

WEB COPY

Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 14 December 2016 in the Mary Stewart Seminar Room, Vet School, Garscube

Present:

Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Professor Lindsay Farmer Senate Assessor, Dr Carl Goodyear Senate Assessor, Professor Nick Hill Senate Assessor, Mr Ameer Ibrahim SRC President, Professor Karen Lury Senate Assessor, Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson General Council Assessor, Ms Lauren McDougall SRC Assessor, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor's Assessor (to item 16 incl.), Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr Ronnie Mercer Co-opted Member, Ms June Milligan Co-opted Member, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Ms Margaret Morton Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Ms Elspeth Orcharton Co-opted Member, Ms Elizabeth Passey Co-opted Member (Convener of Court), Dr Duncan Ross Senate Assessor, Cllr Helen Stephen Glasgow City Council Representative, Ms Lesley Sutherland General Council Assessor

In attendance:

Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings), Professor Anne Anderson (Head of College of Social Sciences and Vice-Principal), Ms Christine Barr (Director of Human Resources), Ms Cathy Bell (Director, Development & Alumni) (to item 17 incl.), 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 Jon Cooper (Vice-Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange), Professor Frank Coton (Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Roibeard Ó Maolaláigh (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal), Professor Miles Padgett (Vice-Principal Research), Dr Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary) (to item 16 incl.)

Apologies:

Members: Professor Paul Younger Senate Assessor

CRT/2011/13. Announcements

Ms Lauren McDougall and Cllr Helen Stephen were welcomed to their first meeting.

Margaret Morton was attending her final meeting of Court. Court thanked her for her contributions to Court and wished her well in the future. In her absence, Cllr Pauline McKeever was also thanked for her time on Court, having demitted office since the last meeting.

There were no declarations of interest in relation to business to be conducted at the meeting.

CRT/2016/14. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 12 October 2016

The minutes were approved and signed by the Convener as a correct record.

CRT/2016/15. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2016/16. Capital Plan and Learning and Teaching Hub Full Business Case

Capital Plan

Court members had received a briefing on the Capital Plan, from the Principal and the Senior Vice-Principal Professor Neal Juster, ahead of the meeting. The briefing had set out the University's ambition to excel in an increasingly competitive global HE sector. Proposals within the capital plan had been tested against key strategic criteria (academic excellence; enhancing the student experience; supporting student and research growth; industry collaboration; protecting income; and allowing new ways of working). They had also been developed to promote collaboration through 'flexing' College-focused projects in order to maximise the benefit for the entire institution. The phasing of development had been considered carefully with a view to: enabling downside risks for income generation to be managed; achieving benefits associated with early development; and timing borrowing so as to benefit from advantageous financial market conditions.

Court had also received details of: the proposed phasing and baseline financial scenarios, modelling and income/expenditure assumptions, cash flow, and scenario-based borrowing spread across projects. Information on governance had also been provided, outlining the establishment of two new governance boards: a Programme Governance Board for the overall capital plan including financial sustainability and funding, masterplan, infrastructure, disposals, and the efficiency work streams; and a Projects Governance Board, which would replace the current eight individual project governance boards. Project Development Boards would continue to exist and become Delivery Boards once a project was on site.

For the meeting, Court had received a comprehensive paper providing an update to the Capital Plan for the period 2016-2023, together with an outline for the period 2023-2033. Court members having requested reassurances on these areas during the pre-Court briefing, it was stressed that a business case for each project would come to Court for consideration, with clarity about the external environment and detailed evidence on income streams, and about change programmes that would generate savings. Court would also be reminded of the context of each project within the programme package, and it was noted that individual projects could be stopped if circumstances required this.

In discussion, Court noted that the Capital Plan took account of the importance of IT infrastructure/management. There was a significant piece of work ongoing in this area, although it had been decided that development of a major data centre was not to be taken forward. Court noted also a comment that 'pause points' within the Plan were essential, and that the Plan should be looked at afresh each time a full business case was presented. Court noted through an update from the Committee's chair, Ronnie Mercer, that the Estates Committee was content with the Plan's vision as now presented, and that he would ensure the Committee was mindful of points raised by Court, and that it would continue to provide oversight and regular reports to Court over the course of the Plan.

Court noted that the property disposal scheme would ensure that appropriate properties were maintained and protected as necessary, for example via leasehold or joint venture arrangements, to ensure that the University's interests were protected. The Programme Governance Board, the Estates Committee and Court would consider property proposals on a case by case basis. Court noted a comment about the importance of good governance generally, given the proposed rapid pace of the development and the people resource it

required.

