University Court meeting 21 June 2017

The Court papers for the June 2017 meeting cover a number of key strategic matters including:

- The annual briefing on progress against the Strategic Plan and associated KPIs and the capital plan
- The 2017/18 budget and financial forecasts
- The Full Business Case for Infrastructure capital expenditure of £73M, part of the Capital Plan approved by Court in December 2016
- Recommendations relating to the Principal’s Appointment
- Recent University Rankings
- A report from the new University Secretary
- The University Risk Register and mitigating actions, provided to Court annually in June
- Proposals for the revised composition of Senate, to comply with the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016
Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 12 April 2017 in Room 127, Rutherford McCowan Building, Dumfries Campus

Present:

Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr Aamer Anwar Rector, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Dr Carl Goodyear 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, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr Ronnie Mercer Co-opted Member, Ms June Milligan Co-opted Member, 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), Dr Duncan Ross Senate Assessor, Cllr Helen Stephen Glasgow City Council Representative, Mr Gavin Stewart Co-opted Member, 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), Professor John Briggs (Clerk of Senate), Professor James Conroy (Vice-Principal Internationalisation), Professor Jon Cooper (Vice-Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange), Professor Frank Coton (Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Mr David Newall (Secretary of Court), Professor Miles Padgett (Vice-Principal Research)

Apologies:

Members: Professor Lindsay Farmer Senate Assessor, Professor Nick Hill Senate Assessor, Professor Paul Younger Senate Assessor

Attenders: Professor Muffy Calder (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Professor Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal)

CRT/2016/33. Announcements and Declarations of Interest

CRT/2016/33.1 Announcements

The Rector Aamer Anwar and Co-opted member Gavin Stewart were welcomed to their first meeting as new members of Court. Dr David Duncan, Chief Operating Officer and University Secretary, was welcomed to the meeting.

Cllr Helen Stephen was attending her final meeting. Court thanked her for her contributions to Court business and wished her well.

David Newall, Secretary of Court, was attending his final meeting. On behalf of Court, the Convener thanked Mr Newall for his outstanding contribution to Court’s business and to the University for the past 12 years, and wished him all the best for the future. Mr Newall thanked
members for their support and good wishes, and thanked colleagues at the University.

The School of Interdisciplinary Studies was thanked for its hospitality for the meeting.

**CRT/2016/33.1 Declarations of Interest**

June Milligan noted that, for the purpose of transparency, she had discussed with the Convener and the Secretary of Court the matter of her presenting the University's Gender Pay Action Plan under the HR Committee report, in the context of her being an Equality and Human Rights Commissioner, a role which was already declared on her Register of Interests. The reason for the discussion had arisen from the fact that failure to report gender pay information by the University would be an 'unlawful act' which could trigger EHRC Equality Act 2006 enforcement powers - the latter linked to a Commissioner’s role. It had been agreed that there was no conflict in respect of action by the University, including Ms Milligan’s role as chair of the Committee, in planning to address the gap.

With regard to the item on Campus Development Borrowing Group, during the discussion on that item, Gavin Stewart, who advised he had not been involved in the Borrowing Group’s work, declared an interest for the purposes of transparency. This was owing to his employment in Lloyds Banking Group, and was made in the context of a reference, during the discussion, of the appointment of Lloyds as placement agent for the borrowing. Mr Stewart confirmed that as an employee of Lloyds he had had no knowledge of the borrowing business being transacted.

**CRT/2016/34. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 15 February 2017**

The minutes were approved subject to a correction to minute CRT/2016/27.2 Court and Committee governance (Committee composition), where a reference to ‘trade union representatives on Court’ would be amended to ‘trade union nominees on Court’; the amended minute would be signed by the Convener as a correct record.

**CRT/2016/35. Matters Arising**

With regard to minute CRT 2016/26.1. Higher Education developments and the University’s position regarding the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), and in response to a question about the timing of any proposals for the University’s future involvement in TEF coming to Court, it was noted that the outcomes of the TEF exercise were expected in late May or early June. However, the mechanisms for its continuing application, and scope within Scotland, required much further consideration, and possible piloting. Court would continue to be kept informed, and when proposals were formulated, they would come to Court via the Secretary’s Report, in 2018.

**CRT/2016/36. Report from the Principal**

**CRT 2016/36.1. Higher Education developments**

**CRT 2016/36.1.1 Higher Education and Research Bill**

Court had previously noted that the Bill working its way through Westminster would have a major impact on Scotland, both through reserved matters (e.g. the new UK Research and Innovation structure UKRI), and indirectly through other areas which, although devolved (e.g. the TEF), would still have an impact in Scotland.

The Third Reading of the Bill in the Lords had taken place on 4 April 2017, the Lords having
made amendments, the government’s response to which would not be clear until after the Easter recess. Given the tight timescales, the ultimate passage of the Bill was also unclear. Universities UK were seeking to encourage MPs to support amendments to the Bill which were favourable to the intent of protecting international student flows, and which addressed concerns with the poor quality of net migration data. The Bill would establish UKRI. Attempts to amend the legislation to ensure that the new UKRI Board reflected the devolved nations in its membership had not been successful. Nevertheless, it was likely that the Board appointments would seek to reflect different areas of expertise and regional/devolved knowledge. Court would continue to be kept informed.

CRT 2016/36.1.2 Skills and Enterprise Review

Court had heard at its February meeting that the Scottish Government’s Skills and Enterprise Review had entered its second phase, with representations from the HE sector and businesses being examined. In March, the Cabinet Secretary had made a statement to the Scottish Parliament about the governance workstream of the Enterprise & Skills Review. The key announcement had been that the existing boards (SFC, SDS, Scottish Enterprise, Highlands & Islands Enterprise) would continue, with their existing statutory functions unchanged. The Scottish Government would establish a new ‘strategic board’, intended to achieve better alignment between the agencies to maximise their impact on the economy and productivity. It would be a non-statutory body, chaired by an independent figure from the business community. The Minister had also confirmed that Ministers and Parliament would continue to allocate funding to the SFC, rather than via the new strategic board. The remaining strands of phase 2 of the Review would report in May.

CRT 2016/36.1.3 Funding status for EU Students

In March, the Scottish Government had announced that the post-Brexit fees status of EU students commencing their studies in academic year 2018/19 would be protected. This meant that EU nationals choosing to study in Scotland and enrolling in 2018-19 were guaranteed free tuition for the duration of their entire course.

Court noted that applications from the EU continued to be healthy, but that if government funding ceased then the position could change. The University was currently receiving high numbers of high quality applications from other applicants, that would mean student numbers could be maintained by recruiting higher numbers from these other groups, although the tuition fee position would need to be reviewed should this occur.

CRT 2016/36.1.4 Letter of Guidance to Scottish Funding Council.

The Minister for Further and Higher Education had recently issued guidance to the SFC on priorities for Further and Higher Education. This had been supplemented by a Letter of Guidance from Cabinet Secretary to state the expectations on joint working by the agencies in light of the Skills and Enterprise Review.

There was an intention, expressed in the recently issued documents, to intensify the Outcome Agreement process, which could include direction about areas of focus for University teaching. This was connected to the government’s planning around the country’s skills needs, which the sector acknowledged to be a key policy concern in relation to its receipt of significant public funding. The sector would however be concerned about the possible impact of any move towards a more centralised approach to workforce planning. Court noted that it would be important for any changes in government requirements to be communicated with as long a lead-in time as possible, since there were matters such as resource planning and student work placements that institutions would need to address in good time, to maintain the best student experience.
CRT 2016/36.2. Campus Masterplan

As Court members had been advised since the last meeting, the Campus Masterplan had been approved by the City Council on 16 February. Court joined the Principal in thanking all those involved in moving the vision for the campus development to this key stage. The Principal thanked Court for its involvement in the process to date.

CRT 2016/36.3 Key Activities

Court noted a summary of some of the main activities in which the Principal had been involved since the last meeting of Court, covering internal and external activities beyond daily operational management and strategy meetings. The activities were under the broad headings of: Academic Development and Strategy; Internationalisation activities; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; Internal activities and Communications.

CRT/2016/37. Annual Report on Research and Knowledge Exchange

Professor Miles Padgett, Vice Principal Research, briefed Court on Research priorities and KPIs. Court was reminded that the Research Excellence Framework (REF) was a highly important exercise that drove reputation and league tables, and informed the allocation of £45M pa of unrestricted funds to the University.

Court heard that performance in the REF2014 had been weakened by the 4* outputs profile, which had placed the University 20th in the Russell Group, based on percentages of 4*. Actions since then were focusing on addressing this, with prioritising excellence as the first research priority. The REF2014 Unit of Assessment (UoA) reviews were now complete, having involved a panel-based external review of each of the UoAs, leading to areas for future focus to improve performance. Interim reviews were ongoing for the next REF, with panel-based external reviews of outputs, environment measures, and impact preparations.

The second research priority was nurturing and attracting talent. Researcher development was a key aspect, with resources having been developed to aid this. These resources included a development portal; a Glasgow ‘Crucible’ providing a leadership and development programme for Early-Career Researchers; and a Senior Research Leaders Programme for staff in REF leadership roles. Actions to attract the highest talent included Professorial recruitment of eminent professorial chairs to Research zones, and the extension of the Lord Kelvin Adam Smith Fellowships scheme.

The third research priority was to increase and diversify research income. Court received details of a number of notable funding awards made across the Colleges. Systems and resources for increasing grant capture had been augmented. Court noted details of Research Beacons, six broad-based themed areas of research excellence that had attracted major external investment, which were to be launched in 2017.

Court noted the report and progress against Research KPIs, the latter relating to Research income, PGR:Academic ratio, Research output quality, and staff holding grants.

In discussion, Court noted that all staff would be required to be returned in the next REF, which would reduce to a degree the complicated decision-making that institutions engaged in about which staff to include in returns. It was also noted that the sector largely supported the current dual funding mechanism for research, involving the general quality-based allocation arising from the REF, and specific project and programme grants from the Research Councils.
Professor Jon Cooper, Vice Principal for Knowledge Exchange and Innovation, briefed Court on the area’s priorities and on the KPI of increasing knowledge exchange. Progress was being mapped via activity including Spin Outs, Easy Access IP, new Knowledge Transfer awards, and the value of Innovate UK Grants.

The priority to increase Innovation was being achieved by developing economic impact from research-led innovation, via increased engagement in industry collaboration, licensing and spin-out company creation; enhancing the institutional environment to grow the portfolio of economic impact case studies for the next REF; and exploiting opportunities for partnerships for campus development investments to increase the University’s local economic impact. Court noted a number of successful spin-out achievements, and also noted details of the funding and collaborative environments associated with the Innovation strand.

Court heard that the SFC had replaced the Knowledge Transfer Grant with the University Innovation Fund (UIF). This comprised a Platform Grant of £250k to all HEIs, and an Outcomes Grant of £7.49m for sector to share, the award being contingent on delivery of progress against a plan submitted by the University in January 2016. In 2017/18, the Outcomes Grant would be conditional on the University demonstrating progress towards meeting National Outcomes, with a requirement for monitoring and reporting of progress against National Outcomes being made via the University’s Outcome Agreement. Court heard details of the UIF’s National Priority Actions for the current year and the National Outcomes for the following year.

Court heard how the University was addressing the priority of the Scottish government for in-curricula and ex-curricula student entrepreneurship. Court also heard details of universities being increasingly at the centre of national economic development strategies e.g. the City Deal, which would be used to boost entrepreneurship, economic growth and industry engagement within a proposed ‘Innovation Quarter’ area. Court also heard details about activities relating to public engagement.

Court noted the statistical trends in the agreed reporting areas for KE&I over the period 2014-2017.

Court heard that the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) was a £1.5bn fund announced by the UK Government to support cutting-edge research that addressed the challenges faced by developing countries. There had been early successes in projects in Asia, China and Africa, in which the University was involved.

In discussion, Court heard that in terms of spin-out success, the University had been successful with relatively limited resource. Court requested that consideration be given to including a KPI relating to financial growth and profitability over time/return on investment. Court members with relevant experience could be asked for advice on useful indicators in this area. With regard to the incorporation of entrepreneurial activity into the student curriculum, Court heard that ‘graduate attributes’ were key informers of curricula, and that entrepreneurship needed to be approached carefully in terms of course content, with an emphasis on building activity that would bring out entrepreneurship and support it.

Court thanked Professors Padgett and Cooper for the briefings.

CRT/2016/38. Report from the Secretary of Court

CRT/2016/38.1 Campus Development Borrowing Group

At the December 2016 meeting of Court, it had agreed that a short-life working group be established with delegated authority to make decisions on the University’s long-term borrowing strategy, in the light of Court’s decision to commit to an additional £175M of
long-term borrowing. That working group had met on 20 February, comprising: the Convener of Court, Elizabeth Passey; the Chair of the Finance Committee, Ken Brown; the Vice-Chair of Finance Committee, Graeme Bissett; the Director of Finance, Robert Fraser; and Allan Bertie, an expert in investment banking.

At the request of the Director of Finance, Ernst & Young (EY) had prepared a report for the working group, which report had considered the University’s borrowing requirements, evaluated a broad range of options available and arrived at a recommended way forward. EY favoured Private Placement as the most favourable option for the University and had clarified the advantages of that approach as compared with the other main options (Bank Debt, Public Bond, European Investment Bank loan). All members of the working group had been satisfied with the clarity of the EY analysis and the thrust of EY’s recommendations. The working group had agreed that, with the risk that interest rates might soon begin to rise, early progress should be made on putting a borrowing facility in place.

Following that meeting, and with the agreement of the working group, the Director of Finance had employed legal and financial agents to act on the University’s behalf in implementing the borrowing strategy. The University had then issued a prospectus, following which there had been a presentation to possible lenders by the Principal and the Director of Finance, on 11 April. Following this date, there was approximately one week in which lenders might submit proposals. It was essential that, at the expiry of that time, the University should be in a position to make an early decision on the best borrowing option. The working group had therefore agreed that, subject to Court’s agreement, a group of four University officers should have delegated authority to make commitments on the University’s behalf. The four officers were: the Convener of Court, Graeme Bissett, the Principal and the Director of Finance.

Court approved the proposed arrangement for the group of four officers - comprising the Convener of Court, Elizabeth Passey; the Vice-Chair of Finance Committee, Graeme Bissett; the Principal, Anton Muscatelli; and the Director of Finance, Robert Fraser, to have delegated authority to make commitments on the University’s behalf. It was agreed that, before commitments were entered into, the Group would approve the terms of a document setting out the nature of these commitments, and that this document would be shared with Court members for their information.

CRT/2016/38.2 Appointment of the Principal

The Principal left the meeting for this item.

The Principal’s contract of employment with the University would run until 30 September 2019. Within the contract, there was a clause stating that it may be extended, should both parties be willing, and that discussion on a possible extension should take place before 1 April 2018.

To allow early progress in taking forward consideration of the matter, Court agreed that a working group be established with a remit to: review the Principal’s performance in his role; consider whether the University should offer an extension to his current contract of employment and, if so, on what terms; and report with recommendations the June meeting of Court.

Court agreed that membership of the working group should be: the Convener of Court, as chair; the Convener of HR Committee; two other lay members; the Senior Senate Assessor; a Staff Representative on Court; the SRC President.

