

**WEB COPY**

## **Court**

### **Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 11 October 2017 in the Senate Room**

**Present:**

Cllr Susan Aitken Glasgow City Council Assessor (to item 8.1.2), Mr Aamer Anwar Rector (to item 8.1.3), Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Professor Lindsay Farmer Senate Assessor (to item 7), Professor Carl Goodyear Senate Assessor, Professor Nick Hill Senate Assessor, Dr Simon Kennedy Senate Assessor, Professor Kirsteen McCue Senate Assessor, Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson General Council Assessor, Ms Lauren McDougall SRC Assessor, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr Ronnie Mercer Co-opted Member, Dr June Milligan Co-opted Member (to item 8.1.2 but not the discussion thereon) Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Professor Anton Muscatelli Principal, Ms Elspeth Orcharton Co-opted Member, Ms Elizabeth Passey Co-opted Member (Convener of Court), Ms Kate Powell SRC President, Mr Gavin Stewart Co-opted Member, Ms Lesley Sutherland General Council Assessor, Dr Bethan Wood Senate Assessor

**In attendance:**

Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates & Buildings) (for item 5), Dr Neil Bowering (Interim Director Research Hub) (for item 5), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate) (for items 10, 11 & 12), Professor Frank Coton (Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation) (for item 7), Dr David Duncan (Chief Operating Officer [COO] & University Secretary), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance) (to item 3), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer)

**Apologies:**

**Members:** Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor's Assessor

#### **CRT/2017/1. Announcements**

Court was welcomed to the first meeting of the academic year.

Cllr Susan Aitken, Glasgow City Council Assessor, and Senate Assessors Dr Simon Kennedy, Professor Kirsteen McCue and Dr Bethan Wood were welcomed to their first meeting. Ms Kate Powell was welcomed to her first meeting in her capacity as SRC President, having attended the June meeting as an observer.

Lauren McDougall, SRC Assessor, was attending her final meeting. Court thanked her for her contributions to Court business and wished her well.

There were the following declarations of interest in relation to business to be conducted at the meeting: the Convener Elizabeth Passey in relation to the Remuneration Committee item on Convener remuneration; and Graeme Bissett and David Milloy in relation to recommendations by the Nominations Committee that they serve a further 4 year term as Co-opted members of Court.

The Convener referred to two items of general governance for Court meetings: that members should not raise matters relating to personal agendas, and that the Annual Schedule of Court Business indicated the cycle of Court business for the year, with a number of areas to be covered in more depth as part of Court agendas during the year, but which were not on the current agenda. Court also noted that the revised Scottish Code of Good HE Governance had recently been published and might result in some changes to Court business in due course. A paper on the Code would be paper brought to the

December meeting, with general feedback also invited from Court members in the meantime.

### **CRT/2017/2. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 22 June 2017**

The minutes were approved and would be signed by the Convener of the June meeting, Graeme Bissett, as a correct record.

### **CRT/2017/3. Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising.

The Convener advised Court that the Rector would speak for 20 minutes rather than for the 10 minutes previously noted on the agenda.

### **CRT/2017/4. Report from the Principal**

#### *CRT 2017/4.1 Transformation Programme*

At the Court meeting in June, Court had received a brief report on actions taken with respect to the Transformation Programme. The programme would engage with staff and students to define the services they needed and then effect change to improve business processes, enhancing efficiency and effectiveness and ultimately improving the University experience for staff and students. This would include establishing how Glasgow might embrace new technologies and innovative practices. The programme brought together the three workstreams (Focus, Agility, and Empowering People) set out in the Strategic Plan 2015-20. An external independent consultant had assisted in establishing priorities for the programme and for ways of working, and had helped design the new office's working methodology. A transformation team was being established.

A Vision and Charter had now been drawn up for the programme. Court received a summary of the programme's progress to date and of details of the Vision and Charter document, from Professor Neal Juster.

Court noted that the programme was not simply related to efficiencies in order to progress the capital plan: the primary aim was to achieve greater overall effectiveness, including implementation of more streamlined administrative processes across the University. It was agreed that the programme outputs might include analysis of benefits realisation, although this matter was already addressed in the capital plan.

