered to be satisfactorily addressed. A further update has been requested by ASC for the November 2015

	meeting.
Philosophy	Out of 22 recommendations, all but 4 were considered to be satisfactorily addressed. A further update has been requested by ASC for the February 2016 meeting.
Education Community Development & Adult Education	The full progress report to be presented at the October 2015 meeting of ASC.

2.3 Further progress reports on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed prior to Session 2013-14

From Session 2012-13

School/Subject	Outcome
Veterinary Medicine	All outstanding issues had been resolved satisfactorily.
Engineering	All outstanding issues had been resolved.
Modern Languages and Cultures	One remaining recommendation concerning the delivery of weekly oral classes had been resolved. ASC had welcomed the progress that was being made with this issue.
Celtic and Gaelic	A progress report for one remaining recommendation would be presented to the October meeting of ASC.
Politics	Further updates on 5 recommendations were requested to be presented to the October 2015 meeting of ASC.

From Session 2011-12

School/Subject	Outcome
School of Education	Progress had been made with the last remaining recommendation with no further action deemed necessary.
Undergraduate School of Medicine	Progress made in the remaining outstanding issues had been welcomed, with a thorough review of Problem Based Learning having been undertaken.

Physics	All but one recommendation had been fully resolved.
---------	---

2.4 Subject Reviews to be conducted in Session 2015-16

The following reviews are scheduled to take place in Session 2015-16

Accounting and Finance
Archaeology
Dental School
School of Interdisciplinary Studies (Dumfries Campus)
English Language
English Literature
Learning and Teaching Centre (Academic Development Unit)
Scottish Literature
School of Mathematics and Statistics

The subjects of English Language, English Literature and Scottish Literature had originally been timetabled to be reviewed as one group as they shared common benchmark statements. However, following consultation with the Head of the School of Critical Studies, preference was indicated that each subject be reviewed separately. The Learning and Teaching Centre is being reviewed as it offers the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice and the MEd Learning and Teaching in Higher Education for members of staff. This is the first time the Centre has been reviewed. Since the taught courses are for members of staff, the format of the review will vary slightly, although every attempt has been made to keep it as similar to current processes as possible.

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

3.1 PSRB Reviews conducted in Session 2014-2015.

Please note that the reviews listed below are those reported to the SFC in Autumn 2014 as expected in 2014-2015. The reviews shaded in grey will be carried over to the 2015-2016 report and will be noted there.¹ Those marked in italics provide updates to reviews which took place in 2013-14.

Subject	PSRB	Outcome
Business School	Chartered Institute of Management	Current extension in

¹ While the reviews may have taken place in 2014-2015, some reports of reviews were not available at the time of writing. These programmes will be noted in the 2015-2016 listing with appropriate comment.

	Accountants (CIMA)	progress for graduating cohorts – 2015 to 2017.
	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)	Accreditation extended to cover students graduating in 2015.
School of Chemistry	Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC)	Review undertaken in November 2014. Report received. Programmes accredited for student enrolling between 2014-2019.
<i>School of Education</i>	<i>British Psychological Society (BPS)</i>	<i>Review undertaken in March 2014. Report now received. Programme accredited to 2019.</i>
School of Engineering	Engineering Accreditation Board (EAB)	Added in error. EAB organise visits but do not award accreditation.
	Institute of Physics and Medicine in Engineering (IPEM)	Review undertaken in May 2015. Report still to be received.
	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Monitoring Visit undertaken May 2015. Accreditation up to the 2015 intake.
	Institution of Engineering Designers (IED)	Review undertaken in May 2015. Report still to be received.
	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)	Review undertaken in May 2015. Report still to be received.
	Joint Board of Moderators (JBM)	Review undertaken in January 2015. Letter received. Accreditation up to the 2019 intake.
	Royal Aeronautical Society (RAeS)	Review undertaken in May 2015. Report still to be received.
<i>School of Medicine</i>	<i>General Medical Council (GMC)</i>	<i>Review undertaken in April 2014. Report now received. Programme accredited on an ongoing basis.</i>

3.2 PSRB reviews to be conducted in Session 2015-16

The following PSRB visits are anticipated in 2015-16. Subjects noted in grey are reviews carried over from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016.