CRT/2016/38.3 Review of Code of Good HE Governance

The current Code had been published in July 2013, with a commitment to a review after 3 years. The Committee of Scottish Chairs had established a Review Committee in 2016. It was expected that the updated Code would be published in draft form in April 2017.

Court agreed that the Court Governance Working Group would, on Court’s behalf, consider
whether to submit comments on the draft Code, and would also identify any issues which should be brought to Court’s attention at the June 2017 meeting. Matters which might potentially be raised included: the composition of Court Committees; the question of remuneration for governing body chairs; and the governing body’s strategy on promoting equality and diversity.

Court members noted that they would be able to submit comments on the draft Code individually if they so wished.

**CRT/2016/38.4 Court annual self-assessment**

A questionnaire for Court self-assessment/feedback on performance had been circulated. The Court Governance Working Group would consider the outcomes of this and would also refer to the Code, to ensure that the University was addressing all its responsibilities in terms of good governance. The working group would report to Court in June.

**CRT/2016/38.5 Organisational Change Governance Group**

Court noted the annual report of the Organisational Change Governance Group.

Court noted (via the report) that the Group had made the decision in March to authorise management to implement a reorganisation of the technical staffing support at the Scottish Centre for Ecology and Natural Environmental (SCENE) at Rowardennan, Loch Lomond, to meet evolving academic needs. The staffing complement would remain at 2 FTE, but with posts redesigned.

David Anderson sought assurance that Group would have a role in considering organisational change in relation to the recently announced merger of the estates and campus services functions. In response, it was reported that the organisational structure for this merged unit was currently being considered by management and that the Organisational Change Governance Group would indeed be involved in considering proposed changes.

**CRT/2016/38.6 Court and Committee appointments**

Mr Aamer Anwar had been elected by the student body to serve as Rector for 3 years from 1 April 2017. Court noted that the turnout had been high and that Mr Anwar had been elected in the first round. Court’s congratulations were extended to him.

Applications for a new Co-opted member had been considered by the Nominations Committee and interviews held in March. Mr Gavin Stewart had been appointed as a Co-opted member for 4 years from 1 April 2017.

Recruitment of a member of the Audit Committee was in hand, and Court would be kept updated.

**CRT/2016/38.7 Appointment of Vice-Chairs**

The Human Resources Committee and the Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee had identified Vice-Chairs, which meant that each of Court’s Committees, and Court itself, now had a formally appointed Vice-Chair. The two new appointees were:

- Human Resources Committee: Rob Goward
- Health, Safety & Wellbeing Committee: Richard Cloughton
In both cases, the Vice-Chair would serve for a period of 4 years, starting 1 May 2017.

**CRT/2016/38.8 SRC Elections**

The following candidates had been successful in the Spring 2017 SRC elections and would take up sabbatical officer posts on 1st July 2017:

- President: Kate Powell
- VP Education: Hannah-May Todd
- VP Student Support: Lauren McDougall
- VP Student Activities: Pritasha Kariappa

**CRT/2016/38.9 Head of School Appointments**

Professor Philippe Schyns had been reappointed as Head of the School of Psychology for 3 years from 1 August 2017.

Professor Alice Jenkins had been appointed as Head of the School of Critical Studies from 1 August 2017 until 31 December 2020.

**CRT/2016/38.10 Glasgow University Union Lease**

The University and the Glasgow University Union (GUU) had recently entered into a formal lease in relation to the Union’s occupancy of space in the Stevenson Building extension, since this provided a VAT benefit. The University would charge GUU rental and would fully reimburse the Union for the cost.

**CRT/2016/38.11 Glasgow University Union Constitution**

On behalf of Court, the Secretary of Court had approved minor changes to the GUU’s constitution, as approved by the Union’s Board of Management in March. These related to the status of the GUU’s honorary librarian.

**CRT/2016/39. Reports of Court Committees**

**CRT/2016/39.1 Finance Committee**

**CRT/2016/39.1.2 Committee Business**

Court noted a report from the most recent Finance Committee meeting, at which business had included the Committee’s approval of a number of Capex applications, including three relating to the Joseph Black Building, totalling £16.3M. Court had been reminded ahead of the present meeting that the latter formed part of the planned £34.2M capital spend on the Joseph Black Building, approved by Court in December 2016 as part of the Capital Plan. The total cost of the three elements had been approximately £1M lower than the figure included for them within the Capital Plan.

The Committee had also: approved a reduction in counterparty limits, and approved proposed changes to bank signatories; received a report giving an overview of the Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) Return for 2015/16; and received a summary update on the budget position after the February 2017 round of budget meetings.
CRT/2016/39.1.2 Endowment Investment Report

Court noted an endowment investment report as at 28 February 2017.

CRT/2016/39.1.3 Financial reports

Court noted an overview of performance as at 28 February 2017.

CRT/2016/39.2 Audit and Risk Committee

The Committee had received internal audit reports on reviews of: Cyber Security; Project Management - Workload Modelling; Strategic Planning; Performance Management; and International Activity (use of agents in Student Recruitment). The Committee had received the updated University Risk Register, and a Higher Education Sector Risk Profile 2017 compiled by the internal auditors. The Committee had received an update on implementation of outstanding recommendations from prior internal audits.

Court noted the report.

CRT/2016/39.3 Estates Committee

Court noted the report, including: Estates Committee's approval of three projects which formed part of the £34.2M investment in the Joseph Black Building, as referred to above: Functional Nanomaterials Laboratory Upgrade £1.33M, Building Fabric Repairs £13.54M, and Fire Upgrade £1.41M; and Estates Committee's approval of three other CapEx applications: Pixel Sensor Array Fabrications Facility £0.58M, James Watt Nanofabrication Centre £0.78M, and Western/New Build/Research Hub £0.501M.

Court heard that good progress was being made with regard to appointment of the Delivery Partner for the campus redevelopment. Court would be kept informed.

In response to a question about the effect of the demolition of the Mathematics and Statistics Building on Queen Margaret Union activities during Freshers’ week 2017, Court noted from Ann Allen and Frank Coton that there was ongoing liaison with the University community so as to minimise disruption of key events for the duration of the demolition, which was expected to take several months.

CRT/2016/39.4 Human Resources Committee

CRT/2016/39.4.1 Gender Pay Strategy and Action Plan

Court received the Gender Pay Strategy and Action Plan which sought to address, over time, the gender pay gap. The paper set out the key factors contributing to the pay gap and proposed actions to tackle this. The strategy had been positively received by the HR Committee at its March meeting, following earlier detailed discussions at its November 2016 meeting.

June Milligan explained that the focus was the totality of remuneration across the male and female workforces and actions to address this by the University; it was not about equal pay, which was the subject of a separate legal framework. The Gender Pay Strategy had been developed against a backdrop of legislative change, with increased governmental focus on tackling the gender pay gap by all organisations, regardless of sector. This was coupled with the University’s strategic imperative to tackle inequalities in gender pay, to further enhance its brand in attracting and retaining the very best available talent.
Court noted that the development of the strategy and action plan had included a focus on occupational segmentation and on how the University might ‘do things differently’ to tackle areas where there was a marked preponderance of one gender doing a particular job, for example in operational services such as security and catering. There were opportunities ahead, for example where an ageing workforce in a particular job group was approaching retirement, with resultant chances to change the demographic profile. There were also opportunities to look at attracting, developing and retaining staff differently and to enshrine such revised methods in the context of the strategy’s aims.

The action plan had a target date of 2030, which although some way into the future, was considered realistic.

Court welcomed the paper and its careful and detailed consideration of the issues. Court noted a comment about the importance of maintaining a careful watch on any trends emerging in terms of female academic staff being more likely to be Teaching staff and male academic staff more likely to be Research staff. It was agreed that there should be a choice of career paths, for example for academics returning from maternity leave. Court noted a further comment about the importance of setting milestones in the context of what was a long term action plan.

Court heard a comment relating to patterns from data on Black and Minority Ethnic applicants for employment, noting that there was a need for the University to undertake further work to attract more applicants from these groups; and that new reporting requirements were in place.

Court thanked the HR Committee for its work on the Gender Pay Strategy and Action Plan. Court approved both the documents.

**CRT/2016/39.4.2 Other HR Committee business**

The Committee had received a presentation from Professor Frank Coton on the People aspects of the University Learning and Teaching Strategy. The Committee had discussed matters relating to Academic Promotion. The Committee had also considered draft reports prepared to fulfil the University responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty, which reports were received and noted by Court.

The HR Director’s strategic update to the Committee had included briefings on Strategic Recruitment, the Strategy Transformation Programme and the University's response to Brexit

The report was noted.

**CRT/2016/39.5 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee**

The Committee had received: an update on the pilot of central recording of overseas travel; an update from the Business Continuity Officer; an update on the stress survey action plan; an update on the HSE visit to CVR; and the HSW annual report. The Committee had covered its usual range of business in reviewing standard reports on Occupational Health activities, Audit updates, Accident reporting, Employee counselling and Minutes from the University Services Health & Safety Committee.

The report was noted.

**CRT/2016/40. Report from the Rector**

The Rector, Aamer Anwar, made his first report to Court following his election. He considered his election an honour, noting that he had been a student at the University and
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wished to give something back. He planned to be an active Rector, honouring pledges made
to students during his election campaign, and hoped for a good working relationship with the
University.

The Rector’s main pledges were: to be on campus and hold surgeries regularly; to look at
issues relating to the student unions, the provision of extra-curricular activities, student
accommodation/rents and the local property market; to discuss the University’s and students’
roles in relation to Brexit matters affecting students; and to look at matters relating to student
mental health and provision for this in the context of contemporary pressures on students from
a wide variety of backgrounds. He looked forward to working with the University on a range
of issues.

Court noted that work was ongoing to address the problem of the wide choice of local student
accommodation sometimes leading to segregation of certain student groups. Court also noted
comments from members on the Student Finance Committee, relating to the student unions
needing to review their provision to optimise offerings for as wide a range of students as
possible, including international students; and to work together to avoid offering similar
activities.

The SRC President commended the high turnout for the Rectorial election, which had showed
good student engagement, and noted that the role of the Rector had been rejuvenated as a
result. The SRC was thanked by Court for its role in facilitating the recent election.

CRT/2016/41. Any Other Business

Court was reminded that the annual Strategy Day would take place on 29th September.

CRT/2016/42. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 21 June 2017 at 2pm in the Senate
Room.
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Principal’s Report

Items A: For Discussion

1. Higher Education developments

1.1 SFC Final Funding Outcome for 2017/18

The overall funding position for the University of Glasgow for 2017/18 compared to 2016/17 is in line with what was published in the Indicative Grant letter in February.

The main highlights of the SFC guidance letter are:

1. SFC have retained their commitment to maintain Teaching and Research Funding at 2016/17 funding levels: our Total teaching Funding & Research funding for 2017-18 will be £138,114k – a 0.71% increase on 2016-17. A table with a breakdown of the allocations is at Appendix 1. The outcome is slightly better than our original forecast for 2017-18, and this is mainly due to the continued improvement in Research Excellence Grant funding post-REF 2014, and to minor adjustments in the teaching funding methodology.

2. In time for session 2018/19, the SFC will review both:
   a) the Subject to Subject Price Group mappings referring to TRAC (Transparent Approach to Costing) data, to re-allocate subjects to Subject Price Groups. Planning and Business Intelligence will monitor this for SMG and highlight any areas of potential change as part of next year’s planning and budgeting round;
   b) the number of students we have in each Subject Price Group, compared to the 2012/13 original allocation. Planning & Business Intelligence has already begun an analysis of our data to assess any potential impact.

3. The SFC have also confirmed that for 2017-18 the Scottish Government has advised SFC that it has agreed to fund a student intake for two pre-medical entry courses in AY 2017-18. Twenty additional funded places have been allocated to both the University of Aberdeen and the University of Glasgow for pre-medical entry courses for students from a disadvantaged background. As noted in the award letter of 31 May, these additional places will be monitored as if they are controlled places.

1.2 Higher Education and Research Act 2017

On 27 April, the UK Parliament passed the Higher Education and Research Act 2017. This will implement all the major reforms put forward by the UK government, including the creation of
the (regulatory) Office for Students (in England), and of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), a single, strategic body that will bring together the 7 Research Councils, Innovate UK and the research and knowledge exchange functions of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). The Act also introduces a Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), linked to rises in tuition fees; and the opening of the Higher Education market to alternative providers.

The government accepted changes to its plans to open the sector to new providers, agreeing to additional safeguards when granting degree-awarding powers. It also agreed to the introduction of a statutory, independent review of the TEF, thereby delaying the introduction of measures linking the TEF to differentiated tuition fees. Depending on the new ministerial team at BEIS/DfE, this may impact on the future of the exercise. The initial TEF outcomes for those institutions participating should have been published on 14 June 2017, but at the time of writing this seems likely to be delayed by the extension of purdah following the inconclusive general election.

The government rejected a Lords amendment calling for students to be removed from the target to reduce net migration.

2. Transformation Programme

In the last two months the following actions have been taken with respect to the transformation programme, the programme of cultural change aligned to workstreams in the Strategic Plan, and the delivery of the Capital Plan:

1. A transformation team is being built. Initially this is through the external recruitment of a business process improvement manager and one or more business process improvement practitioners. These new appointments will initially support a transformation project to improve student assessment and feedback. Interviews for the posts will take place in the next 2 weeks. The external appointments will be supported by training a cohort of staff currently at the university who will provide knowledge of, and insight into, the working and culture of the university.

2. Space has been allocated, and is being refurbished, to co-locate a transformation team.

3. An external independent consultant with strong experience in business process transformation, and who has experience of working with the University, has facilitated a workshop with SMG to establish priorities for the transformation and ways of working.

4. The consultant is also helping design the transformation office and the office’s working methodology.

The intention is to bring a fuller update and report to Court in October.

Items B: For Information

3. USS – Triennial Valuation 2017

Every three years, pension schemes must undergo a valuation in line with pensions law. USS is required to carry out its latest valuation as at 31 March 2017 and the outcome of this should be
submitted to the Pensions Regulator by 30 June 2018. The USS Trustees are currently considering the technical provisions assumptions which underlie the valuation. These are a scheme-specific measure of the liabilities of the scheme: i.e. a prudent estimate of the assets required to pay for pensions for members already retired and for pensions for active and deferred members, which will become payable in the future.

Court members will recall that after the 2014 valuation, the USS benefit structure was altered to move to a hybrid Defined Benefit (DB)-Defined Contribution (DC) scheme. However, USS has shared with employers that pension costs for the DB component at the 2017 valuation may increase markedly compared to the 2014 valuation due to continuing low gilts yields, lower expected asset returns and increased longevity. The main issue relates to the cost of future benefit accrual under DB. A particular issue for discussion during the valuation between the major stakeholders (the employers and UCU) will be the extent to which the reliance of the pension scheme on the sector, which could increase future contribution rates (from both members and employers) should be maintained or increased/reduced. Reliance is measured by the trustee as the difference between the assets of the scheme to fund promised benefits and those required by a low risk investment portfolio (a funding approach known as self-sufficiency). The risk appetite from employers will be a key determinant here, as will be the view expressed by the Pensions Regulator of what is a reasonable approach to prudence.