Court noted that the Development Boards, which shaped projects, would have student representation, and that students would also be involved at the point when the delivery board was put in place. With regard to a comment about the Arts project being a phased proposal, it was noted that the first phase should be approved by Court on the basis that it presented a coherent development that would deliver major benefits of itself, whether or not the second phase was subsequently approved. With regard to a comment about the need for the Plan and the associated funding to be co-ordinated even in the event of changes in the future, it was noted that this would be provided from senior management, in particular through the work of the Programme Board.

Court received a summary of the recommendations being made to it. These were:

i) That the Capital Plan projects, and the phasing as outlined in sections 4.1 - 4.2 of the main paper be adopted with the assumption that the construction timetable be followed, with Phase 1a being completed in 2022 at a cost of £433.5m, and Phase 1b completed by the middle of 2026 at a cost of £98.5m.

ii) That a facility be put in place to borrow £175m.

iii) With the exception of the Mathematics and Statistics project (currently on site) and the Learning and Teaching Hub (where the full business case would be presented at the Court meeting), that full business cases be developed for the projects in Phases 1a and 1b of the capital plan, i.e. for: a. Research Hub; b. Institute of Health and Well-being; c. Adam Smith Business School; d. Arts and Humanities building (phase 1); e. Joseph Black Building refurbishment; f. Infrastructure; g. Engineering (phase 1); h. Social Justice Hub (part of) move to the Gilbert Scott. It was expected that funding for design and development would only be released upon a capex application for each individual project thereby ensuring that funds were managed and controlled. Construction would only commence upon Court approval of a full business case. Any full business case would include the project's impact on the affordability of subsequent projects.

iv) Given the potential uncertainty and volatility in financial markets, and having decided on points i) and ii) above, that Court should delegate authority to a small working group to take forward the borrowing strategy and ensure that full advantage is taken of the current low borrowing rates.

Court approved the recommendations. Court thanked Professor Juster, Ann Allen Director of Estates, and all those involved in the preparation of the Capital Plan.

Learning and Teaching Hub Full Business Case

Court had received paperwork setting out the full business case for the Learning and Teaching Hub. Having thanked colleagues including students involved in the development of the plans, Professor Frank Coton, Vice-Principal (Academic & Educational Innovation), briefed Court on key points relating to the context for the Hub. This included the teaching estate being significantly stretched, current teaching space being constrained and inflexible, and the Library having reached capacity in terms of the provision of student study space.

Court noted key design aspects, including the building's central positioning and its accommodation and space data. The building would provide a focal point for student life, with student study and informal space; catering, student kitchens, locker facilities and plentiful power; bookable space for student clubs, societies and social events; and pop-up space for Careers, induction and other events. Teaching space had been designed with

certain principles in mind, including the rooms not constraining staff to teach in a certain way, and staff being supported to explore and develop new approaches to teaching, with spaces facilitating this. Study spaces had been designed with student ownership as key.

Court heard that the Hub would: ensure the estate was able to support teaching space disposals on the WI site, as identified in the campus masterplan, and return the Bute Hall to general use; address the current shortfall in student study space; improve utilisation of the teaching estate by 10%; create capacity for student growth of at least 1900 above 2015/16 baseline, supporting associated income growth of £26m per annum; and improve the student learning experience enabled by shifts in pedagogy and improved facilities.

Court noted that benchmark costs had been submitted by the two prospective delivery partners and these had been tested by the University cost consultants.

In discussion, Court noted that full consideration, testing and appropriate development had been undertaken with regard to the building's accessibility for disabled users. This would be reflected in future information about the Hub. Court noted that with respect to change control processes, the revised governance model approved earlier in the meeting would in part govern these, and each draft project's documentation would set out the details on change control specific to the individual contract. With regard to procurement models and maximum target prices, bidders for delivery partner status would furnish tenders by the end of January 2017, at which point there would be final certainty on price; at present there was a price envelope given different prices based on the approach to risk. The maximum price would be covered by the contract once awarded; it was noted the Capital Plan estimate was realistic in this respect.

Ann Allen agreed to refer a query around business continuity, emergency generators and sustained use of the building in the event of an external power failure to the Estates Committee.

With regard to a question about capacity problems potentially being compounded if the building allowed further growth in student numbers, Court noted that the Hub would create efficiencies relating to timetabling, and better provision of teaching spaces. It was also noted that the University budget contained provisions to maintain the student experience. It was further noted that the operating model was such that there would be a dedicated team for the building.