In response to a query from the Rector about the level of engagement with staff, Professor Juster explained that there would be a high level of engagement with regard to the programme, as there had been with the development of the Strategic Plan and the outcomes of the staff survey. A concern was expressed by the Rector about the staff survey for some lower paid staff being paper-based, with local management seeing the responses, which might have affected the content.

Court would receive further updates as the Transformation Programme progressed.

#### *CRT 2017/4.2 Student Admissions including RUK*

Court noted details of admissions to the University for 2017/18, for Undergraduate and Postgraduate (PGT/PGR), Home, RUK and International students, noting also that targets had been met, or in the case of PG intake, exceeded by 22% (PGT) and 26% (PGR). With regard to these significant increases, Court noted that measures were being taken to ensure sufficient resource and facilities – both in the short and longer term – were in place to support the additional student numbers; this

included the possibility of extended Library opening hours, an increase in PG space and possible acceleration of relevant areas of the capital plan.

Court also noted the healthy UG admissions numbers, which were a positive reputational sign for the University at a time when some HEIs were experiencing a decline in numbers.

In discussion, Court noted that the University was cognisant of the potential reputational damage if students did not have a good educational experience because of lack of space, staffing or other resource connected to their studies. Colleges were working to ensure that optimal planning was in place for 2018/19 entry, including additional staffing resource in areas of high intake. The Learning & Teaching Hub, once completed, would address a number of these matters. It was not, however, intended to grow student numbers indefinitely to the size of some of the very large metropolitan HEIs in the UK.

#### *CRT 2017/4.3 USS Triennial Valuation 2017*

The Principal declared an interest as a member of the USS Board, although advised Court that the item was simply an update on USS and would not involve a decision about which there might be a potential conflict of interest. Members were invited to advise the Convener if they wished the Principal to leave the meeting during the discussion on the item; this did not occur.

Court was reminded that every three years, pension schemes were required to undergo a valuation in line with pensions law. USS was required to carry out its latest valuation as at 31 March 2017 and the outcome of this had to be submitted to the Pensions Regulator by 30 June 2018. The Trustee was currently consulting formally with Universities UK (UUK), which represented the sponsoring employers on the technical provisions assumptions.

The Trustee's consultation had closed at the end of September and a conclusion on the technical provisions would be reached in the coming weeks. There were differences between views on the matter of risk, on the part of employers and unions respectively. If there were to be contributions or benefits changes, then joint negotiations would ensue and would begin, if required, in the next 2 months. The pensions regulator's role also needed to be taken into consideration since the regulator could intervene, and – as one option – impose contributions increases, if agreement was not reached between the parties.

Court would be kept updated.

#### *CRT 2017/4.4 League Table Rankings / NSS*

The University had recently been named Scottish University of the Year by The Times and The Sunday Times Good University Guide 2018.

At the time of the June Court report, there had been details from three League Tables. Since then, the University had been placed 80th in the THE World Rankings, up from 88th last year.

For the third year running, the University of Glasgow had won the top title – Higher Education Institution of the Year – at The Herald's Higher Education Awards. The University had also won a number of category awards including Enhancing Student Learning and Outstanding Contribution to the Local Community.

#### *CRT 2017/4.5 Teaching Excellence Framework TEF*

The University was continuing to monitor developments ahead of any possible reconsideration of entry into the TEF. It was possible that some academic staff might engage with the TEF-3 pilots as reviewers to provide the University with more insight into the process.

*CRT 2017/4.6 Outcome Agreement - Dumfries*

At the June meeting, Court had given the Principal delegated authority to approve the finalised Outcome Agreement for Dumfries, since the agreement required to be submitted to the SFC during the summer. The document had now been submitted and was noted by Court.

*CRT 2017/4.7 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/2017/5. Research Hub Final Business Case**

At the Court Strategy Day, Court had received a presentation from Dr Neil Bowering on the business case for the Research Hub. Court now received the Full Business Case documentation including tracker costs, operational expenditure and discounted cash flow, the latter to be finalised following the conclusion of discussions with the contractor about the target price.