The trustee will consult formally with stakeholders on the technical provisions assumptions. This was originally planned for June 2017, but to allow informal discussion of the issues between employers and unions through the Joint Negotiating Committee/Funding and Benefits Sub-Committee of USS, this has been delayed until September 2017.

SMG will keep Court informed of developments.

4. Outcome Agreement - Dumfries

On the Dumfries consolidated Outcome Agreement, we are still working on a draft as we are not yet content with some of the drafting proposed by SFC. Neal Juster can provide Court with a verbal update, as we will need delegated authority from Court to approve this during the summer.

5. University Rankings

We have details from three of the UK League Tables: the Complete University Guide, The Guardian and the QS.

In the Complete University Guide, we are up two places to 27th from 29th since 2016 (30th in 2015 and 2014) placing us 3rd in Scotland behind St Andrews and Edinburgh and 19th in the Russell Group, an improvement of 1 position from last year. This result is significantly different to those published on 24th April. Glasgow was initially published at 36th, but following corrections made to errors in the Entry Standards data, we were repositioned to 27th. We have made strong representations to CUG about the way in which they collected the data from HESA.
We are now 23rd in the Guardian league table, up from 26th in 2016 (24th in 2015 and 25th in 2014). We have improved 2 places in the Russell Group to 13th, and have risen 1 place to 2nd this year in Scotland.

Glasgow has fallen 2 places in the 2018 QS table to 65th (63rd in 2017), with the overall score falling from 71.7 to 71.6, indicative of the fact that very small changes in scores have a disproportionate impact on league table positions. Amongst the Russell Group/UK Universities we have retained our 11th position. Most UK and Scottish Universities have fallen back in this year’s QS ranking.

The University has been recognised as one of Reuters Top 100: Europe’s Most Innovative Universities for the first time.

6. 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. I have, in the main, provided brief headings and can expand on any items of interest to Court.

Academic Development and Strategy
4 – 5 May: Attended the Universitas 21 AGM and Presidential Meeting, University of Nottingham.

16 May: Chaired interviews for two Professorships in English Literature.

23 May: Participated in an SFC Strategic Dialogue Meeting in Edinburgh in relation to SRUC.

26 May: Met with Sir David Greenaway, VC Nottingham and current Chair of the Russell Group and Tim Bradshaw, its acting Director, to discuss handover of the Chair in September.

30 May: Formed part of a small group of 6-7 Russell Group Vice Chancellors/Deputy Vice-Chancellors to visit Brussels to communicate positive messages about the UK’s ongoing research collaboration with EU partners now and post-Brexit.

5 June: Met with Elaine Gourlay, Head of Organisation Development & Change Management at SQA.

5 June: Attended the Beatson Institute Board of Governors meeting.

7 June: Participated in a high level call initiated by the Wellcome Trust to consider key messages that should be shared with the incoming UK government post-election on 8 June.

13 June: Attended and took part in an MoU signing with Biocon.

16 June: Participated in a Due Diligence visit by Canada Life and Barings, our lenders as part of our recent borrowing placement.
19 June: Chaired interview for Chairs in Quantum Technologies.

**Internationalisation Activities**
21 – 22 April: Travelled to Hong Kong and met with range of supporters and friends of the University and hosted an alumni reception. I also met with the Vice – President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Global) University of Hong Kong.
23 - 24 April: Flew on to Singapore and again met with key supporters of the University and hosted an Alumni event.
25 - 26 April: Travelled to Jakarta. On 25 April gave a presentation on University of Glasgow and UK Higher Education to several HE sector representatives in Indonesia and on the 26 April a presentation to Lemhannas, National Resilience Institute of Indonesia on Brexit, Trade and Geopolitical challenges. I also had the opportunity to meet with the Vice Governor of Lemhannas. I also visited our new UoG office in Indonesia.
26 - 29 April: returned to Singapore and on 27 April gave a filmed interview with VP for Global Engagement, Tricia King and subsequently attended the 10³ - A CASE Higher Education Leadership Symposium held at the National University of Singapore. This brought together 10 global University leaders from 5 continents to discuss the challenges facing global Higher Education. Thereafter I participated in the closing plenary of the CASE Asia-Pacific Conference and on the 28 – 29 attended the CASE Global Governance Congress.
10 May: Met with the Latvian Ambassador, who was visiting the University.
21 June: Met with Daisuke Matsunaga, Consul General of Japan.

**Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University**
13 April: Met with Sir Paul Grice, Chief Executive, Scottish Parliament.
18 April: Welcomed delegates to the Glasgow End of Life studies group symposium.
18 April: Participated in the joint meeting of Scottish Enterprise and the University and thereafter met with Linda Hanna – Managing Director of Strategy & Sectors Scottish Enterprise.
2 May: Met with Mark Leach, Editor & Ant Bagshaw of Wonkhe, an organisation which provides a focus for current issues around: Higher Education: policy, people and politics, and publishes blogs and social media contributions on HE.
2 May: Participated in a FinTech Conference call and a FinTech CityUK Workstream planning meeting on 12 June.
11 May: Met with, and addressed a meeting of the Scottish Planners Group which was being hosted by our Planning and Business Intelligence office, on the role and contribution Planners might make to their Universities in the current political and economic environment.

12 May: Took part along with senior University colleagues in a signing and photo opportunity with John Ballantyne, Executive Director and Fergus Shaw, Construction Lead, of Multiplex. Multiplex has been awarded the contract for the construction of the University’s campus development programme.

15 May: Met with the First Minister who was on campus for a filmed media interview.

16 May: Participated as a panelist in a Sunday Times/Brodies LIP Business Breakfast on Brexit and Immigration.

16 May: Hosted a CASE Europe School Heads Dinner in the Melville Room.

17 May: Met with Ceri Thomas, Communications Director, Oxford University.

18 May: Attended a USS Investment Committee Meeting in London and on 1 June a Board Training session followed by a Trustees Board Meeting.

19 May: Attended an SFC Council Strategy Day and on 24 May attended an SFC Finance Committee Meeting and an SFC Liaison Meeting on 6 June.

22 May: Attended a Europa Institute Dinner, University of Edinburgh, which included a lecture by Elmar Brok MEP on The Future of the European Union.

25-26 May: Attended CASE Europe Board Meeting.

6 June: Attended the Universities Scotland Main Committee Meeting.

7 June: Met with Councillor Susan Aitken, new Leader of Glasgow City Council.

8 June: Hosted a Lodging dinner for a delegation from McGill University, who were visiting Glasgow for the Lucian Award Committee meeting. My colleague, Professor Touyz, Director of Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences Research Institute, is a member of the Committee.

12 June: Attended a Scottish Universities Legal Network on Europe (SULNE) Workshop which was focusing on Borders. This was the second of four workshops planned.

13 June: Attended and gave the introduction to Stevenson lecture delivered by Professor John Curtice.

15 June: Chaired a meeting of Glasgow Commission on Economic Growth.

15 June: Hosted a lecture delivered by Michael Russell MSP, Scottish Government Minister as part of our Policy Scotland series of lectures and hosted a Lodging dinner thereafter.
16 June: Met with Andrew Thomson, Chief Executive of the Arts & Humanities Research Council (AHRC), as part of a general visit to our University, the College of Arts in particular.
16 June: Along with Professor Anne Anderson, VP and Head of College Social Sciences, met with Sir Paul Grice and Sir John Elvidge, members of the Advisory Board of Policy Scotland.
19 June: Hosted a dinner in Edinburgh, to promote our Campus Development campaign.

**Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events**
15 May: Held one of my periodic staff surgeries.
15 May: Gave a presentation to an MBChB Graduates (Class of 57) Reunion on the Campus Development.
17 May: Met with the SRC President and Sabbaticals and again on 15 June as part of our monthly meetings.
5 June: Hosted the annual Major Research Awards reception in the Senate Room.
13 & 14 June: Attended evening dinner for the Honorary graduands and on 14th Commemoration Day delivering an address in the Bute Hall.
17 June: Attended and welcomed delegates to a celebration of 60 Years of Computing Science at Glasgow.

**7. Senior Management Group business**
In addition to standing and regular items the following issues were discussed:

*SMG meeting of 19 April 2017*
- Future EU recruitment and Admissions policy 2018
- College Articulation Update
- REF Reviews
  - UoA 28B Celtic Studies

*SMG meeting of 18 May 2017*
- University Services – Organisational Structure
- Budgets
- Feedback on International and European Student Symposiums
  - SRC presentation
- International Student Barometer

*SMG meeting of 19 June 2017*
- Kelvin Hall (Phase II)
- City and Sector Deal – Leveraging Government Funding
### Appendix 1

**SFC Final Funding Outcome for 2017/18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Glasgow</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>Diff</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£k</td>
<td>£k</td>
<td>£k</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teaching Funding</td>
<td>83,426</td>
<td>82,983</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Excellence Grant</td>
<td>45,935</td>
<td>45,335</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Postgraduate Grant</td>
<td>7,344</td>
<td>7,407</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>-0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Exchange (General)/ Knowledge Transfer Grant</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research</td>
<td>54,688</td>
<td>54,151</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>138,114</td>
<td>137,134</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Court Context Card - University Secretary's Report 21 June 2017

**Speaker**: Dr. David Duncan  
**Speaker role**: COO and University Secretary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paper Description</strong></th>
<th>For information / some items for discussion/decision/approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic last discussed at Court</strong></td>
<td>Regular report to Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic discussed at Committee</strong></td>
<td>NA Committee members present NA Cost of proposed plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major benefit of proposed plan</strong></td>
<td>Revenue from proposed plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Urgency
- High: Item A1, B1; Medium: Low red

#### Timing
- Immediate: where relevant
- Green: Decision/Discussion/Information

#### Red-Amber-Green Rating
- Green: Green

#### Paper Type
- Decision/Discussion/Information

#### Paper Summary
Report from Secretary on a number of items for Court's discussion/decision and/or information. Items for decision are:
- A1 Appointment of Principal (NOTE this item will be taken at the beginning of the Court meeting)
- A2 Remuneration Committee matters
- A3 Court Governance. Recommendations for change arising from the Court self-assessment
- A4 Ordinances relating to elections of Chancellor and General Council Assessors. Court's in-principle is sought for an Ordinance simplifying the election processes.
- B1 Campus Development Borrowing. Court's approval is sought for the Principal and University Secretary to be the signatories on finalised borrowing documents for private placement.
- B3 Court Resolution: Amendment to composition of Board of Catholic Education. Court's approval is sought for a draft Resolution that amends the membership, remit and responsibilities of the Board of Catholic Education, to reflect changes in University structures and in nomenclature since earlier Resolutions
- B4 Nominations Committee business: Court's approval is sought for Graeme Bissett to be appointed as Convener of the Finance Committee and for a new appointment to the Audit Committee

#### Topics to be discussed
As above plus any B items Court members may wish to discuss

#### List under each item: specific decisions requested under:
- Action from Court
  - A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, B3, B4
  - as above under relevant A & B items

#### Relevant Strategic Plan workstream
- Empowering People, Agility, Focus

#### Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve
- NA

#### Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve
- NA

#### Risk register - university level

#### Risk register - college level

#### Demographics
- % of University
- % of college

100% Cross University application on several items

#### Operating stats
- % of
- \% of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Campus</strong></th>
<th>All locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>External bodies</strong></th>
<th>Scottish Government; private lenders (campus development borrowing), Privy Council (Ordinance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other universities that have done something similar</strong></th>
<th>Other universities that will do something similar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College, Cambridge University, Kent have borrowed for capital projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Relevant Legislation
Higher Education governance; Financial regulations

#### Equality Impact Assessment

#### Suggested next steps

#### Any other observations
Court - Wednesday 21 June 2017

Report from the University Secretary

SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Appointment of the Principal

As previously advised, the Principal’s contract of employment with the University runs until 30 September 2019. Within the contract, there is a clause that states that the contract may be extended, should both parties be willing, and that discussion on a possible extension should take place before 1 April 2018.

At the last meeting, Court approved the establishment of a Court working group, comprising the Convener as chair, the Convener of HR Committee (June Milligan), 2 other lay members (Murdoch MacLennan and Lesley Sutherland subsequently joined the group), the Senior Senate Assessor (Duncan Ross), a Staff Representative on Court (Dave Anderson subsequently joined the group), and the SRC President (Ameer Ibrahim), with a remit to: review the Principal’s performance in his role; consider whether the University should offer an extension to his current contract of employment and, if so, on what terms; and report with recommendations the June meeting of Court.

Court is invited to consider the recommendations. Please note that this item will be dealt with at the beginning of the Court meeting.

A.2 Remuneration Committee

The Committee, which is chaired Ken Brown, will meet on 21 June to consider the matter of the remuneration of two senior individuals. I will brief Court orally at the Court meeting. Ken will also be at the meeting.

A.3 Court Governance

There are a number of items relating to governance:

i) Court’s Governance Working Group met on 31 May. It had two main agenda items:
   - to consider whether to submit comments to the consultation on the draft (revised) Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, and to identify any issues which should be brought to Court’s attention at the June meeting.
   - to review the outcome of Court’s recent self-assessment of effectiveness;
The Group agreed that the response would welcome the consultation and endorse its principles, and also agree with many of the individual proposals. It would however suggest that a shorter, more focused, document would be better, respecting the sector’s autonomy and diversity, and allowing some elements of flexibility. It would refer to the absence of reference to key roles of a governing body, and suggest that clarity on the respective roles of the Rector and Senior Lay Member at the ancient Universities might be provided.

A response to the consultation has been submitted. The response has been provided to Court for information.

If the Code is eventually published in the current detailed format of the draft, Court will need to agree its approach to having goals and policies on equality and diversity for Court positions and review the composition of Court Committees - this latter area is already scheduled for the 2017/18 session. With respect to equality and diversity, recent attendance by two Court members at a LFHE governance workshop has resulted in useful proposals for promoting the role of governor and recruiting from a wider pool of potential applicants.

Annex relates to the Court self-assessment. It contains a number of recommendations for Court relating to modifications to Court meetings and activity.

Is Court willing to approve these recommendations?

ii) With regard to the current Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, in 2016 the Court Governance Working Group undertook a full review of compliance. The Group was satisfied at that time that the University/Court was complying with the terms of the Code. As such, the Group has not reviewed the Code in detail again this year, since the way in which Court and the University address the requirements have not changed.

iii) Following good practice as set out in the Code, Murdoch MacLennan has undertaken an appraisal of the Convener's performance and has provided Court with a summary.

A.4 Ordinances regarding elections of Chancellor and General Council Assessors

The current Ordinances for the above elections require postal voting and include very specific wording about all aspects of the process. To modernise the election process and provide a degree of flexibility for administrative changes that might be needed in the future, it is proposed that the wording of the Ordinances be amended to permit electronic voting and to take out very detailed process descriptions, so that the latter are included in local (more easily amendable) regulations and not in the Ordinances. Other Ancient Universities in Scotland have put similar arrangements in place.