The Full Business Case having been presented, approval was sought from Court for a financial ceiling of £97m to deliver the Learning and Teaching Hub project. Court's approval to this was given.

Court thanked Professor Coton and all those involved in the preparation of the Full Business Case.

CRT/2016/17. Report from the Principal

CRT 2016/17.1 Development Campaign

Court received a briefing on the current Development Campaign, from Cathy Bell, Director, Development and Alumni.

Court heard that with regard to fundraising for the campus development, it has been recommended by consultants that the working target be £110M, with £55M for projects within the capital plan and £55M for projects outside the capital plan and for scholarships and selected research/staff/student support. This was an ambitious increase in the scale of

targets, compared to previous campaigns. The office's team has been augmented accordingly.

Court heard details of the campaign phasing, the predicted distribution of levels of gifts, donations and pledges to date, and information about previous campaigns. Court noted some risks associated with the current campaign, including some benefactors potentially not wishing to support priority projects given their very specific interests; insufficient benefactor and lead potential donors coming forward; a climate of political uncertainty around Brexit and Scottish independence; and the regulatory environment around the use of data.

Court thanked Ms Bell for the briefing.

CRT 2016/17.2. Higher Education developments

Court noted a number of current developments in train in Westminster, particularly in respect of the Higher Education and Research Bill and Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and the forthcoming Home Office consultation on student visas. The Higher Education and Research Bill continued to cause concern to both UUK and Universities Scotland and active lobbying of both Peers and MPs was continuing. It remained to be seen how Scottish HEIs would be subject to the TEF.

On immigration policy, the Home Secretary had announced a consultation on the potential future linking of international student visa policy to the quality of the student and the institution, with the consultation delayed until the New Year. The UK sector was continuing to lobby energetically on this issue, which was of high importance to all institutions.

Following the First Minister's announcement in May, the Cabinet Secretary for the Economy, Jobs and Fair Work had established a review of the enterprise and skills support provided by Scotland's economic development and skills agencies. The stated aim of the review was to ensure that Scotland's businesses, workforce, training providers, colleges and universities and young people received the joined-up support they needed. Phase 1 of the Review was now complete, and the first recommendation stated that in order to bring greater integration and focus to the delivery of enterprise and skills support to businesses and users of the skills system, a new Scotland wide statutory board would be created to co-ordinate the activities of Highlands & Islands Enterprise and Scottish Enterprise, including Scottish Development International, Skills Development Scotland and the SFC. This development had raised concerns within the HE sector regarding increasing levels of Government control over the work of higher education, and a possible loss of focus on teaching and research such as was currently provided through the work of the SFC. These concerns had been presented to the government which had stated that its reforms were not intended to impinge on the autonomy of institutions.

CRT 2016/17.3 Guild of European Research-Intensive Universities

Court had previously been updated on the formation of the Guild of European Research-Intensive Universities. The Guild had been launched at an opening symposium in Brussels in November. It had now expanded to include eighteen of Europe's leading universities from across thirteen countries. The Guild was committed to promoting excellence in research, teaching and learning across Europe. It had explored and evaluated how funding was currently framed to see what effects this had on fostering excellent science and innovation; and had considered how the Guild might also promote and enhance support for basic collaborative research throughout Europe, in addition to the current emphasis on applied research and the themes around Europe's societal challenges in particular.

CRT 2016/17.4. Outcome Agreement - Dumfries

Over the recent past, Court members had been updated on the background to and content of the University's Outcome Agreement, which was required to be submitted to the SFC as a condition of funding. Since the last meeting and under the delegated authority of the Secretary of Court, the Outcome Agreement for the Dumfries Campus had been approved and provided to the Scottish Funding Council.

CRT 2016/17.5 USS

The triennial review of the scheme would be undertaken in March 2017. Court would be updated ahead of this, at its February meeting, with the Principal to record an interest given his Directorship of USS.

CRT 2016/17.6 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/2016/18. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2016/18.1 Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act – Transitional Arrangements

The Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act would come into force in the coming months [subsequently confirmed as 30 December]. Amended arrangements for membership of both Court and Senate, arising from the Act, were subject to a transition period of 4 years. This would allow existing terms of office to expire. As previously agreed at Court, there would be as little disruption as possible to Court's existing membership categories, retaining the membership at 25 (and no more), and retaining a clear lay majority.

Court approved arrangements for a proposed Court and Senate Working Group, which would meet in the New Year. Court noted a comment from Margaret Anne McParland that a staff member should be on the group.