The Research Hub was one of the centrepieces of the University's campus development plan and would be located at the heart of the former Western Infirmary site. It would have the capacity to house 600 academic and student researchers from across the four Colleges, and would create a collaborative environment to attract, stimulate and enable interdisciplinary research. The Capital Plan had identified that the Research Hub would be constructed in Phase 1a of the plan, with completion in 2020. It was recognised however that occupation and use of the building could be phased with the fit-out of one floor delayed and included in phase 1b of the Capital Plan, which commenced after 2022.

The case referred to the Research Hub being essential for the University to achieve its strategic ambitions. In particular, the building would enable the University to grow and diversify its research income in a funding landscape where increasing emphasis was being placed on 'big team', interdisciplinary research. As a consequence, it would allow the University to significantly enhance its international research reputation.

The Research Hub would play a pivotal role in redefining the University's relationship with industry and its contribution to the City of Glasgow and the wider economy. Sited as it was alongside a new Innovation Zone and the relocated Adam Smith Business School, it would provide a forum for multiple interactions with large multi-nationals and SMEs in specific areas where the University could be truly world class. More generally, the Research Hub would enable the University to respond to the call from governments and national funding bodies to demonstrate deep links with industry and produce research which made a profound impact on the economy and society.

The four main objectives for the Research Hub were:

- Transformational Research: To develop ambitious and bold interdisciplinary research ideas and globally connected teams at the forefront of intellectual advances that define whole new areas and methods of research and exploration.
- Industrial Engagement: To collaborate with business and inspire new research directions and long-term partnerships that catalyse future UK industries.
- Shaping International Research: To engage with policy makers, communities and the public in co-developed, cross-disciplinary research defining new progressive policy and practice that brings prosperity for individuals and communities.

- Changing the face of Glasgow: Promoting the University of Glasgow as an inspirational and aspirational research intensive university, tackling local, national and international research and innovation agendas.

Court heard from Ronnie Mercer, chair of the Estates Committee, that the Capital Projects Governance Board had required and received further information on the case, ahead of its approval; and that the Finance Committee had requested further information – provided for Court within the document for the present meeting – ahead of its final approval, which had subsequently been given.

In discussion, it was noted that the Hub would not generate surplus as a stand-alone entity, but would generate major reputational, opportunity and cultural change benefits for the University, giving it the ability to contribute in a more enhanced way to the economy and to society. It was noted that grant income projections included in the business case, albeit based on actual growth, were ambitious. Court noted that delivery of the project, in addition to other works that were underway, was considered achievable given the University's healthy cash flow position. Court also noted that every capital project was tested to ensure the product was correct for the University's needs – including not being overly value-engineered – and to examine its impact on the capital plan down the line. Court requested that documents for future cases address this latter area more explicitly.

The Hub was scheduled to come into full operation in Quarter 4 2020. Court was reminded that the two phases (levels 1-4, and level 5) of the project had been agreed as part of the capital plan in December 2016.

The project team was in the process of clarifying the target price with the contractor and it was expected that the agreed figure would be available by end of October.

Dr Neil Bowering was thanked for his work on the production of the Final Business Case. Court also thanked Graeme Bissett and Ronnie Mercer, as chairs of the Finance and Estates Committees, and the Committees and Boards involved, for their diligence in examining the case.

Court approved the Full Business Case of an estimated maximum financial envelope of £116.1m to deliver the Research Hub project.

### **CRT/2017/6. Report from the Rector**

As there has been no written report circulated in advance of the meeting by the Rector, the Convener asked the Rector to summarise the main themes of his oral report at the beginning of his presentation. The Rector noted that he would update Court on his first few months, his conversations with staff members and also his thoughts on governance.

The Rector updated Court on his activities as Rector over recent months. He noted his pride in the University community and drew several observations from his early engagements.

The Rector had attended a large number of events, including Freshers' week and conferences. He had met a wide variety of student bodies and individual staff and students across the University. He had spoken also to some staff members of Court.