Court’s in-principle approval of this approach is sought, following which (if Court is content) a draft Ordinance will be drawn up and circulated for approval and there will be informal discussion with the Scottish Government (as now required) ahead of the required formal consultation process. A single Ordinance would replace the current Ordinances referred to the above.
SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Campus Development Borrowing

At the December 2016 meeting of Court, it was agreed that a short-life working group should be established with delegated authority to make decisions on the University’s long-term borrowing strategy, in the light of Court’s decision to commit to an additional £175M of long-term borrowing for the campus development.

The working group subsequently considered borrowing options and agreed on Private Placement as the most favourable option. The group also agreed that with the risk that interest rates might soon begin to rise, early progress should be made on putting a borrowing facility in place. Legal and financial agents were subsequently engaged to act on the University’s behalf in implementing the borrowing strategy; there was a presentation to possible lenders, and thereafter a window during which lenders were given the opportunity to submit proposals. Given that the University needed to be in a position to make an early decision on the best borrowing option, the working group agreed that, subject to Court’s agreement, a group of four University officers should have delegated authority to make commitments on the University’s behalf.

At its April 2017 meeting, Court approved the proposed arrangement that a group of four officers - the Convener of Court, Elizabeth Passey; the Vice-Chair of Finance Committee, Graeme Bissett; the Principal, Anton Muscatelli; and the Director of Finance, Robert Fraser - should have delegated authority to make commitments on the University’s behalf. Court agreed that, before commitments were entered into, the Group would approve the terms of a document setting out the nature of these commitments, and that this document would be shared with Court members for their information.

The above business was concluded on 20 April and a document setting out the terms of the commitments was shared with Court as agreed. Subsequent to that date, a complete suite of Private Placement documents has been drafted, with input from the University’s lawyers, and with a view to the documents being concluded through signature in mid July 2017. This suite of Private Placement documents will be approved by the Group.

Court’s approval is sought for the Principal and University Secretary to be the signatories on these documents.

Such an arrangement would be in line with the Court Ordinance on Execution of Deeds, which indicates a deed is valid if signed by a member of Court and the Secretary, and sealed with the University seal.

B.2 Court Strategy Day

The Strategy Day is scheduled for 29 September. The day will have as its broad theme the University’s competitiveness, with opportunities for Court members to contribute to discussion about this, including through group workshops. The programme will include a session involving student representatives, a briefing on the Research Hub and a discussion about the political landscape.
B.3 Court Resolution: Amendment to composition of Board of Catholic Education

The Board of Catholic Education was set up at the time of a merger of St Andrew’s College of Education with the University, in 1999. The Board’s remit and composition are governed by a University Resolution (governing instrument), which was approved following the required consultation with the Senate and General Council. There have been some amendments to the Resolution since 1999. Further changes are now required.

Court’s approval of the draft at Annex is requested ahead of the one month formal consultation required by legislation governing the University’s governance.

As mentioned in the note to the draft, the proposed Resolution amends the membership, remit and responsibilities of the Board of Catholic Education, to reflect changes in University structures and in nomenclature since earlier Resolutions. It also introduces Co-Conveners, one from the Catholic Church and one from the University, to reflect the Board’s dual membership and interests, and current practice. The text has been agreed with the Board.

The text of the current Resolution (including an amendment previously agreed) is also provided, for information.

B.4 Nominations Committee Business

i) On the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, Court’s approval is sought to Graeme Bissett becoming convener of the Finance Committee to the end of his term on Court, following Ken Brown leaving Court on 31 July. Graeme is currently the vice-convener of the Committee.

ii) Recruitment for a member of the Audit Committee took place in April, to replace an external member who demitted office early. On the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, Court’s approval is sought for the appointment of Mr Vincent Jeannin to the Audit Committee for 4 years from 1 August 2017. Mr Jeannin has educational qualifications in Finance, Mathematics and Law, and a professional background in derivatives trading.

iii) Advertisements for recruitment to a co-opted position on Court, to replace Ken Brown, will be placed in July, with a recommendation for appointment following via the Nominations Committee.

B.5 Senate Assessors

Three Senate Assessor vacancies will arise on Court, one from the retirement from the University of Professor Paul Younger and two from Professor Karen Lury and Dr Duncan Ross demitting office on 31 July. The Council of Senate is in the process of appointing replacements. An election may be required. Court will be updated at the Court meeting if possible.

B.6 Head of School Appointment

Professor Michele Burman has been re-appointed as Head of the School of Social & Political Sciences from 1 August 2017 to 31 July 2019.
Court Governance Working Group: Court Self-Assessment

The Court Governance Working Group comprises Elizabeth Passey, Dave Anderson, Ken Brown, Ameer Ibrahim, Morag Macdonald Simpson and Duncan Ross. The group has reviewed the self-assessment responses from 2017. 12 completed assessments were received (8 lay and 4 internal members), a response rate of 50%, excluding the Rector who had only just been elected. The return rate last year was 20/24 (83%). The group suggests that all members are strongly encouraged to participate in the next self-assessment.

The self-assessment form included sections on the role of Court and its members; Court procedures and meetings; Court committees; and governor development. Overall, the self-assessment was positive, although the average score in some sections was fractionally down on last year’s average score; some sections scored fractionally higher. The following themes for action emerged, with the Working Group’s recommendations appearing in each section. The recommendations also take account of comments received from feedback solicited after Court meetings.

1. Opportunities to contribute to the development of the University’s strategy. The Strategy Day content in 2016 was welcomed, and the opportunity that was given for Court to contribute to the University’s strategic plan was acknowledged, but some comments were received about the need for Court papers to get more quickly to the strategic import of issues, and about Court receiving too much information in ‘passive’ mode, e.g. via powerpoint presentations, rather than properly engaging.

The group therefore recommends that papers’ authors/presenters should be reminded about the need for the context cards, the general content of the papers, and all presentations, to be highly focused. The group also recommends that every effort is made to make Court meetings as active as possible in terms of inclusiveness of members in discussion, and in terms of seeking Court input on key strategic issues.

Connected to this, several members referred to the high number of attenders at Court meetings and to this potentially diluting meetings’ effectiveness. The group recommends that the number of attenders at Court meetings be reduced to a minimum, with only papers’ authors/presenters, or executives whose expertise is likely to be required at a particular meeting, being invited to attend. Court members can contact SMG/executive members by email to request clarification on any points, ahead of meetings.

The group also recommends that Court members be asked annually for suggestions about the content of the Strategy Day.

2. Opportunities to meet and canvass opinion with fellow Court members. Comments were received that opportunities are somewhat limited. The group recommends that a lunchtime pre-Court session is always convened and that efforts are made to ensure these events are very inclusive, allowing optimal interaction between all members; and that events for Court members to mix in a more informal environment are organised from time to time.

3. Encouragement to engage in the business and life of the University outside Court meetings. Comments were received from a small number of Court members about there being room for more of this. The group noted that Court members are able an individual basis to involve themselves as much as they wish in University activity. The group nevertheless recommends that Court members are reminded about University events where these might be of particular interest. Members should also be reminded on an annual basis about the invitation (agreed previously by Court) for up to two members to attend any Court Committee meeting on an observer basis, where they are not members of that Committee.
4. Governor training and development opportunities. Training and CPD were generally considered to be good, but the Working Group recommends that all members, but in particular student members, contact the Convener and Clerk if there are particular areas they would like covered in more detail.

5. Skills and expertise being used effectively by the University either on Court, within the wider committee structure or through other means. Comments were received from a student member that more involvement would be welcomed. The group recommends that this is considered as part of the review of Committee remits and memberships that is scheduled for next session.

June 2017
In pursuance of the powers conferred under Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, the University Court hereby resolves as follows:

1. There shall be a Board of Catholic Education in the School of Education (‘the Board’).

2. The membership of the Board shall be:

   • A Co-Convener nominated by the Bishops Conference and appointed by the Senate, subject to confirmation by the University Court. He or she will be a non-University member of the Board selected from one of the four nominees of the Bishops' Conference, appointed for a period of three years with the possibility of re-appointment for a second term;
   • A Co-Convener nominated by the Head of the School of Education and appointed by the Senate, subject to confirmation by the University Court. He or she will be a University member of Board outside the School of Education, appointed for a period of three years with the possibility of re-appointment for a second term;
   • The Clerk of Senate or nominee;
   • A Vice-Principal;
   • The Head of the School of Education;
   • The Director of UG/ITE or nominee;
   • 4 nominees of the Bishops’ Conference appointed for a period of three years with the possibility of re-appointment for a second term;
   • The Director of the Scottish Catholic Education Service;
   • The Director of the St Andrew’s Foundation;
   • The Coordinator of Spiritual and Pastoral Formation (Catholic Teacher Education);
   • An academic member of the School of Education nominated by the members of the School appointed for a period of 3 years, with the possibility of re-appointment for a second term;
   • Two student representatives who are registered students in the School of Education on Initial Teacher Education programmes preparing students to teach in Catholic schools. One student member will represent students on degree programmes and may be appointed for a maximum of three years. One student member will represent students on PGDE programmes and will be appointed for one year.

3. The remit shall be:

   • The Board of Catholic Education will be responsible for advising on all aspects of the professional education of intending teachers for Catholic schools within the School and also in relevant continuing professional development;

   • In discharging its responsibilities the Board will consult and advise the School’s Undergraduate Committee and the School Executive. The Board shall normally report to the School of Education and through it to the Senate. It may, however, in exceptional circumstances, communicate directly with the Education Policy and Strategy Committee, and from there to the Senate and the University
Court. The Board may also liaise, as appropriate, with Leaders of the School's Research and Teaching Groups.

4. The responsibilities of the Board shall be:

- Maintaining an overview of teacher education for students preparing to teach in Catholic schools, including monitoring arrangements for the admission of suitable students to courses;
- Monitoring courses in religious education and programmes in Catholic teacher formation developed by the St Andrew's Foundation for students and teachers in Catholic education so that they meet the requirements of the Bishops' Conference;
- Monitoring arrangements for quality assurance with respect to educational programmes specifically relating to the preparation of prospective teachers for Catholic schools; such arrangements shall be consistent with the University’s requirements for the management of the quality of taught provision;
- Advising the School on matters relevant to the effective development of Catholic education, research and consultancy;
- Monitoring the staffing profile of the School in terms of its appropriateness and balance to discharge its obligations in respect of support for the professional education of students for Catholic schools and of teachers in Catholic schools;
- Monitoring the use of resources to support the training of intending teachers for Catholic schools.

5. The Board shall produce an annual report, based upon its review of these responsibilities, for transmission through the School of Education to the Senate and from there to the University Court.

6. Resolutions 546 and 571 are hereby repealed

7. This Resolution shall take effect on 1 September 2017.

Secretary of the University Court

Explanation
This Resolution amends the membership, remit and responsibilities of the Board of Catholic Education, to reflect changes in University structures and in nomenclature since Resolutions 546 and 571. In addition, the Resolution introduces Co-Conveners, one from the Catholic Church and one from the University, to reflect the Board’s dual membership and interests, and current practice. The Resolution consolidates earlier Resolutions regarding the Board of Catholic Education and all earlier Resolutions are repealed.
RESOLUTION 546: - ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOARD OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND REPEAL OF RESOLUTIONS 464, 475, 488 AND 509-

In pursuance of the powers conferred under Section 3 of the Universities (Scotland) Act 1966, the University Court hereby resolves as follows:

1. There shall be a Board of Catholic Education in the Faculty of Education

2. The membership shall be:
   - A Convener nominated by the Dean of Education, approved by the Catholic Church and appointed by the Senate, subject to confirmation by the University Court. He or she will be one of the four nominees of the Bishops’ Conference or the Director of the Catholic Education Service appointed for a period of three years with the possibility of re-appointment for a second term
   - The Clerk of Senate
   - The Dean of the Faculty of Education
   - 4 nominees of the Bishops’ Conference appointed for a period of three years with the possibility of re-appointment for a second term
   - The Director of the Scottish Catholic Education Service
   - The Head of the Department of Religious Education
   - 2 members of the Faculty of Education nominated by the members of the Faculty appointed for a period of 3 years, with the possibility of re-appointment for a second term
   - 1 student representative who is matriculated in the Faculty of Education and pursuing an Initial Teacher Education programme preparing students to teach in Catholic Schools appointed for a maximum of three years
   - Two student representatives who are registered students in the Faculty of Education on Initial Teacher Education programmes preparing students to teach in Catholic schools. One student member will represent students on degree programmes and may be appointed for a maximum of three years. One student member will represent students on PGDE programmes and will be appointed for one year.
   [Amendment arising from Resolution 571 effective 10 October 2007]
   - The Associate Dean – ITE Provision
   - A Vice-Principal

3. The remit shall be:-
   - The Board of Catholic Education will be responsible for advising on all aspects of the professional education of intending teachers for Catholic schools within the Faculty; and also in relevant continuing professional development.
   - In discharging its responsibilities the Board will consult and advise the Undergraduate Committee of the Faculty and the Faculty Management Group. The Board shall normally report to the Faculty of Education and through it to the Senate. It may, however, in exceptional circumstances, communicate directly with the Senate thence to the University Court. The Board will also liaise, as appropriate, with academic departments of the Faculty.

4. The responsibilities of the Board shall be:
   - Maintaining an overview of teacher education for students preparing to teach in Catholic schools, including monitoring arrangements for the admission of suitable students to courses.
• Monitoring courses in religious education and programmes in Catholic teacher formation for students and teachers in Catholic education so that they meet the requirements of the Bishops' Conference.
• Monitoring arrangements for quality assurance with respect to educational programmes specifically relating to the preparation of prospective teachers for Catholic schools.
• Advising the Faculty on matters relevant to the effective development of Catholic education, research and consultancy.
• Monitoring the staffing profile of the Faculty in terms of its appropriateness and balance to discharge its obligations in respect of support for the professional education of students for Catholic schools and of teachers in Catholic schools.
• Monitoring the use of resources to support the training of intending teachers for Catholic schools.

5. The Board shall produce an annual report, based upon its review of these responsibilities, for transmission through the Faculty of Education to the Senate and thence to the University Court.

6. Resolutions 464, 475, 488 and 509 are hereby repealed

7. This Resolution shall take effect on 1 October 2005.

David Newall
Secretary of the University Court

Explanation
This Resolution amends the membership of the Board of Catholic Education so as to allow the Convener to be the Director of the Scottish Catholic Education Service as an alternative to one of the four nominees of the Bishops’ Conference. This preserves the original intention that the Convener be appointed from the non-University members of the Board. In addition this Resolution consolidates the earlier Resolutions regarding the Board of Catholic Education and the earlier Resolutions are repealed.
### Topic last discussed at Court

- **Main items:** University budget & forecasts and capital plan; Infrastructure final business case. In minutes and summarised below

### Topic discussed at Committee

- **Committee members present:** Court members present at last meeting: G Bissett, K Brown, C Goodyear, A Ibrahim, R Mercer, E Orcharton, E Passey, D Ross, Principal

### Cost of proposed plan

### Major benefit of proposed plan

#### Revenue from proposed plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urgency</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-Amber-Green Rating</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Type</td>
<td>Some items for approval; others for information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paper Summary

- The Budget and Four Year Forecast and Capital Plan were considered by the Committee.
- The Infrastructure Full Business Case was considered by the Committee.
- Finance Committee noted the Investment Managers’ Reports
- Finance Committee noted a report showing the Overview of Performance as at 30 April 2017

#### Topics to be discussed

- Budget/Four Year Forecasts, Capital Plan; Infrastructure Full Business Case (all also to be discussed earlier in Court meeting); (for information unless Court wishes to discuss:) Capex Applications approved; Investment Managers’ Reports (attached); Period 9 Overview of Performance (attached).