Court would be kept updated on progress from the Group.

CRT/2016/18.2 Court meetings – administration and paperwork

i) Court papers app

Since the last meeting, details of a web-based application (app), that would provide Court and Committee papers in electronic format to PCs and mobile devices, had been obtained. It was agreed that a small cross-section of Court members would meet the app provider in January, to make a decision about whether an investment would be made in the system.

ii) Court meeting day and time

From time to time Court Office had canvassed members' opinion on what the preferred timing is for Court meetings. This would occur again early in the New Year, to establish if members were content with the current arrangements, or if there were suggestions for alternative days/times to the current Wednesday 2pm meetings.

CRT/2016/18.3 Vice-Convenor

Graeme Bissett left the room for this item.

At the last Court meeting, Court had agreed arrangements relating to a Vice-convenor of Court. The Vice-convenor of Court would deputise for the Convenor of Court in her absence. The Vice-convenor was to be appointed by Court on the nomination of the Convenor.

Court approved the Convenor's nomination of Graeme Bissett to undertake the role of Vice-convenor.

CRT/2016/18.4 Scheme of Delegated Authorities

The Scheme of Delegated Authorities formally set out where responsibilities lay in the University across the main areas of activity. The current Scheme had been adopted by Court in 2007 and updated in 2010. It had been reviewed and refreshed, and was approved by Court subject to some finalised information being added about signatory authority.

CRT/2016/18.5 Vice-Chairs

At the last Court meeting, Court had agreed arrangements relating to Vice-chairs of Court Committees being appointed. The Vice-chairs of each Court committee would deputise for the Chair in his/her absence. The Vice-chair would be appointed by the Committee, on the nomination of the Chair. Court has agreed that the Vice-chair of any Committee would be drawn only from lay members. The following had been appointed:

Audit Committee: Simon Bishop appointed as vice-chair.

Estates Committee: David Milloy appointed as vice-chair.

Finance Committee: Graeme Bissett appointed as vice-chair.

Remuneration Committee: June Milligan appointed as vice-chair.

Vice-chairs were still to be appointed for the Health, Safety & Wellbeing and HR Committees.

CRT/2016/18.6 Competition and Markets Authority: Student Debt

At the last meeting, Court had heard that the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) had advised in the summer that, in its opinion, the University's use of academic sanctions to enforce a non-tuition fee debt was unlawful and had requested that the University amend its debt policy. In common with most other UK universities, Glasgow had historically applied an academic sanction (refusing to allow students to graduate, or to progress to the next level of study) in a situation where, following extensive correspondence, a student had failed to clear debt due to the University.

In October, Court had authorised further discussion with the CMA, in the hope that discussions might arrive at a satisfactory way forward. Following such further discussion with CMA, it has been proposed that the relevant current clause in the University Calendar be replaced by a new clause, which stated that academic sanctions would be applied only in respect of tuition fee debt. CMA was content with the revised wording of the clause and Court had approved it between meetings. The new policy would however involve the University having to consider the application of new debt collection sanctions in future, including penalty payments and, in the case of residential accommodation debt, eviction.

CRT/2016/18.7 Nominations Committee business

i) Audit Committee

At Court's last meeting, it had been agreed that a Senate Assessor would be appointed to the Audit Committee. Dr Duncan Ross had been proposed as the appointee and had attended the November meeting. He was also a member of the Finance Committee. The Audit Committee's remit indicated that "*Members of the Committee will not normally also be members of the Finance Committee, except with the express approval of the Court.*"

Noting that the Convener of Court, the Secretary of Court and the Chair of Audit Committee were all supportive of the appointment, Court confirmed Dr Ross's appointment to the Audit Committee.

ii) Remuneration Committee

Since its last meeting and on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, Court had approved the appointment of June Milligan to the Remuneration Committee, with effect from 1 November 2016.

CRT/2016/18.8 New Court members

Since the last meeting, two new Court members had been appointed: Lauren McDougall had been elected as SRC Assessor; and Cllr Helen Stephen had been appointed by Glasgow City Council.

CRT/2016/18.9 Election of Rector

The student body would elect a successor to Edward Snowden, in February 2017. The Rector would continue to be the 'ordinary president' of Court - in the words of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1858 - and would have a deliberative and a casting vote. Within the terms of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016, the Convener would remain responsible for the leadership and effectiveness of the governing body, and for ensuring that there was an appropriate balance of authority between the governing body and the Principal. The Convener would also continue, per Court's Standing Orders, to undertake the other responsibilities associated with the chairing of a governing body.