The Rector raised a number of items, including a governance matter, where he noted that there were no staff representatives on Court committees. The Rector also referred to the restructuring of the Sport & Recreation Service (SRS), where he considered there were a number of issues including: a reduction in staff morale; a perceived lack of consultation; an adverse impact on female staff in particular; some health and safety concerns arising from the proposed staff reduction; the potential for interaction with the local community reducing as a result of the restructuring; and adverse reputational consequences.

The Rector reiterated his concern that the staff survey for some lower-paid staff had been paper-

based, with local management seeing the responses.

In discussion, the Convener thanked the Rector for his report and commented on its breadth, noting that a large number of items raised by the Rector appeared to be of an operational nature, and some governance-related. It was also noted that although he was elected by the student body, the majority of the items raised by the Rector were staff related. The Rector commented that student concerns were also connected to staff matters. The Convener agreed, and invited the Rector to meet with the Principal and the COO & University Secretary directly to discuss these matters.

Court noted a comment from Margaret Anne McParland that the SRS changes were at 'tier 2' level under the Management of Organisational Change policy, but that this policy should be revisited given the potential reputation matters that the Rector had outlined.

The Convener observed that structures existed to percolate suggestions for improvements to governance to the Convener and that much work in the area of governance had been undertaken in the past year. Court members were routinely invited to send their feedback to the University Secretary after all Court meetings so that governance could be improved on an ongoing basis, acknowledging that change should be steady and not reactive. If there were further improvements that could be made to the governance process, they would be welcomed and duly considered.

While it was noted that the COO & University Secretary would meet with the Rector about the matters he had raised, and that the SRS restructuring was still ongoing and would be reported to Court in due course via the HR Committee, Court was reminded that it existed as a governing body and not as a body tasked with running or managing the institution. The University Secretary added that the revised Code would provide an opportunity to discuss a number of important areas of governance, and that, as previously advised, a paper would be drafted for Court for discussion at its meeting in December 2017.

Court members were reminded that if they had questions or comments on the content of papers where these referred to operational matters, they could contact senior management colleagues or the clerk to Court in advance of the Court meeting so that minor queries could be answered and/or appropriate speakers, not otherwise in attendance, could be invited to address relevant topics with due consideration.

Margaret Anne McParland commented that the matter of staff representatives on Court Committees had been raised by her in the previous year, but had not been addressed. The Convener thanked her for this observation and noted that the publication of the revised Code had been delayed but that, as discussed, a paper would be coming to the December meeting of Court, with a view to Court agreeing how it would wish to address the Code's requirements for the long term. The Convener also noted that it had been agreed by Court previously that changes to Court sub-committees would be made at the same time as implementing any recommendations of the Code. This would prevent two sets of changes being made unnecessarily.

It was noted that as an outcome of the Court Strategy Day's session on the student experience, there would be discussions with the student representatives about how their reports to Court were configured and timed, since at present the main report was in February, which was late into the session. The Convener noted that the Rector and the SRC might also discuss how to co-ordinate input to Court on student matters.

### **CRT/2017/7. Learning & Teaching Strategy**

Professor Frank Coton updated Court on the Learning and Teaching Strategy, including performance against Key Performance Indicators, which were noted by Court. The strategy was focused on enhancement and aimed to foster critical thought and investigative learning amongst students. It aimed to create a learning environment that was inclusive, promoting access and opportunity, and that was supportive of all staff and students. The strategy had twelve key objectives; Court noted

achievements against these in the past year.

With regard to the National Student Survey, overall student satisfaction remained at 89%. This was considered a good performance, currently 1st in the Russell Group, but still below the KPI. The Assessment and Feedback score had improved but remained below target. SMG had taken oversight of this area and an NSS task group, led by the Professor Coton, was currently looking at how best to configure support for the student experience in the longer term. Focused work around Assessment and Feedback continued. Timeliness of feedback was a particular issue which brought scores down in some areas. Court noted that there was variation across subject areas, therefore interventions were being done in a targeted manner, using improved business intelligence methods to examine data at a granular level. The design of formative assessment was also being looked at, with the aim of helping Schools. In addition, there was an annual cycle of action planning within Colleges to address subject specific NSS issues and this was currently under way.