#### Action from Court

- To approve Budget & Financial Forecasts and capital plan; to approve Infrastructure Full Business Case.
- Other items for noting.

#### Recommendation to Court

- The Budget is RECOMMENDED to Court. The Infrastructure Full Business Case is RECOMMENDED to Court.

### Relevant Strategic Plan workstream

- Agility, Focus

### Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve

- Cash generation

### Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve

- 5. Financial Resource

### Risk register - university level

### Risk register - college level

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of University</th>
<th>100% undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% postgraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% home students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of</th>
<th>100% revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% real estate - land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% real estate - buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of total assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of total liabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus

- **All**

### Case

- **All**

### Other universities that have done something similar

### Other universities that will do something similar

### Relevant Legislation

### Equality Impact Assessment

### Suggested next steps

### Any other observations
University of Glasgow
Finance Committee
Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 31 May 2017
in Melville Room, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:
Mr Graeme Bissett, Mr Ken Brown (Convener), Mr Robert Fraser, Dr Carl Goodyear, Mr Ameer Ibrahim, Prof Anton Muscatelli, Ms Elspeth Orcharton, Ms Elizabeth Passey, Dr Duncan Ross, Mr Iain Stewart

In attendance:
Mrs Ann Allen, Mr Gregor Caldow, Dr David Duncan, Prof Neal Juster, Mr Ronnie Mercer, Ms Fiona Quinn

Apologies:
Ms Heather Cousins

CA/2016/66. Farewell and Welcome

The Convener of Court thanked Ken Brown for his work in convening the Committee over the past seven years. Committee members added their thanks, noting that Mr Brown would step down from Court in the summer.

The Convener thanked Dr Duncan Ross for his work on the Committee. Dr Ross’ tenure as a Senate Assessor would draw to a close in the summer.

The Convener thanked Ameer Ibrahim, SRC President, for his contribution to the Committee over the past year. His successor, Kate Powell, would be invited to attend Finance Committee meetings from September.

Dr David Duncan was welcomed to his first Finance Committee meeting.

CA/2016/67. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 29 March 2017

The minutes of Finance Committee held on 29 March 2017 were approved.

CA/2016/68. Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were noted.
CA/2016/69. Capital Plan Update 2017-2023 (paper 5.1)

Finance Committee received a paper outlining an update to the University Capital Plan.

Members noted the update on projects completed in 2016/17, changes and additions to “minor” projects, and the latest spend profile. The Committee also noted that two projects had been stopped: upgrades to the Stevenson Building changing facilities and the Water Source Heat Pump. In response to a question from the SRC President, the Senior Vice Principal confirmed that the Stevenson Building improvements could be re-started provided the business case was sufficiently strengthened.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Director of Finance confirmed that it would be possible for some VAT to be reclaimed on newbuilds. However it was not feasible to produce a forecast at this stage as more information was required on the precise use of buildings and the sources of funding for each building.

The Committee approved the budget for capital spend.

CA/2016/70. Budget 2017-18 and Four Year Forecast (paper 5.2)

Finance Committee received the proposed budget for 2017-18 and financial forecasts to 2020-21. The Committee noted that the 2017-18 budget outlined anticipated cash generation of £26.1m, ahead of the associated KPI target (£24.5m) and significantly ahead of the amended target as per the Capital Plan presented to Court in December 2016 (£21.8m).

The budgetary forecast predicted cash generation of £23.5m, £20.4m and £30.3m in 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21 respectively, against targets of £23.8m, £19m and £28.5m respectively.

In order to achieve the projected cash generation targets, tuition fee income from overseas students was expected to increase incrementally to £188.2m per annum (2020-21) from £163.1m in 2017-18. The Committee noted the risks around international student recruitment and the challenge of building accurate forecasts in what was a complex environment. MVLS student forecasts were discussed and the committee sought reassurances on the robustness of the forecasts for this College.

The Senior Vice Principal highlighted the positive effects of higher numbers of students than expected in the Adam Smith Business School, and of securing borrowing at lower rates than forecast.

There was a discussion around the consolidated cash flow forecast for the budget period and the Committee noted that 2021 was the lowest point in the forecasts. The Committee requested a 10 year projection in order to give longer term context to the cycle.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend the budget to Court.

CA/2016/71. Full Business Case – Infrastructure (paper 5.3)

Finance Committee received a paper setting out the case for the investment in public realm landscaping and infrastructure on the Western Infirmary site at a cost of £72.7m (incl. VAT). This compares with a budget in the Capital Plan of £75.5m. The Director of Estates gave a presentation.
The Committee accepted in principle the case for treating the infrastructure investment as one single project. However members were concerned about the risks associated with elements of the total package. These risks were largely associated with the fact that 41% of the total cost was, at this stage, an estimate. The Committee noted the risk of variances in the costs of utilities and other elements of the project and members discussed the level of contingency provided for in the budget.

The Committee accepted the argument that waiting for greater cost certainty to be available before granting approval would impose undesirable delays on the campus redevelopment project as a whole. The Director of Estates and the Senior Vice Principal emphasised the robust governance arrangements for the project itself and the fact that the Capital Plan was a dynamic document, with adjustments of projects as necessary and to adapt to circumstances. The Committee noted the following:

- The Project Governance Board received a monthly report on the utilities element of the project;
- The project’s development would be reported regularly to Estates Committee as it progressed;
- Finance Committee would have an annual opportunity to scrutinise progress as the Infrastructure project would form part of the yearly discussion on the Capital Plan and Budget.

The Committee requested a reminder of the governance arrangements and Committee structure around the project, and the Director of Estates agreed to circulate this.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend the business case to Court but wished to emphasise their concerns regarding potential adverse variation in the untested costings.

CA/2016/72. Capex Application: Garscube / McCall Building / External Fabric Works (paper 5.4.1)

The Committee received a request for £840k of funding to deliver a replacement roof covering and cladding to the James Herriott Library linked to the McCall and Mary Stewart buildings at Garscube.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2016/73. Capex Application: Thomson Building / Anatomy Upgrade (paper 5.4.2)

Finance Committee received an application for £1.8m for upgrades to Anatomy facilities in the Thomson Building.

Noting that there was an imperative placed on the University by HM Inspector of Anatomy for Scotland regarding the works, Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2016/74. Capex Application: Professor Square / Elevation Repairs (Phase 1) (paper 5.4.3)

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for £1.2m to complete repairs to buildings in Professor Square.
Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2016/75. Capex Application: Fees – Programme Delivery Management Service (paper 5.4.4)

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for £19.8m to establish the Programme Delivery Management Service (PDMS). Members noted that securing this service would remove the requirement for the Estates team to manage the construction site as the campus development progressed. The benefits of the PDMS would include value for money through economies of scale; providing a single point of responsibility for Health and Safety; minimising risk to the University at the points of interface between projects; and providing the University with flexibility to alter requirements.

The committee noted the projected cash flow, which showed that the full costs would not be paid upfront.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2016/76. Capex Application: Forensic Medicine Service – Move to Glasgow Royal Infirmary (paper 5.4.5)

Finance Committee received a capital expenditure application for £1.4m to effect a move for the Forensic Medicine Service within MVLS to the Glasgow Royal Infirmary. The Committee noted the strategic reasons for the move as well as the necessity to vacate the Joseph Black building to allow refurbishment works to go ahead.

Members of the Committee requested more information on the project in order to understand the detail of what the proposed expenditure entailed. The Director of Estates agreed to circulate the plans.

The Committee deferred approval of the application pending receipt of the plans.

CA/2016/77. Capex Application: Hillhead Street / Psychology Additional Space (paper 5.4.6)

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for £160k for additional accommodation for Psychology. The request was for additional funds for construction and design fees over and above those already approved, due to changes to the project scope since October 2016 when the original Capex request was approved.

Finance Committee approved the application.

CA/2016/78. Capex Application: Western / New Build / Institute for Health and Wellbeing (paper 5.4.7)

The Committee received a capital expenditure application for £1.94m for Fees to allow the Institute of Health and Wellbeing project to progress to Full Business Case and planning application.

The Committee approved the application.
CA/2016/79. Investment Strategy – Surplus Funds (paper 5.5)

Finance Committee received a paper outlining a number of investment options and proposals to oversee the investment of surplus funds over the coming years. The Committee noted that the University was expected to hold cash balances of approximately £400m following the receipt of £175m from private placement funding. These funds are forecast to be spent over the course of the next four years as the campus redevelopment building programme progresses. The Committee was asked to give consideration to proposals to invest surplus funds in order to reduce counterparty risk.

Finance Committee was asked to approve the creation of a sub-committee to oversee and approve the investments of surplus funds. The proposed membership of the sub-committee was the Principal, the Director of Finance, Graeme Bissett and Gavin Stewart. Further, the Committee was asked to delegate authority to the sub-committee to approve any required changes to the University Treasury Policy to facilitate implementation of the agreed investment strategy.

Finance Committee approved the creation of the sub-committee and the proposed membership, with the addition of Elizabeth Passey and a student member as attendees. In response to a question from the Committee regarding the lifespan of the group, it was agreed that the sub-committee would remain in place as long as the surplus funds existed.

With regard to delegated authority to approve changes to the Treasury Policy, the Committee preferred to reserve that authority to the Committee. Due to time constraints, proposed changes to the Treasury Policy would be circulated to Committee members via email for approval.

CA/2016/81. Endowments – Unspent Revenue (paper 5.7)

Withdrawn.

CA/2016/82. Private Placement Funding Update and Terms (paper 6.1)

Finance Committee received a paper outlining the terms of the private placement. Due diligence was underway. Closing and funding was scheduled for 20 July 2017.

The Committee noted the update, congratulating the Director of Finance and his team on a very successful outcome.

CA/2016/83. Investment Managers Reports as at 31 March 2017 (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee noted the endowment investment reports. The Committee noted that a meeting of the Investment Advisory Committee had taken place on 19 May 2017 however the minutes were not yet available.

Finance Committee noted that the University had terminated its contract with Newton Fund Managers on 17 May 2017. Dividend income would continue to be received into the Newton account until the end of the financial year. The Committee noted the final valuation of the Newton fund prior to it being transferred to the UBS Smart Beta fund.
CA/2016/84. Report from Investment Advisory Committee held on 19 May 2017 (paper 6.3)

The Committee noted the report.

CA/2016/85. Draft Minutes of Student Finance Sub-Committee held on 24 March 2017 (paper 6.4)

Finance Committee received the minutes of Student Finance Sub-Committee for information.

It was noted that the SRC reported an operating surplus of £2,789 (versus prior year surplus of £38,091); the QMU returned a deficit of £79,102 (versus last year’s £112,566 deficit); the GUU reported a £157,616 surplus in comparison with a prior year surplus of £9,906; and GUSA reported a surplus of £20,367, an increase on last year’s £7,062 surplus.

The Committee noted that the Student Finance Sub-Committee had agreed the following grant allocations for 2017/18:

- SRC - £583,315
- QMU - £221,600
- GUU - £221,600
- GUSA - £229,500

The SRC President and University Secretary confirmed that a set of themes had been agreed around which the student bodies would aim to contribute further to the student experience, and progress towards this aim would be monitored.

CA/2016/86. Overview of Performance at 30 April 2017 (paper 7.1)

Finance Committee received an overview of performance in Period 9. Finance Committee noted that the Period 9 actuals were £2.9m ahead of budget at £20.8m. The full year outlook at period 9 was £9.7m, £8.7m higher than budget. Under FRS102, the full year outlook was £41m, £12.3m higher than budget.

The projected full year outlook variances against budget include a £6.7m underspend on salaries, across all Colleges and University Services. Tuition fee income is projected to be £1.7m higher than budget with increases in Arts, Social Sciences and Science and Engineering offset by a decrease in MVLS. Other variances include: research contribution £1.5m lower than budget; commercial contribution £1.2m lower than budget; transnational education contribution increased by £1.1m (largely due to exchange rate); other income increased by £2.8m.

The Committee noted the University was on track to generate cash from operations of £32.9m, a cash inflow of £24.4m after capital items and before the bond receipt.

CA/2016/87. Debtors Report at 30 April 2017 (paper 7.2)

The Group Financial Controller provided an overview of debtors as at 30 April 2017. Overall debt levels had decreased year on year to £34.29m at April 2017 (£39.2m at April 2016).
Finance Committee noted that the overall decrease was primarily due to lower levels of outstanding commercial debt, due to decreased billing. Commercial debt stood at £22.7m, a decrease from £28.05m at April 2016.

Student debt levels were slightly lower overall in April 2017 in comparison to April 2016, with £6.47m outstanding against students and £1.02m against sponsors (£6.84m and £1.13m respectively in April 2016). Within the sponsor debt, the top ten balances represented 76% of total sponsor balances outstanding. The improvement was due to faster billing of sponsors, and implementation of improved communication via email and text message with self-funded students.

CA/2016/88. Cash Balances Report at 22 May 2017 (paper 7.3)

Finance Committee noted the summary of cash balances, totalling £264.5m across ten institutions at 22 May 2017.

CA/2016/89. Dates of meetings 2017/18

26 September 2017, 10am – location tbc
20 November 2017, 2pm – location tbc
24 January 2018, 2pm – location tbc
28 March 2018, 2pm – Melville Room
30 May 2018, 2pm – Melville Room

Prepared by: Fiona Quinn, Clerk to Committee, Fiona.Queen@glasgow.ac.uk
Last modified on: Monday 12 June 2017
**Court Context Card 21 June 2017 - Estates Committee**

**Speaker**  
Mr Ronnie Mercer

**Speaker role**  
Estates Committee Convenor

**Paper Description**  
Report from Estates Committee (9 May 2017)

**Topic last discussed at Court**  
Last Estates Committee report to Court 12 April 2017

**Topic discussed at Committee**  
Various

**Committee members present**  
Mr Ameer Ibrahim, Professor Karen Lury, Mr Ronnie Mercer (Convenor), Mr David Milloy, Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal)

**Cost of proposed plan**  
Various

**Major benefit of proposed plan**  
Teaching, Learning and Research, Student Experience

**Revenue from proposed plan**  
Not Applicable

**Urgency**  
Various

**Timing**  
Short, Medium and Long Term

**Red-Amber-Green Rating**  
Not Applicable

**Paper Type**  
Information

**Paper Summary**  
Update covering Estate Strategy, Capital Plan, Programme and Project progress

**Topics to be discussed**  
None for Court approval; items to discuss if Court wishes.

**Action from Court**  
Court is asked to NOTE the following:

1. that Estates Committee reviewed the draft Infrastructure Full Business Case and approved it subject to a number of recommendations being addressed, ahead of it being considered by the Programme Governance Board, Finance Committee and Court.
2. Estates Committee’s approval of CapEx applications: James Herriot (McCall) Building External Fabric Works in the sum of £840k; Thomson Building (Anatomy) upgrades in the sum of £1,822,228; 13 Professors’ Square - conservation works in the sum of £1,215,500; Programme Delivery Management Service (PDMS) Fees in the sum of £19.8m; relocation of Forensics from the Joseph Black Building to Glasgow Royal Infirmary in the sum of £1.449m; Psychology, Hillhead Street (additional space) in the sum of £1.94m. Institute for Health and Wellbeing (design fees and development of full business case) in the sum of £1.94m.