Subject	PSRB
Business School	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW)
	Institute of Chartered Accountants in Scotland (ICAS)
School of Engineering	Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)
School of Law	Law Society of Scotland (LSS)
School of Mathematics & Statistics	Institute of Mathematics and its Applications (IMA)
School of Psychology	Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)
The following subjects were reviewed in 2014-2015 but reports of accreditation reviews have not yet been received. The reports from the accrediting bodies listed below are due to be received/confirmed in 2015-2016.	
School of Engineering	Institute of Physics and Medicine in Engineering (IPEM)
	Institution of Engineering Designers (IED)
	Institution of Mechanical Engineers (IMechE)
	Royal Aeronautical Society (RAeS)

4. Graduate School Reviews

The College of Arts Graduate School review took place during Session 2013-14 but the report had not been available for inclusion in last year's report. The Report highlighted a number of strengths such as engagement with external partnerships; development of internship programme providing work experience for students; emphasis placed on developing skills and employability and; support for student-led events and training opportunities. The recommendations emphasised continuation of developing strategies specifically drawing attention to their research strengths and unique selling points, plans for internationalisation as well as growth in student and staff numbers. Physical resource issues were identified as challenging especially limited student workspaces and the College attention was drawn to consider potential to re-develop space in the short to medium term. The Review Panel concluded that the Graduate School operated very effectively and had made significant progress since its last Review in 2009 (as the Faculty of Arts prior to restructuring in 2010). There was clearly a process of reflection with a number of good practices commended. The Panel commented on the positivity of the students interviewed who were excellent ambassadors for the Graduate School.

The College of Medicine, Veterinary Medicine and Life Sciences was reviewed during Session 2014-15 but the report has yet to be approved

5. University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP)

Planning and Business Intelligence Office (PBI) was reviewed during Session 2014-15. The review concluded that the PBI had made significant progress including leading the improvement in the quality of data and its accessibility. Senior Management commitment and guidance was required on its future role in alignment with the University's Strategic Plan and

business needs. The review panel had recommended that the PBO should become more business intelligence-orientated than data provision-focussed.

The Janitorial and Security Service had been provisionally identified for review during Session 2014-15. However, an external consultant had been commissioned and this took place instead of a Service review.

It is still to be confirmed which service will be reviewed during Session 2015-16.

6. The Outcomes of the Institution-led Review Processes

The outcome of a subject review visit at the University of Glasgow is a report produced by the Review Panel identifying the key strengths of the School or Subject Area along with conclusions and recommendations for improvement or change. There were no recommendations during the 2014-15 PSR reviews and Graduate School reviews that called into question the continuation of any programme for reasons relating to quality or standards.

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

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

The University continues to work closely with the Students' Representative Council (SRC) with students involved with all review processes at the University of Glasgow. The University considers its relationship with the SRC to be very strong.

Concern was raised last year by the SRC regarding some disappointing low attendance at the PSR meetings scheduled with the students. Following discussion with the SRC, it was agreed that both the Senate Office and SRC would be more pro-active: from Session 2015-16, the Senate Office will send a general email to all students within subjects being reviewed to advise them of the review and the importance of student involvement in the process. A number of students across levels and backgrounds will then be directly invited by the Senate Office to meet with the Panel. The SRC will also contact those students identified to emphasise the importance of their attendance. Student attendance will be monitored to ensure robust numbers are maintained.

8. Development Needs and the Identification of Good Practice

8.1 PSR

Development Needs

As in previous years, an examination of the recommendations made by PSR Panels during Session 2014-15 has been undertaken. In total, 75 recommendations were made from 7 reviews. As part of our standard practice, a report on the examination of the recommendations will be submitted to the October 2015 meeting of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). ASC's attention will be drawn to the groupings with specific attention drawn to any recommendations that have potential for University-wide consideration.

Academic standards[4]	<i>Setting, maintaining and reviewing</i>	Appropriate quality processes	
		Course/Programme approval	1

		Annual monitoring	
		External Examining	
		Student feedback	
		Benchmark statements	
		Accreditation and other external references	1
		Academic governance	2
		Sharing good practice	
Context and Strategy [12]		Range of provision	1
		Staffing	1
		Changes since last review	
		Strategic approach	9
		Overall aims and linkage to University strategy	1
Enhancing the Student Experience [16]	<i>Admissions, Retention, Success</i>	Student numbers and trends	
		Recruitment	1
		Retention and Progression	
		Leavers destination data	
	<i>Equality and Diversity</i>		
	<i>Supporting students</i>	Support mechanisms	7
		Transition and Induction	2
		International students	
		Widening participation	