In discussion, in response to a question about the achievability of the student satisfaction KPI target, it was acknowledged that there were risks associated with this. The rise in recruitment numbers and the potential disruption during the campus redevelopment were factors that needed to be considered, but it was believed that the student experience was fundamentally good and the target could be met.

Responding to questions, Professor Coton advised that there was a small gap in the progress of WD20 and WD40 students in comparison with the student body as a whole. Previous analysis had shown there was no difference in progression rates for those coming from Widening Access programmes; indeed there was outperformance as against the student body in general. With regard to staff being asked to undertake more duties relating to assessment and feedback, Professor Coton advised that the University was endeavouring to share best practice across all areas so that the workload associated with providing good feedback would be reasonable and, in most cases, less than it was currently. With regard to control of standards relating to recruitment to online distance courses, in the context of the tender process to secure a partner to market courses, it was noted that the University would set the admission standards for all programmes of study and would be responsible for all aspects of academic standards.

Court thanked Professor Coton for the briefing.

## **CRT/2017/8. Report from the University Secretary**

### *CRT/2017/8.1 Remuneration Committee*

#### *CRT/2017/8.1.1 Annual Review of SMG salaries*

Members of SMG (The Principal, COO & University Secretary and Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Senior Vice-Principal) left the room for this item. June Milligan, chair of the Remuneration Committee, spoke to the paper, noting that the review process for SMG salaries would be informed by P&DRs, a 360 degree appraisal and a matrix of comparative data. Remuneration Committee would conduct the review in the autumn and in line with established practice, it would submit a full minute of that meeting to the December meeting of Court, summarising the decisions it had made and setting out the rationale. Court's approval for the methodology for the review exercise was being sought. Court was reminded also that in 2014, the Committee of Scottish Chairs had issued a Guidance Note for Remuneration Committees. One aspect of it was that 'each year, in advance of the committee's annual review of senior salaries, the governing body should provide policy guidance to the committee'.

In discussion, it was confirmed that the same performance rating descriptions were applied to SMG as to other member of staff, and that the Committee had not seen anything that would indicate a difference in the spread of ratings compared to that for the other areas of the University.

It was noted that the revised Code would inform and guide the salary review exercise in 2018. For the current year, Court was being invited to approve the guidance in the papers for the present meeting. In response to a question about how decisions on salary review would be made, Court noted that Remuneration Committee had discussed this matter. This included consideration of HR data that showed the trajectories of SMG pay had progressed commensurate with other staff pay, that progression had been comparable to professorial grades and that it was also in the median of Russell Group pay levels. Ms Milligan offered to discuss further the wider review details with the Rector, the discussions to include reputational considerations – which Ms Milligan confirmed had been covered – and also to involve the Director of HR. The present business for Court being the procedure to be followed for the 2017 review of SMG salaries, Court approved the following statement for 2017:

*Remuneration Committee's review of the salaries of members of SMG will be informed by:*

- *a statement of each SMG member's salary for this and the previous 4 years;*
- *benchmark information, from the Universities and Colleges Employers Association, showing how Glasgow's salary levels compare with those of other UK universities;*
- *advice from the Principal on the performance of each member of the SMG in 2016/17, following his P&DR discussions with them; and*
- *in respect of the Principal, advice on performance from the Convener of Court, following a P&DR discussion with the Principal and reflecting the views she has obtained on the Principal's performance through consultation with staff, students and lay governors. (Please note that Court has already approved salary uplifts for the Principal for the years 2017-19, based on satisfactory performance assessed through the P&DR process on an annual basis).*

*In considering the appropriate level of reward, the Committee intends to:*

- *provide tangible reward for excellent performance;*
- *give consideration to any cases where the salary awarded by the University is substantially out of line with that of managers in equivalent positions at comparable universities; and*
- *apply a general principle that percentage pay increases for senior managers should not be higher than those for the workforce as a whole.*

#### *CRT/2017/8.1.2 Convener Remuneration*

Mr Graeme Bissett, Vice-Convener of Court, chaired this item. The Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 provided optionally for the remuneration of the Convener. The University did not currently remunerate the role of Convener of Court. However, when the role had been advertised, the University had indicated that it would pay compensation for loss of earnings and certain other costs. The current Convener had suggested that an agreed rate of remuneration would be less costly for the University than compensating for loss of earnings; this approach might also help the University to attract a diverse field of candidates for the position when it became vacant in the future.