**Recommendation to Court**  
Note as above

**Relevant Strategic Plan workstream**  
People, Place and Purpose

**Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve**  
All

**Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve**  
Effective use of the Estate

**Risk register - university level**  
Risk 1 - Delivery of Estate Strategy

**Risk register - college level**  
Not Applicable

**Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of University</th>
<th>100% staff and students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Entire University Estate (all campuses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External bodies</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict areas</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other universities that have done something similar**  
Swansea

**Other universities that will do something similar**  
Building and Planning legislation

**Suggested next steps**  
On a building by building basis/by CapEx, where applicable

**Any other observations**  


UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW
Estates Committee
Minute of the meeting held in the Principal’s Meeting Room on Tuesday 9 May 2017

Present: Mrs A Allen, Mr D Duncan, Mr R Fraser, Mr A Ibrahim, Professor N Juster, Professor K Lury, Mr R Mercer (Convenor), Mr D Milloy, Professor A Muscatelli (Principal), Mr A Seabourne, Mr D Smith,

In Attendance: Mrs N Cameron, Mrs L Duncan, Mr P Haggarty, Mr R Smith (Currie and Brown) agenda item 4.2 (minute 37.2)

Apologies: Professor P Younger

EC/2016/34 Minute of the meeting held on 17 March 2017
The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2016/35 Matters Arising
There were no matters arising.

EC/2016/36 Declarations of Interest
There were no declarations.

EC/2016/37 Capital Programme Board Report

EC/2016/37.1 Update Report
The Committee noted the Terms of Reference for the Capital Programme Governance Board and Workstream progress to date:

**Workstream 1a – Masterplanning**
Interim Masterplan proposals would be reviewed and developed with the Preferred Delivery Partner (PDP) following appointment.

The Committee noted that a number of technical workstreams would be formed to develop specific aspects of the Masterplan. These included a Public Art Strategy for which proposals were being sought from suitable specialist partners; Interim Masterplan which would be progressed following PDP appointment; and Planning to work through planning Conditions.

**Workstream 1b – Infrastructure**
The Committee noted that formal approval of the Stage 3 report in respect of Infrastructure Design had been presented to the Programme Governance Board.

Discussions were ongoing with Scottish Power for provision of a new primary sub-station. Viability of the preferred Thurso Street location was being reviewed.

It was confirmed that Graham Construction had been appointed as enabling works contractor for the Learning and Teaching Hub and Western Infirmary site and that there was potential for Novation to the PDP.

The Committee noted that due to extended asbestos removal works there would be a further six weeks added to the programme with a corresponding impact on LTH programme.

**Workstream 3 - Procurement and Appointment of Lead Contractor (Construction)**
The Committee noted that following ratification of the Preferred Bidder on 17 March 2017 briefings had been undertaken with both the successful and unsuccessful bidders. Resolution of tender matters and preparatory work had been ongoing between the University and the Preferred Bidder in order to confirm appointment.

The Committee noted further approval of the Programme Delivery Management Service (PDMS) at Finance Committee on 31 May with appointment expected on 28 June 2017.
Workstream 7 – Future Learning Spaces
The Committee noted that meetings had taken place with College Management Groups where there had been support for review of provision. It also noted that future meetings would have representation from MaRIO and Senate.

Workstream 8 - Strategic Investment and Disposal
The Committee noted that further progress had been made in respect of investigation of market interest, interdependencies and campus development priorities to understand the impact on potential vacant possession, potential alternative structures and strategies, including joint ventures and Student Accommodation provision.

Workstream 9 – Strategic Travel and Transport Plan (STTP)
The Committee noted workstream activity and progress across a number of strategic themes: Information and Awareness Raising; Public Realm; Active Travel; Directional Signage; Public Transport; Fleet Vehicles; Inter-campus Travel; Servicing & Deliveries; Business Travel; Car Parking; and SMART Campus.

EC/2016/37.2 Infrastructure - Full Business Case (FBC) - Draft
The Committee welcomed the presentation provided by the Director of Estates and Commercial Services. It noted the purpose of the Infrastructure project:

- to support the University’s Vision for public realm and placemaking as set out in its Masterplan and a key principle of the Campus Development Framework (CDF), ultimately delivering the University’s strategic ambition of an inspirational, transformational and sustainable Campus and which deliver upon the conditions of the Planning Permission in Principle (PPiP) granted by Glasgow City Council in February 2017;
- to support: world-class learning, teaching and research and the University’s position within a competitive global market; accessibility for all; a permeable Campus environment which encourages engagement with the City and West End communities; creation of a healthy, inclusive environment with increased greenspace to support wellbeing; and a permeable Campus which is open and welcoming to all and which prioritises pedestrians over vehicular accessibility and movement; and
- to deliver a comprehensive, site-wide approach to infrastructure design and delivery which was essential for the effective and efficient use of new buildings on the Western site which will vary in type and use. It would also add resilience to the current provisions of utilities and services and support the University’s ambition to operate in a sustainable and environmentally responsible way.

The Committee noted the draft status of the FBC. The case was based on tendered figures for the previous programme and tenders were being revised based on the current Capital Plan. Revised figures would be available at the end of May 2017. It also noted that the Programme Governance Board would review the FBC for approval at its meeting scheduled to take place on 21 May 2017. Subject to these provisions the Committee agreed to consider the case as drafted in order to maintain momentum and ensure that delivery milestones were achieved.

From its analysis of the draft the Committee noted:

i. the rationale for a comprehensive approach to delivery of the Infrastructure package. Whilst it was possible for delivery on a building-by-building basis there were benefits to taking a comprehensive approach, as required by statutory authorities. The approach would permit the most efficient and cost-effective provision of Utilities infrastructure throughout the site, would minimise the impact on latter construction works and would support a managed approach to future maintenance requirements;

ii. the requirement to comply with an approved Design Guide and pallet of materials in the development. The Committee emphasised the need to balance cost and quality but supported the principle that there should be no adverse impact on the quality of the Campus. The Project Delivery Board would be accountable for this area and that outcomes would be regularly tested by the Project Governance Board;

iii. development of an Interim Masterplan to support the extended delivery programme. It agreed that it was critical to ensure a sense of Place in the early phase of development to support and protect the student and staff experience and to ensure reasonable consideration of our residential and commercial neighbours during construction;

iv. engagement was ongoing between the University and Utility providers to ensure sufficient network capacity to support the entire site and those of the West End and its potential future demand requirements;
v. the preferred option for Scottish Power Energy Network was development of a new Primary Sub-station located at Dunaskin Road. The site was leased by the University from Glasgow City Council although purchase was being investigated as approved by the Infrastructure Governance Board in November 2016. The University and Scottish Power continue to test the suitability of the site and to consider alternative approaches;

vi. the Programme Delivery Management Service (PDMS) would manage and have oversight of all utilities although there may be a requirement for direct procurement in some instances. All options were being reviewed and recommendations would be presented to the Programme Governance Board;

vii. the University’s sustainability commitment and the requirement for provision of a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) to manage and minimise the run-off of ground water into the River Kelvin. The Committee noted that landscaping proposals were being developed to support this.

viii. there would be two points of to allow for expansion of the District Heat Network into the Western Site;

ix. each plot would have a minimum of two points of entry for ICT Infrastructure supply from the University’s private network. Commercial plots would be served from individual public network supplies. There was no provision for digital connection and any requirement for development of a digital campus would require a separate business case;

x. University investment would be complemented by £100m of investment by Glasgow City Council in the surrounding area;

In respect of cost estimates, cost movement and cost risk the Committee noted:

i. the Business Case had been built on the Masterplan as approved by Court (June 2016);

ii. the Capital Plan was approved by Court in December 2016. Within the Plan, £75.5m (incl.VAT) was identified for infrastructure and public realm investment (Phase 1a and 1b);

iii. total estimated Capital cost of £72.7m (incl. VAT) comprising a number of components: PDP Target Price (£36.0m); University/other costs (£32.2m); Risk (£4.0m); Pain allocation 0.5m. It was noted that this was not a Guaranteed Maximum Price. The sum allows for: increased costs for enabling works; a cost reduction in respect of inflation and risk allowance following tender; removal of costs for the Water Source Heat Pump; costs to support route to market of the land at the corner of Dumbarton Road and Church Street and anticipated purchase costs for the freehold of the site at Dunaskin Road; potential additional costs under the pain/gain arrangements in the delivery partner contract; an adjustment to provide for costs to develop and deliver an Interim Masterplan. A business case and detailed proposals would be taken to the Programme Governance Board prior to investment. The total cost estimate remains below the Capital Plan budget figure.

iv. The Committee noted there remained an element of risk around final costs for a number of packages of work and there were recognised risks in respect of unknown ground conditions. It noted that all possible analysis, assessment and surveys had been undertaken to obtain as much cost certainty as possible and that a costed Risk Register had been prepared to mitigate and manage cost exposure.

v. It noted that the final target price would be agreed by the end of May 2017 and a Tender Report would be provided in the final version of the FBC which would be presented to Court.

vi. Proposals for the management of risk and the robust governance procedures established to scrutinise and challenge this;

vii. The Committee noted that of the £72.2m cost estimate expenditure of £6.5m, 9% had already been incurred; a further 50% had been tendered providing some element of cost certainty and 41% had yet to be tendered providing no cost certainty. It was noted that it was intended to develop design solutions that do not exceed the budget figure.

viii. At its meeting in November 2016 the Programme Governance Board approved inclusion of a pain/gain mechanism in the PDP contract. Under this arrangement the University accept a limited element of the ‘pain share’, should the actual costs exceed the target price. The University’s maximum exposure share is an additional 1.25% of the target price, i.e. £0.5m (incl VAT).
ix. In respect of Operating Models and Costs (OPEX) the Committee noted these were being fully reviewed but would allow for: grounds and landscaping; waste management; drainage; lighting; pest control; HV cabling maintenance; IT/Telecom cable maintenance; statutory inspections; planned replacements.

The Committee noted that within the project there were a number of cost and design decisions still to be made and that given the significance, complexity, risk to the overall programme of development and the number of inter-related workstreams, the project would be subject to stringent Change Control processes.

The Committee noted that whilst the Project Delivery Partner will own the majority of the risks, the University would retain a small but significant number including: University changes to Brief or Works Information; Ground and other site conditions which could not have been reasonably foreseen; University suspension of works; Specified Perils. The Committee noted that the quantified Risk Register, identifying the University retained residual risks.

Following full consideration of the draft Full Business Case Estates Committee requested:

that a breakdown of full works and costs be added to the FBC giving clarity to the elements of spend and benefit to each section;

that an annual spend profile be prepared to show cost phasing;

that a building criticality assessment be undertaken to ensure full understanding of the impact of any delay to mitigate this and any potential negative reputational impact. This would be relevant for the Institute of Health and Wellbeing, currently based in leased accommodation. A review of lease conditions would be undertaken to ensure the University’s position and potential for lease extension were protected to mitigate against programme delay. The Committee also noted that completion of the Research Hub beyond 2020 could be problematic;

that the risk sum of £2.9m between the approved Capital Plan budget and the current cost estimate be allocated to the project, subject to spend control by the Project Governance Board;

that an approach to manage and control leakage of cost from site-wide infrastructure works impacting or resulting in duplication of costs for works associated with individual building projects; and

that assurance be provided to ensure the University retains full control of HV and SUDS networks to ensure there are no third-party permissions required to undertake works on the site.

Subject to all of its recommendations the Committee approved the FBC. It recommended that the Director of Estates and Commercial Services establish a sub-group to include the Estates Committee Convenor, Alan Seabourne, Doug Smith and David Milloy requesting that the group ensures that all outstanding matters are considered and concluded with a view to achieving approval at Programme Governance (21 May 17) and Finance Committee (31 May 17).

EC/2016/37.3 Contractual Arrangement with Preferred Bidder

The Committee noted that it was anticipated that contractual arrangements with the Preferred Bidder would be concluded with the next week, subject to clarification of some minor details.

EC/2016/38 Capital Projects Governance Board Report

The Committee noted status of project Dashboards. It noted there were delays, due to resource constraints within Development and Regeneration Services at Glasgow City Council in respect of approval of Building Warrants. The Director of Estates and Commercial Services was having weekly dialogue with the University’s Planning Advisors and with senior executives within Planning Services. Further information would be provided to the Principal in order that the matter could be further escalated.

EC/2016/39 CapEx Committee Reports

EC/2016/39.1 CapEx Applications

EC/2016/39.1.1 James Herriot (McCall) Building External Fabric Works

The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £840k (incl. VAT) for the purposes of strategic maintenance upgrades and replacement of the external building envelope.

EC/2016/39.1.2 Thomson Building (Anatomy)
The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £1,822,227.52 to upgrade the architectural finishes and layout, upgrades to mechanical and electrical infrastructure and to ensure compliance with the recommendations contained within the reported prepared by the HM Inspector of Anatomy (Scotland).

**EC/2016/39.1.3 5 – 13 Professor’s Square**
The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £1,215,500 to deliver a further conservation works package which will address backlog maintenance and preserve the heritage estate.

**EC/2016/39.1.4 Programme Delivery Management Service (PDMS) Fees**
The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £19.8m for appointment of a single contractor to deliver services for Phase 1a and b of the Campus Development Programme.

**EC/2016/39.1.5 Glasgow Royal Infirmary (Forensics)**
The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £1.449m for the relocation of Forensics from the Joseph Black Building to Glasgow Royal Infirmary.

**EC/2016/39.1.6 Psychology, Hillhead Street (additional space)**
The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £160k for construction and design fees in addition to those previously approved. It noted the additional sum was associated with changes in scope and specification since the original CapEx approval.

**EC/2016/39.1.7 Institute for Health and Wellbeing**
The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £1.94m for design fees and to support development of a Full Business Case.

**EC/2016/40 Control and Monitor Reports**

**EC/2016/40.1 RAG Report**
The Committee noted the status of the projects with a value in excess of £100k and that it had been updated to reflect the Capital Plan approved at Court on the 14 December 2017. It requested that the overall report be updated to reflect accurate infrastructure costs.

It noted that since the last Estates Committee: the Western/New Build (Mathematics and Statistics project has completed; one project was noted as Red: Gilmorehill (Computing Science Reconfiguration). The red status was noted as the result of expected grant funding not reaching agreement to date; and twelve projects were noted as Amber:


*5 - 13 Professor’s Square Elevation Repairs* – amber as the current cost plan was indicating the project would cost more than originally planned and may also have a slightly extended programme. It was noted that work was underway bring this back in line with the original budget.

*Western (Enabling Works) and Gilmorehill/Learning and Teaching Hub (Enabling Works)* – amber due to re-tendering resulting in a slight time delay for the L&T (Enabling works) and cost increase on the main enabling works with subsequent impact on programme for completion of the L&T Hub. The Team was working with the Preferred Delivery Partner to review programme.