CRT/2016/18.10 Review of Code of Good HE Governance

The current Governance Code for Scottish Higher Education had been published by the Committee of Scottish Chairs in July 2013, and at the time of publication, the chairs had committed to a review of the Code after 3 years. The outcome of review was now expected in the first quarter of 2017.

CRT/2016/18.11 Risk Management Processes

At the last meeting, and following a recommendation from the Audit Committee, Court had received a copy of the University Risk Register. Court had provided some comments on the format, including a suggestion that more specific detail should be included about what gave rise to some of the (more generalised) risks listed; and that a RAG classification might be applied. These and other comments, received since by the Secretary of Court, would be discussed by him with the chair of the Audit Committee. A report would be provided to the February meeting of Court.

CRT/2016/19. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2016/19.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2016/19.1.1 University Financial Statements as at 31 July 2016

The Director of Finance, Robert Fraser, gave a presentation on the University's financial statements for the year to 31 July 2016, Court having received the University Financial Statements for the said year.

Court noted a management accounts surplus for 2015/16 of £23.7m, £12.2m higher than the original budget. The statutory accounts surplus after exceptional items and tax was £13.5m. The main operational movements included: staff savings of £6.3m, £2.4m increase in tuition fees and increased other income of £2.4m. The Committee noted the additional movements which brought the statutory accounting surplus to £13.5m, including GSV (charge of £21.9m), pensions (charge of £3.5m), £6.6m increase in endowments and £6.7m positive impact of FRS 102.

At year end, cash and deposits totalled £194m, an increase of £40.2m in the year.

Court noted the impact of Financial Reporting Standard (FRS) 102 on the financial statements. Because a year on year comparison was required to be shown in the accounts, the 2015 financial statements had been restated. Due to the treatment of donations, grants and contracts under FRS 102, there would be increased volatility showing in the Income and Expenditure account.

The Committee noted capital expenditure for 2015/16 of £75.8m, an increase of £11.2m compared to 2014/15. The capital spend was split £17.1m on GSV, £47.3m on land and buildings, and £11.4m on equipment. Court noted the underlying commercial reasons for the GSV deal.

Court approved the University Financial Statements for the year to 31 July 2016. The chair of the Finance Committee, Ken Brown, and other members of Court thanked Robert Fraser and his team for their work.

CRT/2016/19.1.2 Universities Subsidiaries and Trust Financial Statements as at 31 July 2016

Court approved the financial statements of the subsidiaries and the Trust, which had also been approved where applicable by the respective boards and trustees.

CRT/2016/19.1.3 Learning and Teaching Hub – Final Business Case

Finance Committee had agreed to recommend the project to Court. The matter had been considered under item 16.

CRT/2016/19.1.4 Capex Applications

The Committee had approved a CapEx application relating to: Water Source Heat Pump - Fees.

CRT/2016/19.1.5 Endowment Investment Report

Court noted an endowment investment report as at 30 September 2016.

CRT/2016/19.1.6 Financial reports

Court noted an overview of performance as at 30 September 2016.

The report was noted.

CRT/2016/19.2 Audit Committee

CRT/2016/19.2.1 Audit Committee remit

Court approved revisions to the remit of the Committee, which had been agreed and recommended to Court by the Committee following a review of best practice; and approved a change of the Committee's name to the Audit and Risk Committee.

CRT/2016/19.2.2 Audit Committee annual report 2015/2016

Court noted the annual report of the Audit Committee, which was provided as a matter of good governance, and included its assessment of the adequacy of the University's systems of internal control. The Committee was of the view that for the year past, on the basis of the internal audit work undertaken in the course of the year, and of the comments of the external auditors on the University's financial statements, the University generally had an adequate framework of internal control.

CRT/2016/19.2.3 Other Audit Committee business

At its recent meeting, the Committee had received reports on internal audit reviews of Data Governance, MyCampus enrolment, Risk Management Arrangements in Colleges, and Corporate Governance (Remuneration Committee). The internal auditors had provided the Committee with an annual report, which had concluded that for 2015/16, governance, risk management and control, and value for money arrangements in relation to business critical areas, were generally satisfactory, but there were some areas of weakness or non-compliance with processes which potentially put the achievement of institutional objectives at risk. The Committee had received the University's financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2016, noting the main areas where the 2015 Statement of Recommended Practice/FRS102 had impacted on them. The Committee had heard that on the basis of work performed to date, the external auditors anticipated issuing unqualified audit opinions on the University's consolidated, parent and subsidiary entity financial statements. The Committee had noted the accounts for subsidiary companies and the University Trust.