	<i>Student Engagement</i>	Graduate attributes	2
		Employability	3
		Internationalisation	
		Feedback mechanisms	1
Enhancement Learning & Teaching [43]	<i>Learning & Teaching</i>	Curriculum design and development	12
		Approaches to ILOs	
		Work based learning and placement	
		Technology enhanced L&T	2
	<i>Assessment & Feedback [11]</i>	Range of assessment methods	4
		Engagement with Assessment policy	
		What/how students receive feedback	5
	<i>Resources for L&T [4]</i>	Staffing	1
		Physical resources	3
	<i>Engaging and supporting staff</i>	Staff (in general)	9
		Probationer and early career development	3
		GTA support and training	4 ²
Collaborative activity			

The conclusion of our examination of the recommendations is that, whilst the recommendations cover a number of themes, the following 3 themes contain the most recommendations: Supporting staff (including early career staff and GTAs) (16), Curriculum design and development had (12) and Strategic Approach (9).

² 3 of the recommendations concerning support for early career staff/staff also included GTAs

Issues highlighted under ‘Supporting staff’ included: the introduction of formal induction events and staff handbooks, clarification of career development for University Teachers and effective and transparent workload models. Some of the generic issues raised under ‘Curriculum design and development’ consisted of: exploration of interdisciplinary opportunities, undertaking systematic mapping and review to bring about coherent and integrated curricula. ‘Strategic Approach’ included development of learning and teaching strategy, more systematic approach to dissemination of good practice and development of a strategic vision in terms of future growth and range of provision. There were no matters raised that had required urgent attention.

Last year, the number of recommendations in relation to “GTA support and training” had been highlighted to Academic Standards Committee on 3 October 2014. As a result, ASC had invited Deans (Learning and Teaching) and Deans (Graduate School) to meet to discuss. The outcome of those deliberations included:

- Deans (Graduate Schools) formally recognised the role of duty of care for students and importance of relevant training
- Colleges now considering adapting the College of Arts policy
- HR highlighted issues in relation to limitations on work undertaken due to funder or visa terms and conditions
- GTA time should be remunerated for all teaching related staff meetings to which they contribute
- Better awareness of training available by Learning & Teaching Centre
- More School level support
- Recognition of GTAs as members of the teaching team

Fuller details on this year’s recommendations can be made available, if required.

Key Strengths and Good Practice

A total of 65 areas of good practice/key strengths were identified, out of which 16 have potential for University-wide dissemination. Good practice was identified in the following areas:

Academic standards [6]	<i>Setting, maintaining and reviewing</i>	Appropriate quality processes	1
		Course/Programme approval	
		Annual monitoring	
		External Examining	
		Responsiveness to student feedback	5
		Benchmark statements	
		Accreditation and other external references	
		Academic governance	

		Sharing good practice	
Context and Strategy [8]		Range of provision	
		Environment (strong sense of community/student focused)	6
		Changes since last review	
		Strategic approach	
		Reflective and high quality Self Evaluation Report	2
		Overall aims and linkage to University strategy	
Enhancing the Student Experience [21]	<i>Admissions, Retention, Success</i>	Student numbers and trends	
		Recruitment	2
		Retention and Progression	
		Leavers destination data	
	<i>Equality and Diversity</i>		
	<i>Supporting students</i>	Support mechanisms	7
		Transition and Induction	1
		International students	1
		Widening participation	1
	<i>Student Engagement</i>	Graduate attributes	3
		Employability	4
		Internationalisation	
		Feedback mechanisms	2
Enhancement Learning & Teaching [30]	<i>Learning & Teaching</i>	Curriculum design and development	7

		Approaches to ILOs	1
		Work based learning and placement	
		Technology enhanced L&T	3
	<i>Assessment & Feedback</i>	Range of/Innovative assessment methods	4
		Engagement with Assessment policy	
		What/how students receive feedback	2
	<i>Identifying/extending good practice</i>		
	<i>Resources for L&T</i>	Staffing	1
		Physical resources	1
	<i>Engaging and supporting staff</i>	Supporting staff (including Equality and Diversity)	7
		GTA support and training	4
Collaborative activity			

Good practice identified covered a large number of themes; with ‘Support mechanisms’ (7), Learning Environment (6) ‘Supporting staff’ (7) and Curriculum design and development (7) being the categories with the most practices identified. The Learning Environment was predominantly recognition of the provision of an open and friendly supportive environment which were student-focussed. Panels recognised that provision of a strong sense of community provided productive relationships between students and staff which undoubtedly provided a supportive student experience as well as enhancing the learning and teaching environment. Similarly, ‘Support mechanisms’ reflected staff commitment and accessibility of staff to students. With regard to curriculum design and development, the breadth and variety and care taken to develop degree programmes to deliver interesting and relevant programmes and the positive impact this had on the student experience had been recognised.