*Garscube/Acre Road/ Wind Tunnel* – This project is incomplete. The contractor has installed the safety system as far as possible and University Engineering Department technicians require to develop and complete controls systems, estimated to take four months.

*Gilmorehill/Davidson Building/ West Medical Refurb Phases 2 and 3* – amber due to project running behind programme to achieve CapEx approval prior to Summer 17 period.

*Gilmorehill/Hillhead St/Psychology (additional space)* – amber due to cost over-run as a result of increased Building Control fire requirements.

*Western/New Build/Mathematics and Statistics Modular Building* – amber due to the current anticipated final expenditure being higher than the CapEx approval (<5%)

**EC/2016/40.2 Risk Register** - The Committee noted the current Risk Register. Item 3.03 would be closed.

**EC/2016/40.3 Programme** - The current Master Programme was noted.
EC/2016/40.4 Health and Safety Dashboard - The Committee noted that the workstream status had moved to Green.

EC/2016/41 Estates Reports
No items to consider.

EC/2016/42 Any Other Business
The Committee extended it thanks to Professor Karen Lury and to Amir Ibrahim for their commitment to Estates Committee and its work.

EC/2016/33 Schedule of Meetings for 2017/18
The schedule of dates was noted:

It was agreed that meetings in 17/18 would be extended to three hours to allow sufficient time for consideration of Estates Business.
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**Paper Summary**
The Committee received internal audit reports on reviews of: Marketing and Communication; and SCENE bank accounts. The Committee discussed a draft Internal Audit Risk Assessment and Plan 2017/18. The Committee approved the External Auditors’ approach to preparing the financial statements for the year to 31 July 2017. The Committee received the updated University Risk Register. The Committee received an update on Implementation of Outstanding Recommendations from prior internal audits.
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Apologies: Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young) (KB)

AUDIT/2016/32 Announcements
David Duncan was welcomed to his first meeting. John Boyd was welcomed to the meeting.

Duncan Ross was attending his last meeting. The Committee thanked him for his contributions to the Committee’s business and wished him well in the future.

There were no declarations of any conflicts of interest.

AUDIT/2016/33 Minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2017
The minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2016/34. Matters Arising

.1 Scottish Code of Good HE Governance
The draft Scottish Code of Good HE Governance was currently the subject of consultation, with a Court working group being convened to consider a response.

.2 Internal Audit – Tender Process
The process had been initiated through the Purchasing Office. A subgroup involving members of the Committee and management would be arranged to consider submissions.

.3 Audit Committee membership
Interviews had been held in April for a new member. A recommendation from the Nominations Committee to Court would be considered at the 21 June Court meeting, with a view to the proposed new member joining the Committee on 1 August 2017.

.4 Procurement Policy update relating to additional work by auditors
The policy would be updated during its annual review/update, to include reference to the chair being consulted in the event of additional work for the auditors being proposed.

.5 Systems and data control clauses in contracts
In relation to the recent audit on cyber security, the Committee had requested that the University ensure there were clauses routinely built into contracts with third parties, relating to systems and data control, and that local University managers should be
aware of, and have ready access to, the details. The Committee noted that this action would be picked up as part of GDPR readiness.

**AUDIT/2016/35. Internal Audit Update**

35.1 Internal Audit Update Report

The summary report was noted, including the reasons for a number of scheduled reports for May having been carried forward to September. The auditors were content with the reasons, which included widening the scope of a review to provide a more useful report, and including more interviewees for a review. It was not expected that the re-timing would impact on the timing of reports previously scheduled for September.

35.1.1 Marketing and Communication

In 2013, the University brand had been created, with a webpage providing staff with guidelines on how to use the brand to ensure marketing was consistent throughout the University. The review had focused on related strategy; brand policy and guidance; communication lines between MaRIO and those undertaking marketing activity throughout the University; and efficiency and value for money. The review had assessed the design and operating effectiveness of key controls.

The overall report classification was medium risk, with two medium risk findings, relating to: monitoring of output to the market, where as a result of marketing activity being split between central marketing (MaRIO), Colleges and in some cases individual Schools, there was increased risk that marketing generated from outside the central function might not be suitably ‘on brand’; and oversight of marketing spend, where each College had its own marketing budget, but some Schools might allocate additional budget to marketing, over which the Colleges might not have visibility. As such, there was no oversight of the full marketing spend within the College. Recommendations had been made accordingly and agreed actions recorded.

35.1.2 SCENE Bank Accounts

SCENE, the Scottish Centre for Ecology and the Natural Environment, was the University’s field station. It included a research wing with office space for resident and visiting scientists and research students, and accommodation for the use of researchers working in the field. SCENE had operated bank accounts including accounts for catering and social activity. In 2016 a number of recommendations had been made following a College-based investigation, including recommended closure and balance transfer of the social account to a University account.

The overall report classification was medium risk, with three medium risk findings, relating to: the social account not having been closed yet and new processes for charging residents not having been formalised; the catering account not being a sanctioned University account, that as such should be closed; and the earlier investigation not having been conducted by a different College and not having been reported to the appropriate level of senior management. The recommendations were being actioned.

**AUDIT/2016/36. Internal Audit Risk Assessment and Plan 2017/18**

A draft paper from PWC had been circulated, setting out a Risk Assessment and Internal Audit Annual Plan 2017/18, including a summary of PWC’s approach to undertaking the risk assessment. The plan was driven by the University’s organisational objectives and priorities, and the risks that might prevent it from meeting those objectives. Discussions had been held with DD, DAW, RF and GC ahead of the plan being provided to the Committee.

PWC had considered an ‘audit universe’ of auditable units, analysed the University’s corporate objectives and risks, and subsequently developed an audit requirement rating based on the inherent risk assessment and the strength of the control environment for
each auditable unit. A plan had then been drafted, covering the auditable units - at a high level covering the Colleges; University Services; thematic areas including academic and educational innovation and research; and the University subsidiaries - and indicating proposed audits for 2017/18 within these high level units.

Internal audit work would be performed in accordance with PWC’s Internal Audit methodology, which was aligned to Scottish Funding Council Financial Memorandum requirements, and required PWC to report on whether PWC believed that the University had adequate and effective arrangements to address the risk that management’s objectives were not achieved in respect of risk management, control and governance.

The Committee welcomed the inclusion of a Value for Money heading within the proposed plan, noting that this area would be included where appropriate.

It was agreed that further information would be added about risk mitigation in relation to risks 3 and 9. A comment was noted that the proposed hours for audits of front facing services were relatively low and that this should be reviewed.

**ACTION PWC/LP**

**AUDIT/2016/37. Audit Planning Report**

The Committee received a report setting out the proposed External Audit approach for the year to 31 July 2017, in accordance with the requirements of auditing standards and other professional requirements.

The auditors’ approach would examine key controls across the University, including both entity level controls and the transactions and general ledger controls. The auditors would consider the work of internal audit in assessing the University’s control environment. Control considerations would be focused around those processes associated with significant financial statement risks. These included the University’s budget monitoring process, payroll controls and project accounting controls which assisted the audit of income and expenditure categories. The auditors would also consider the controls established within the new research model within the Agresso finance system.

The report summarised the auditors’ assessment of the risks inherent in the external influences, the key strategic, operational and financial risks for the University and the auditors’ knowledge of other factors that might impact the University’s financial statements. The outputs were then compared with those risks identified through the University’s own risk management process, and mapped to the financial statements, where applicable. This risk assessment process informed where the focus of the audit work would be for the year ending 31 July 2017.

In terms of significant risks, auditing standards required the auditors to place appropriate audit focus on the recognition of income, and the associated risk of fraud, within the financial statements. The auditors considered the University’s income streams to determine the areas susceptible to greatest risk. There was no material judgement associated with the recognition of the SFC grant income and it had been determined that it was appropriate to rebut the presumption of fraudulent income recognition in this area. There was, however, inherently more judgement applied in determining the amount and timing of income to be recognised in respect of tuition fee income, research income and other commercial income streams. Management override of controls was also an area of potential risk, and the audit would accordingly test all areas, to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole were free of material misstatements whether caused by error or fraud.

Areas of audit emphasis would include accounting for property, plant and equipment and capital funding; and accounting for pension obligations.

The report also discussed levels of materiality that would be applied. While base income for 2016/17 was anticipated to increase, the auditors considered it prudent to
hold the materiality level at the 2016 level. The auditors would scope their work accordingly across the individual components of the University group. The approach to the audit would be based on a balance of controls and substantive testing. The Committee received a timetable, agreed in line with management’s own financial reporting timetable, which showed the key stages of the audit and the deliverables that the auditors had agreed to provide through the 2016/17 Audit and Risk Committee cycle.

The Committee approved the External Auditor’s proposed approach to the audit of the University's accounts.

AUDIT/2016/38. Risk Management

The University Risk Register was noted. It was agreed that completion dates would be included, as well as the register showing tracked changes from the previous version.

ACTION RF

AUDIT/2016/39. Implementation of Outstanding Recommendations

Since the February 2017 meeting, 23 new audit actions had arisen; 24 actions against audit reports had been completed; 54 had been partially implemented or were being progressed; and there were 10 recommendations against which action had not yet commenced. It was agreed that mitigating actions, or an indication that the risk was accepted by management, should be included where the action point was older than a year.

ACTION DAW/GC

At the last meeting, the Committee had heard that a number of financial system development actions had passed the original target completion date, although compensatory controls were in place. A paper would be drafted for a future meeting, proposing that a number of the historical development actions be removed from the reports, given that they were superseded by newer systems developments.

ACTION GC

With regard to the Emergency Planning audit actions, it was agreed that DD would follow up a High risk finding that was still outstanding.

ACTION DD

AUDIT/2016/40. Any Other Business

The Committee noted that University IT had not suffered as a result of the recent ransomware attack in the UK. DD agreed to provide the Committee with information on the patching systems in operation across the institution.

ACTION DD

It has been agreed at the Committee’s special meeting held earlier in the day that there would be an induction session arranged for September, to include input from internal and external audit and from senior management, and to cover the role of the Committee as viewed by these areas.

ACTION DM

AUDIT/2016/41. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 20 September 2017 at 2pm in the Melville Room

Prepared by: Deborah Maddern, Clerk to Committee, deborah.maddern@glasgow.ac.uk
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By Invitation: Professor M Padgett Item 3 (85 below);

Apologies: Professor A Muscatelli (AM), Professor R O Maolalaigh (ROM), Dr M Macdonald Simpson (MMS),

HR/16/83 Opening Remarks & Apologies
JM opened the meeting and noted apologies as above. JM welcomed DD to his first meeting of the Committee.

JM provided brief feedback from the April meeting of Court, noting that the papers on the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and Gender Pay had been well received. She also reported that RG is confirmed as Vice-Chair of the Committee.

Declaration of Interest
JM informed the Committee that she had been appointed to the role of Civil Service Commissioner and noted that she did not anticipate this giving rise to any conflict of interest.

HR/16/84 Minute of the Meeting held on 15 March 2017
The minute of the previous meeting was agreed as drafted. RPC agreed to note any formal actions on future minutes as appropriate.

HR/16/85 Strategic update form the Vice-Principal Research
MP joined the meeting and gave a presentation on the key strategic activities he is leading with the support of the Research Strategy and Innovation Office (RSIO).

MP talked to his three key areas of strategic focus, namely to Improve Output Quality, Nurture and attract talent, and Increase and Diversity Income with his presentation primarily focusing on the first two of these. Within the Attracting Talent agenda, the University is seeking to secure both senior eminent Professors and new early career individuals via the Lord Kelvin Adam Smith Fellowships.

MP’s team also invest heavily in activities to nurture and grow our talent. As well as bespoke training for Early Career Researchers (ECR) RSIO have also created supportive communities, and strive to promote a high performance culture from Post-graduate research level through to senior academics. ECRs participate in an annual Research Staff Conference and the Glasgow Crucible events for a smaller targeted group of recent joiners receive very positive feedback from participants supporting their induction to the University and wider Research Community.

The Senior Research Leaders’ Programme also receives strong feedback and enhances the University’s ability to build strategic partnerships and take a strategic, longer view of research and publications activity. The University is also creating a wider network of REF Champions to promote and support best practice.

MP noted that Research Integrity and the need to both raise awareness and respond to challenges was an increasing area of focus and he anticipated would continue to require additional resources and time. UoG is well placed in this regard following a major review of
policy and procedures but further consideration would be given to supporting these going forward.

MP spoke to the actions being taken to mainstream equality and diversity within the work of the RSIO including the need for all staff with formal REF roles to complete formal training in E&D and Unconscious Bias. MP then went on to summarise the important continuing work to prepare the University for the next REF and talked the members of the Committee through the Interim Research & Impact Review process designed with a particular focus on increasing our ability to self-assess the relative quality of our research publications. Asked about the learning from the last REF, MP indicated that the Unit of Assessment level reviews had informed the Interim process now under way. He also noted that there is a perception that the University is insufficiently ambitious when targeting publications for our Research and a need for greater leadership and courage particularly to create multi-disciplinary opportunities.

There was further discussion regarding the need to support academics who were not contributing to the necessary level and ensure the PDR and wider management tools are used effectively to address this, playing to individual strengths where possible but recognising the strategic imperative to address poor performance. The Committee endorsed this approach to attract and nurture talent in support of a high performance culture.

HR/16/86  
Policy Update

Two policies were presented to the Committee for approval. RPC spoke to these explaining that they had been prepared in consultation with managers and the campus trade unions. The Managing and Supporting Performance policy is designed to provide a structured framework within which managers can support and manage situations where performance expectations are not being met. It will replace the existing Competency Policy. It is accompanied by a new Probation policy that provides guidance to managers on supporting new joiners and tackling any concerns promptly and clearly. The Committee approved both elements though encouraged consideration of the presentation of the policies to ensure it was clear to managers that these were primarily designed to assist in addressing under performance.

The second policy discussed was a relatively minor amendment to the existing Management of Organisational Change policy regarding the University’s approach to redeployment of staff facing redundancy due to funding end dates. Analysis of the effectiveness of existing systems including the Job Seekers Register demonstrated that these were not delivering the desired outcomes and, following detailed discussions with the trade unions and managers it had been decided to adopt a slightly different approach to support staff in this situation. The Committee approved the change as drafted.

RPC indicated that supporting paperwork would now be finalized for both policies with the expectation of introducing the changes during the autumn.  
Action: RPC

HR/16/87  
HR Committee Remit - Annual Review

JM introduced the paper indicating that the proposed changes were put forward for consideration and discussion and took into account the range of views expressed in her informal meetings with the members of the Committee.

There was positive feedback regarding the proposed rewording of the remit with an emphasis on ensuring the Committee was placed to provide strategic advice to Court on matters relating to the people agenda, and the inclusion of explicit reference to the transformation work and to talent and succession planning were welcomed.

There was detailed discussion regarding potential changes to the membership and frequency of Committee meetings. The view was expressed that meetings needed to be sufficiently frequent so that new policies and strategies requiring revision could be
progressed in a timely way. It was though felt that a move to four from five meetings per year should be given serious consideration.

Ensuring a balance of representation from both Academic and Service Units alongside lay membership was also seen as important, with any changes likely to be made in context of the review of all Court Committee membership in the light of the anticipated new HE Code of Governance.