The matter had been raised at the last meeting of the University Court by the Chair of the Remuneration Committee and also by the University Secretary. Court had demitted the matter to the Remuneration Committee for further careful consideration and a recommendation to be brought to the current meeting. The Remuneration Committee had now recommended to Court that the role of Convener be remunerated. Following a discussion, Court agreed that it would approve remuneration of the Convener, from the date of the Court meeting.

*CRT/2017/8.1.3 Remuneration Committee remit*

Court received a paper which included briefing information on the operation of the Remuneration Committee, and a recommendation for a revised remit and membership for the Remuneration Committee.

The Rector commented that he considered that the Committee should include a member of staff and a student. The SRC President commented that student membership could present difficulties for the person nominated to the Committee. It was suggested that the SRC should discuss the matter as a group. Dave Anderson referred to the desirability of having union representation as well as staff representation on the Committee. He also noted with regard to the statement earlier in the meeting that while SMG salary increases were in line with the average across the institution if increments were taken into consideration, in fact a large number of staff received no incremental increase.

The Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor left the meeting for the rest of this item.

A comment was made that the Principal's salary had increased by 10% in recent years and that more than 55% of staff had no increment being at the top of their grade, whereas the Principal was effectively at the top of a grade but continued to receive increments, which accounted for the drift.

A request was made that there be some publication of Remuneration Committee papers; this was agreed.

The proposed changes to the Remuneration Committee remit and membership were approved.

*CRT/2017/8.2 Socially Responsible Investment Policy SRIP*

Court had agreed in 2015 to implement a first stage of divestment, involving a 25% reduction in fossil fuel holdings over the following 4 years. At the time, Court had also been advised that it would receive a progress report on divestment after 2 years.

The Investment Advisory Committee (IAC) had approved a report prepared by investment managers Schroders.

Court agreed that it would request further detail, to include broader perspective, in an updated report to be provided for the December 2017 meeting. Court thanked Gavin Stewart and the IAC for the work to date.

*CRT/2017/8.3 Mental Health Action Plan*

The COO & University Secretary had recently assumed the role of Mental Health Champion within the University. Mental health accounted for the highest number of lost staff days within the University, and there had been a significant increase in student demand for University counselling services in recent years.

A joint University/SRC mental health action plan had been developed and had been launched on 10 October (World Mental Health Day). Court noted the action plan.

*CRT/2017/8.4 Court Strategy Day*

Court's annual strategy day had taken place on 29 September, with an overarching theme of how to enhance the University's competitive position, taking into account current and emerging changes in the external environment. There had been main sessions on the University's competitive position, the University as a student destination of choice and on the political context, with opportunities for group discussion and more informal interaction. Court also had a presentation on the Full Business Case for

the Research Hub.

*CRT/2017/8.5 Nominations Committee Business*

i) New Court Co-opted member

A vacancy for a co-opted member of Court had been advertised over the summer, with interviews held on 3 October. Court approved a recommendation from the Nominations Committee that David Finlayson be appointed as a co-opted member for 4 years from 11 October 2017.

ii) Co-opted members - terms of office

Graeme Bissett and David Milloy left the meeting for this item. Mr Bissett and Mr Milloy would end their first term on Court on 31 December 2017. Court approved a Nominations Committee recommendation that both be reappointed to Court for 4 years from 1 January 2018.

iii) Remuneration Committee convenership

Over the summer, Court had approved a recommendation from the Nominations Committee that June Milligan take on the convenership of the Remuneration Committee.

iv) Finance and Remuneration Committee vacancies

Over the summer, Court had approved a recommendation from the Nominations Committee that Gavin Stewart and Ronnie Mercer fill vacancies on, respectively, the Finance Committee and Remuneration Committee.

*CRT/2017/8.6 Scottish Code of Good HE Governance*

Following a consultation on the draft Code, which had taken place earlier in the year, a final draft had been issued and had subsequently been approved by the Committee of Scottish Chairs on 3 October. There were areas for further consideration by the Court Governance Working Group and thereafter by Court. A report would be made to the December meeting.