ASC will be asked to confirm which areas of good practice identified would be widely disseminated across the University. In addition, the Learning and Teaching Committee will also review the key strengths and good practice and identify practices to be presented at the annual Learning and Teaching Committee Away Day.

Where good practice has been identified, consent will be sought from Heads of Subject/School with further information requested to be forwarded to Heads of School/Subject where recommendations have been made on corresponding activities.

Further details on Key Strengths and Good Practice can be made available, if required.

9. Enhancement Led Institutional Review (ELIR)

The University of Glasgow was reviewed during Session 2013-14. The overarching judgment was: “The University of Glasgow has effective arrangements for managing academic standards and the student learning experience. These arrangements are likely to continue to be effective in the future. This is a positive judgment, which means the University has robust arrangements for securing academic standards and for enhancing the quality of the student experience.”

A draft of the University's year on Follow Up Report was submitted to the QAA in June 2015. We are now in the process of seeking formal approval from the University Court, the University's governing body.

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

Periodic Subject Reviews

Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2014-15

Chemistry

MSci Chemistry with Work Placement
MSci Chemistry with European Placement
MSci Chemistry with Medicinal Chemistry with Work Placement
MSci Chemistry with Medicinal Chemistry with European Placement
MSci Chemical Physics
MSci Chemical Physics with Work Placement
MSci Chemistry & Mathematics
BSc (Hons) Chemistry
BSc (Hons) Chemistry with Medicinal Chemistry
BSc (Hons) Chemical Physics
BSc (Hons) Chemistry & Mathematics
BSc (Designated) Chemical Studies
MSc Chemistry
MSc Chemistry with Medicinal Chemistry

Classics

MA Classics (Classical Civilisation) (Single and Joint)
Latin (Single and Joint)
Greek (Single and Joint)
MLitt Classics

Economics

MA (Social Sciences) Economics, Single Honours
MA (Social Sciences) Business Economics, Single Honours
MA (Social Sciences), MA, BSc, BAcc, LLB Economics, Joint Honours
MA (Social Sciences), LLB Business Economics, Joint Honours
MA Economics with a subsidiary language, Principal Honours (being phased out)
MSc Asset Pricing and Investment
MSc Banking & Financial Services
MSc Finance & Management (joint with Management)
MSc Financial Economics
MSc Financial Forecasting & Investment
MSc Financial Risk Management
MSc International Trade & Finance
MSc Investment Banking & Finance
MSc Investment Fund Management
MSc Quantitative Finance
MSc International Banking & Finance
MSc International Development
MSc International Finance & Economic Policy
MSc Economic Development

MSc Economics, Banking & Finance
MSc Environment & Sustainable Development
MSc Finance & Economic Development
MSc Development Studies

Geographical and Earth Science

BSc Earth Science
BSc Geography
MSc in Water Sciences
MRes Human Geography: Spaces, Politics, Ecologies
MSc/PGCert/PG Dip Geoinformation Technology & Cartography
MSc/PGCert/PG Dip Geospatial & Mapping Sciences
MSc Geomatics and Management

History

MA History (single or joint)
MA Scottish History (joint only)
MLitt/MSc History
MLitt Medieval History
MLitt Early Modern History
MLitt Modern History
MLitt Scottish History
MSc Gender History
MLitt War Studies
MLitt American Studies

Theatre, Film and Television Studies

MA Film and Television Studies (Single and Joint)
MA Theatre Studies (Single and Joint)
MLitt Playwriting and Dramaturgy
MLitt Theatre Studies
MLitt Theatre History
MLitt Theatre Practices
MLitt Film and Television Studies
MSc Filmmaking and Media Arts
MSc Media Management

Urban Studies

MA (Social Sciences) (Hons) Social and Public Policy
MA (Social Sciences) (Hons) Social and Public Policy joint with another subject
MSc City & Regional Planning
MSc City Planning & Regeneration
MSc City Planning and Real Estate Development
MSc International Planning Studies
MSc International Real Estate
MSc International Real Estate and Management
MSc Real Estate
MSc Real Estate and Regeneration
MSc/PGDip Housing Studies

MSc Public and Urban Policy
MSc Public Policy and Management
MSc in Urban Transport
MRes in Public Policy Research
MRes in Urban Policy Research