The report was noted.

CRT/2016/19.3 Estates Committee

CRT/2016/19.3.1 Capital Plan

The Estates Committee had approved of the revised Capital Plan involving Phase 1a, Phase 1b and Phase 2. The Estates Committee had invited Court to consider an accelerated delivery programme and associated additional borrowing requirements to deliver Phases 1a and 1b of the Plan by 2021. The matter had been considered by Court under item 16.

Court noted the Estates Committee minute recording a comment about the potential impact of noise disturbance, supply chain and University resourcing implications resulting from a protracted programme.

CRT/2016/19.3.2 Learning and Teaching Hub

The Estates Committee had approved the Learning and Teaching Hub within the identified cost envelope of £86 - £97m. The matter had been considered by Court under item 16.

CRT/2016/19.3.3

Court noted Estates Committee's approval of a CapEx application relating to: Water Source Heat Pump – Fees in the sum of £658k.

The report was noted.

CRT/2016/19.4 Human Resources Committee

The HR Committee had discussed the draft plan to address the Gender Pay Gap. This had highlighted the importance of increasing the number of female applicants to senior positions, addressing the apparent inequity of gender pay gaps within professorial pay zones, and exploring ways to address occupational segregation across the University. The Committee had also received an update on the Attraction and Recruitment of Talent and the proposal for an end-to-end process review: the level of recruitment activity remained high, and attracting, retaining and developing talent was critical to achieving the University Strategy. A report for the Committee had shown that the Staff Survey had revealed staff with a disability as less engaged and more dissatisfied, identifying some possible reasons for this and proposing action.

A report from the Director of HR, the Annual report from the Joint Committee of Consultation and Negotiation and the annual report of HR Analytics were received by Court and noted. The latter report now included additional information in relation to non-UK EU Nationals employed by the University. The chair of the HR Committee, June Milligan, highlighted to Court that this information would now be able to be tracked and trends identified to Court.

The report was noted.

CRT/2016/19.5 Remuneration Committee

[This item was dealt with as the final item of the meeting's business, after items 20, 21 and 22].

The Principal and all members of senior management, with the exception of Christine Barr, left the meeting for this item.

The approach to the annual review of senior management pay had been agreed by Court at its October meeting, with comments made at that meeting having been incorporated into the process.

The Committee had supported a consolidated award being given to professorial staff assessed as having made a 'Strong Contribution', and whose salary was currently in the Lower Quartile of the relevant Professorial Zone. It was noted that such an assessment would not have led to a consolidated award for other staff. Court was advised that the Committee's decision had recognised the fact that professorial staff did not have access to incremental progression and to the R&R process; and that the decision was helpful in addressing gender pay gap issues.

A comment was noted that the context card for the Committee should in future include details about equality impact. This would be taken forward by the Committee.

It was confirmed that the 'salary augmentation' arrangements agreed by the Committee in 2016 were cost neutral. Under these arrangements, and subject to certain criteria being met, the

Court Wednesday 14 December 2016

University could provide an opportunity for high earning staff who withdrew from their occupational pension scheme to apply to receive a salary enhancement.

The report indicated that within the P&DR exercise in 2016, a lower proportion of exceptional ratings had been afforded to staff on lower grades, with 13% of staff in Grades 1-5 assessed as 'exceptional contribution', whereas across the institution the average had been 18%. Court noted a comment that this potentially reinforced the gender pay gap, noting also that the Director of HR would follow the matter up through the HR Committee agenda. Court also noted that the HR Committee would be updated on the spread of Professorial reward among Colleges, it being noted that, within an agreed budget, individual Colleges had discretion to determine the level of reward in relation to '*exceptional contribution*' by professorial staff.

The report was noted.

CRT/2016/20. Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate 8 December 2016

The Council of Senate had received: a report on the 2016 Staff Survey; an update on the Estates Strategy; an update on research-related matters; a briefing from the Principal (the Convener) on a number of areas including Brexit-related implications for HE, and the Autumn Budget Statement; and details of acceptances received from nominees for Honorary Degrees in 2017

The communications were noted.

CRT/2016/21. Any Other Business

The Convener reminded members to provide any comments to her, for input to a SMG discussion on the future relationship between Court and the Executive.

CRT/2016/22. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 15 February 2017 at 2pm in the Senate Room.