*CRT/2017/8.7 Court Business 2017/18*

Court noted the Schedule of Court Business for the coming year and the reference website for other governance-related documents.

The attendance lists for meetings of Court and its Committees for 2016/17 had been reviewed; there were no matters of concern for Court to note in connection with this.

*CRT/2017/8.8 Senate Assessors on Court*

Three new Senate Assessors had started 4-year terms on Court in August 2017: Dr Simon Kennedy (School of Life Sciences, College of MVLS), Professor Kirsteen McCue (School of Critical Studies, College of Arts) and Dr Bethan Wood (School of Interdisciplinary Studies, College of Social Sciences).

*CRT/2017/8.9 Glasgow City Council Assessor on Court*

Cllr Susan Aitken, Leader of the City Council, had been nominated by the Council to be a member of Court from June 2017.

*CRT/2017/8.10 Court attendance by SMG members*

In June, Court had agreed a recommendation from its Governance Working Group that most SMG members would not routinely attend Court meetings, with effect from October 2017. The Senior Vice-Principal, the Director of Finance and the University Secretary would continue to attend all meetings of Court. This arrangement was now in place.

Court members could contact any other SMG/executive members by email to request clarification on any points, ahead of meetings, if necessary.

*CRT/2017/8.11 Resolution 677 Board of Catholic Education*

At the last meeting, Court had approved a draft Resolution amending the membership, remit and responsibilities of the Board of Catholic Education, to reflect changes in University structures and in nomenclature since earlier Resolutions. Following the required month's consultation, which had not resulted in any substantive changes, the Resolution had been approved by the University Secretary on Court's behalf.

*CRT/2017/8.12 Queen Margaret Union*

At the last Court meeting, concerns had been expressed about the level of the QMU deficit, as outlined in the Student Finance Sub-Committee summary. Since then, progress had been made in improving the financial position, including the QMU putting in place arrangements whereby there was close scrutiny of expenditure and plans by its Finance Committee.

**CRT/2017/9. Reports of Court Committees**

*CRT/2017/9.1 Finance Committee*

*CRT/2017/9.1.1 Research Hub Full Business Case*

The Finance Committee had approved the Research Hub Full Business Case subject to provision of some further financial information, which has been supplied following its meeting, with being advised that the Finance Committee was now recommending approval of the case. This matter had been covered earlier in the Court meeting agenda.

*CRT/2017/9.1.2 Capex Applications*

The Committee had approved CapEx applications relating to: Western/New Build/Adam Smith Business School (Fees) £2.42m; Kelvin Data Annexe £8.55m; Garscube/Jarrett Building/Insectary Phase 2 £545k; Minimally Invasive Micro-ultrasound for Medical Guidance and Early Diagnosis (MIMUMED) €565k (equipment); Edge Wave Laser and Microwave System €261k (equipment); Neuromorphic Printed Tactile Skin (Super Inkjet Printer) £225k (equipment); and Gilmorehill/Pearce Lodge Fabric Repairs and IT staff relocation £2.575m.

*CRT/2017/9.1.3 Committee Remit*

Court noted that the Committee had approved its own remit (unchanged therefore not submitted to Court for approval) and Annual Agenda Plan.

*CRT/2017/9.1.4 Endowment Investment Report*

Court noted an endowment investment report as at 31 July 2017.

*CRT/2017/9.1.5 Capital Projects*

Court noted an update on capital projects.

*CRT/2017/9.1.6 Financial reports*

Court noted an overview of performance as at 31 July 2017.

The report was noted.

*CRT/2017/9.2 Estates Committee*

*CRT/2017/9.2.1 Research Hub*

The Estates Committee had approved the Final Business Case for the Research Hub. This matter had been covered earlier in the Court meeting agenda.

*CRT/2017/9.2.2 CapEx Applications*

Court noted Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications relating to: Western/New Build /Adam Smith Business School (Fees) £2.42m; Kelvin Data Annexe £8.55m; Garscube/Jarrett Building/Insectary Phase 2 £545k; Minimally Invasive Micro-ultrasound for Medical Guidance and Early Diagnosis (MIMUMED) €565k (equipment); Edge Wave Laser and Microwave System €261k (equipment); Neuromorphic Printed Tactile Skin (Super Inkjet Printer) £225k (equipment); and Gilmorehill/Pearce Lodge Fabric Repairs and IT staff relocation £2.575m.

The report was noted.

*CRT/2017/9.3 Audit & Risk Committee*

*CRT/2017/9.3.1 Risk Management*

Court agreed it would review the Risk Register at its next meeting, the register currently being amended to include more information on completion dates and actions in mitigation, at the request of the Audit & Risk Committee. Comments were invited in the meantime if Court members wished to convey them to the Committee chair, Heather Cousins, or to the Committee clerk, Deborah Maddern.

*CRT/2017/9.3.2 Other Audit Committee business*

At its recent meeting, the Committee had received internal audit reports on reviews of: Information security - General Data Protection Regulation GDPR; IT Structure and Governance - IT Strategy; Allocation of Bursaries and Scholarships (Scholarships & Discounting); Risk management - Q4 spend review (Procurement Data Analytics); and Research Grants Management. The Committee had received the updated University Risk Register. The Committee had received an update on Implementation of Outstanding Recommendations from prior internal audits; details of the University's corporate structure; and a summary report on cases of research misconduct from the recent academic session.

The report was noted.

*CRT/2017/9.4 Human Resources Committee*

*CRT/2017/9.4.1 HR Committee remit*

Court approved a revised remit and membership for the HR Committee.

*CRT/2017/9.4.2 Other HR Committee business*

The Committee had received a briefing on the Transformation Programme. The Director of HR had provided an update on progress in delivering the People Strategy and had highlighted HR priorities for the coming Academic Session. The Committee had received an update on the strategic review of recruitment and discussed operating models under consideration. The HR Director's strategic update had included briefings on the ongoing Performance Development Review Process, Strategic Recruitment, the conclusion of the annual pay negotiations and the University's response to the ongoing developments regarding Brexit.

The report was noted.

*CRT/2017/9.5 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee*

The Committee had received an update on the pilot of central recording of overseas travel. The Committee had covered its usual range of business in reviewing standard reports on Occupational Health activities, Audit updates, Accident reporting and Employee counselling.

With respect to the Rector's reference to the SRS Garscube restructuring, it was noted that the Committee was the forum for any health and safety matters raised by SRS staff, and that there was wide staff and union representation on the Committee.

It was noted that any health or safety matters relating to the campus redevelopment programme were notified to the relevant Project Board/Programme Governance Board and thereafter to the Estates and HS&W Committees. It was agreed that such instances should also be reported to Court.

The report was noted.

**CRT/2017/10. Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate 5 October 2017**

The Council of Senate had: received details of the results of the NSS and an update on REF2020; approved a statement on the use of quantitative indicators in the assessment of research quality; endorsed the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy; received a briefing and update on the process for appointing a new Clerk of Senate in the summer of 2018; and received updates on the tuition fee regime in England and on the TEF.

Council of Senate had received a report from the Honorary Degrees Committee concerning recommendations for the conferment of honorary Degrees in 2018. 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 advised Court of the 2018 nominations, on a confidential basis. Members of Court could contact the Clerk of Senate should they have observations to make, by 26 October. Court would be advised when the finalised details could be made public.

The communications were noted.

**CRT/2017/11. Annual report for SFC – Institutional-led Review of Quality and Governing Body Statement of Assurance**

Court had received a copy of the University's draft annual report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) on institution-led review of quality for 2016-17. The contents were specified by the SFC. The statement summarised 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 was also included.

Having noted details of how the University assured the effectiveness of arrangements for maintaining academic standards and quality, Court agreed that the required statement of assurance could be signed off by the Convener of Court. A minor correction would be made to a date in the main document.

**CRT/2017/12. Annual report on the University's Complaints Procedure 2016/17**

Court noted the annual report on complaints activity during academic session 2016-17.

**CRT/2017/13. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**CRT/2017/14. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 13 December 2017 at 2pm in the Senate Room.