Members of the Committee were asked to provide detailed feedback to RPC to inform discussion at a future meeting.

**Action:**

All

HR/16/88 **Strategic Update from the HR Director**

CB spoke briefly to her paper that included commentary on the Strategy Transformation Programme, University Services structural review, the National Pay Negotiations the ongoing review of Recruitment processes, Strategic Recruitment of senior talent and the launch of the PDR process for 2016/17. CB also highlighted some positive early indications that the University’s development programmes are supporting the goal of improving the gender mix amongst our senior academics and reported on two further successful Athena Swan awards at Research Institute level. Members of the Committee noted the importance of maintaining communications regarding the University Strategy and Transformation agenda and it was agreed to invite Professor Neal Juster to the next meeting of the Committee to provide an update.

**Action:** RPC

DD spoke briefly to his review of the high-level structure of University Services, indicating that his aim was to ensure it was appropriately designed to maximise support to our teaching and research activities and ensured clear leadership of all activities. He anticipated that this would result in bringing some units together to form fewer overall Services.

The Committee welcomed the progress being made with regard to the review of recruitment and saw the introduction of a Pilot as a key milestone. CB noted that strategic recruitment activity remained high. The University had attracted a number of enquiries from senior professors following an external campaign, which was encouraging though it was noted that recent campaigns to fill senior finance roles had proved to be quite challenging.

Finally, CB noted that the HR function was supporting a number of change initiatives, particularly within University Services and it was recognised that this would be a particular focus over the coming months.

HR/16/89 **HR Analytics**

RPC spoke briefly to the paper that included additional information regarding sickness absence. The paper also included some additional information on the contract mix across the University employee base as well as expanded turnover information. This followed discussion at the last Committee regarding the resulting high recruitment volumes that continue to be sustained.

HR/16/90 **Matters Arising from 15 March 2017**

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

HR/16/91 **Closing remarks**

JM thanked members for their contributions to the discussion and the consideration of the Committee remit in particular.

There was no other business raised and the meeting closed.

HR/16/92 **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled to take place on Monday 11 September 2017 at 10am in the Melville Room.
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University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Tuesday 23 May 2017 at 10:00 AM in the Melville Room

Present: Dr David Duncan, Mr Richard Claughton, Dr Craig Daly, Ms Paula McKerrow, Mr David McLean, Mr Deric Robinson, Ms Gillian Shaw, Mrs Kathleen Simmonds, Mr David Somerville, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Julie Summers, Mr Graham Tobasnick, Dr Jane Townson, Ms Selina Woolcott

In Attendance: Ms Debbie Beales, Mr David Harty, Dr Philip Rodger

Apologies: Mr Peter Haggarty, Mr Christopher Kennedy, Ms Erin Ross, Ms Jessica Brown, Ms Louise Bowden, Mr James Gray

HSWC/2016/1 Convenor’s Business

The Committee welcomed Dr David Duncan as the new Convenor for the Committee.

HSWC/2016/2 Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 8 March 2017

The Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 8th March 2017 were approved.

HSWC/2016/3 Matters arising

HSWC/2016/3.1 Safety for overseas workers (verbal update SW)

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that the pilot for using CORE to request and authorise travel was now complete. The data will be analysed along with feedback received from staff who used the system during the pilot. 164 applications for travel insurance had been made during the 3-month pilot with only around 20% of applicants completing the full request/authorisation process. Ms Woolcott agreed to update the Committee at the September meeting.

HSWC/2016/3.2 Audit programme (Paper 1)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that the final four audits had taken place, completing this year’s audit cycle across the University. Several areas within MVLS still have actions outstanding and Dr Townson agreed to work with SEPS to help move this forward. Mr McLean hopes that all Units will have completed their outstanding actions, with the assistance of SEPS, within 12 months of audit reports being issued to Schools.

HSWC/2016/4 OH Report (Paper 2)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that:

- Management referrals were down slightly on the same period last year. This could be due to the introduction of the new Managing Attendance Policy and the revised accompanying paperwork. OH will continue to monitor any changes associated with this.
- Health surveillance continued to increase, mainly due to better reporting of staff requiring HS especially within research labs. Ms Stewart tabled a paper showing the stats for respiratory health surveillance in 2017. Respiratory screening forms were sent to 530 staff with 370 completed forms returned. Following the questionnaire reviews, 87 staff required lung function tests resulting in 369 staff being declared fit
for work and one new case of occupational asthma resulting in the staff member being declared unfit for certain work.

- Vaccinations were down substantially on the same period last year due to a national guidance change from Public Health on mantoux and BCG vaccinations. This change is due to an international shortage of the vaccine. As a result, only medical/dental/nursing students with a history of living in high risk Countries now require screening for TB. This meant the number of students who required testing dropped from 250 to 30.

The Committee discussed the fact that the new Managing Attendance Policy is being perceived by some as too regimented and the stress referral form itself as intrusive. In reality, these documents are intended as tools to help line managers begin a dialogue with staff experiencing stress or on sick leave.

**HSWC/2016/5 SEPS Report (Paper 3)**

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that there were no trends or anomalies to report and that there is now a category in the stats for non-work related injuries (including sport). Mr McLean informed the Committee that, due to the high number of false alarms, the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service had informed the University that they had decided to reduce the number of appliances being mobilised to future call outs to the Gilbert Scott and St Andrews Buildings. Moving forward, a single fire appliance will be dispatched initially with additional units to follow only if a fire is confirmed. Mr Harty informed the Committee that a ‘Don't Walk By’ campaign is encouraging E&B staff and contractors to report unsafe working practises to E&B. Mr Harty agreed to provide the Committee with a report on how the University is managing contractors for the next HSWC meeting in September.

**HSWC/2016/6 EAP Report (Paper 4)**

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that a working group had met to review the current provision of employee counselling against the new APUC framework agreement. Following discussions between members of the working group, the Head of Procurement and PAM (the sole APUC framework contractor), the University will begin a contract with PAM on 1st July 2017. Employees taking up counselling services with current provider Optum before 30th June will still be able to complete their counselling package, consisting of up to six sessions, at no additional cost to the University. Benefits of the new service will include counselling at a central location in Port Dundas (near a subway station), locally delivered call centre services and greater input to events. Ms Woolcott agreed to keep the Committee updated on this.

**HSWC/2016/7 Any Other Business**

- Dr Daly raised an issue with asbestos in level 6 of the Business School but was happy to discuss this matter with Mr Harty out with the Committee
- Mr Claughton raised an issue with disabled toilets on Campus but was happy to discuss this issue with E&B out with the Committee
- Dr Duncan informed the Committee that following a recent meeting of Senate he had agreed to be the Mental Health Champion for the University. The University have employed Peter Quinn as a consultant to look at mental health issues for staff and students and devise an action plan.

**HSWC/2016/8 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Thursday 21st September 2017 at 10am in the Melville Room.

*Created by: Miss Debbie Beales*
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Implementation of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016:

Proposals concerning Senate

Professor John Briggs, Clerk of Senate and Vice-Principal

The following paper sets out proposals intended to bring the University Senate into line with the requirements of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016.

The proposals are divided into three sections, corresponding to the three different approval routes the proposals are required to follow. Thus:

Section A comprises proposals for the composition of the ‘new’ Senate. These measures require revision of the existing Ordinances concerning the composition of Senate and thus require that the associated statutory procedure is followed, culminating in approval by the Privy Council.

Section B proposals concern the method of election of students and staff to the new Senate. The 2016 Act requires that ‘the election process is to be conducted in accordance with rules made by the governing body of the institution’. Proposals in Section B are thus proposed for approval and adoption by the University Court.

Section C consists of a number of other measures concerning the operation of the new Senate which Senate may establish in its own right. These have been considered and approved by the Council of Senate, acting on behalf of Senate, at the Council meeting on 13 April 2017.

The proposals are contained within Part 1 of the paper; Part 2 provides (for background only) explanatory notes on the proposals.

Action requested of Court

Court is requested to:

1. Endorse in principle the proposals in Section A – with Court’s agreement, an Ordinance reflecting the proposals shall be drafted and taken forward to approval through the statutory process for the development of University Ordinances.

2. Approve and adopt the proposals in Section B.

3. Note the measures in Section C.

---

1 The Act may be found at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2016/15/contents

2 Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016, Section 16 (2).
The proposals were endorsed by the Council of Senate at its 17 April 2017 meeting.

The proposed model for the new Senate is closely modelled on that of the Council of Senate and in light of operational experience of the Council of Senate. The Council was established in 2014 with a remit to act on behalf of the full existing Senate.

The key differences between the membership of the new Senate and that of the current Senate are:

- Professors are no longer members ex officio
- The addition of student members
- Majority of elected members

The removal of professors as members ex officio in particular means that the new Senate will be much smaller than the current Senate: 127 versus 650+.

The proposals are consistent with legal advice obtained from the University’s lawyers. More ambitious proposals concerning the management of the gender balance of the new Senate have had to be tempered in line with the legal advice provided.

In line with the process for the development of Ordinances, the view of the Scottish Government shall be sought on the Section A proposals at an early stage. In the event that comments on the draft Ordinance affect the proposals in Sections B or C, the latter will be amended as appropriate and resubmitted forward for Court and Council of Senate consideration. It is hoped that the new Ordinance will be approved as soon as the end of 2017.

The Universities of St Andrews and Edinburgh will also be required to amend the compositions and operating arrangements for their senates; these universities do not expect to bring forward associated proposals in the near future.
Implementation of the HE Governance (Scotland) Act 2016: Measures concerning the Senate at the University of Glasgow, 2017

1. Proposals

A. Composition of the new Senate
The 2016 Act prescribes\(^3\) that Senate will comprise: the Principal, Heads of School, elected members of academic staff (more than 50% of the total membership) and members (at least 10% of the total membership) elected by and from the student body. The Act also provides for: ‘Other members as are appointed by virtue of an enactment; in accordance with the governing document of the institution’. The relevant ‘governing document’ here would be an Ordinance\(^4\).

The proposed composition of Senate is:

**Ex officio members:** The Principal (Convener)
The Clerk of Senate
The Vice-Principal
Heads of School
Directors of Research Institutes
The University Secretary and Chief Operating Officer
Members co-opted onto Senate to permit their appointment as Senate Assessors on Court

**Student members:** To comprise 10% (rounded to the nearest integer above) of the total membership of Senate, appointed by and from the students of the University, and drawn from across the University in proportions corresponding approximately to the composition of the overall student body, with respect to both the relative student numbers in the academic disciplines and to the relative numbers of undergraduates, taught postgraduates and research students. The number of student members shall be kept under review to ensure the number of student members (other than through a casual vacancy) continue to comprise at least 10% of the total membership. The foregoing notwithstanding, in no circumstances shall the number of student members exceed thirty\(^5\).

**Elected staff members:** Elected staff members shall be twice the number of ex-officio members, and they shall be elected by and from the academic staff of the University\(^6\). Ex-officio members of the Council of Senate are not eligible to stand as elected members, but are permitted to participate in votes for elected members in the College corresponding to their own academic discipline. Academic staff who are not part of a College shall form part of the College constituency which most closely corresponds with their academic field. The number of ex officio members of Senate shall be kept under review to ensure the number of elected staff members (other than through a casual vacancy) remains twice the number of members ex officio.

---

\(^3\) *Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016*, Section 15.

\(^4\) In practice, this will involve the replacement of University Ordinance 192 (as previously amended by Ordinances 195, 196 & 198). See notes also.

\(^5\) Section 15 (3) of the *Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016* refers.

\(^6\) That is, teaching and/or research staff.
With the in-principle endorsement of the University Court and subject to the statutory approval procedure for new Ordinances, the measures proposed in Part A shall be reflected in a new Ordinance concerning the composition of Senate.

B. Method of election of members of Senate and Transitional Arrangements for establishment of the new Senate

The 2016 Act specifies that ‘the election process is to be conducted in accordance with rules made by the governing body of the institution’⁷ and that these rules ‘may include (in particular)(a) provision specifying the number of appointments to be made’ and ‘(b) different provision for different vacancies’.⁸ The governing body at the University of Glasgow is the University Court.

Proposed method of election of student members

It is proposed that the election of student members of Senate is carried out by the Students’ Representative Council (SRC), subject to the prescriptions set out above regarding the composition of the student members of Senate. The elected student members shall also be appointed as members of the SRC Council in accordance with the terms of appointment to the Council.

Proposed method of election of staff members

The proposed method of election of academic members of staff to Senate is:

The Colleges shall act as constituencies for the purposes of the election of members of academic staff to Senate. The number of elected staff members of Senate appointed by each College shall reflect, in equal measure, the College’s proportion of the total student and academic staff numbers in the University. Senate will review the numbers to be elected by the Colleges against current student and academic staff numbers every three years to ensure their currency.

A minimum of 20% of the elected members of Senate in each College shall be non-professorial members of academic staff.

Nominees must be proposed and seconded by members of academic staff in their College. Nominees must confirm their willingness to stand for election.

Elections to Senate shall be by means of the plurality-at-large method. Thus, each constituent will be given a number of votes that equates to the number of vacancies. The candidates receiving the most votes will be elected in rank order to fill the vacancies available, subject to the minimum number of non-professorial members being appointed. Where the group of candidates receiving most votes means that the minimum number of non-professorial candidates would not be achieved, the highest-polling non-professorial candidate(s) from the group of remaining candidates shall be appointed ahead of the lowest polling professorial nominees within the group of candidates receiving the most votes until the threshold number of non-professorial appointments is reached. In the event of a tie, lots will be drawn.

Elections of academic staff members of Senate shall be managed by the Senate Office.

The period of appointment of elected staff members shall be three years. Elected staff members may stand for a second, but not a third, consecutive term. The period of appointment of an elected staff member will be extended for the duration of any substantial absence from the University, such

⁷ Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016, S 11 (2).
⁸ Ibid., S11 (3).
as maternity leave or a sabbatical period away from the University. Substitutes will not be appointed during such absences.

Elected members of Senate who miss two or more meetings in any one academic session without providing apologies in advance of the Council meetings shall be deemed to have resigned from Senate, and a new member will be elected to commence his/her term of office in the subsequent academic session.

Elected members of Senate are individually and collectively responsible to Senate. Elected members are not appointed as College (or School, Research Institute or Subject) delegates.

**Transitional arrangements**
It is proposed that members of the Council of Senate are permitted to complete the terms of their appointments as members of the Council as members of the new Senate. (The same restrictions apply to periods of appointment to the Council as are proposed above for the new Senate – that is, elected members of the Council may not serve more than two consecutive terms.)

*In accordance with the terms of the 2016 Act, the proposals in Part B are recommended for approval and adoption by the University Court, subject to Privy Council approval of an Ordinance concerning the proposals in Part A.*

**C. Arrangements for meetings of Senate and appointment of officers and committees of Senate**

**Meetings of Senate**
There shall be five ordinary meetings of Senate in each academic year. Meetings shall normally be held in October, December, February, April and June.

Arrangements for the convening of extraordinary meetings shall be specified in the Standing Orders of Senate.

Meetings shall be convened by the Principal. In the absence of the Principal, meetings shall be convened by the senior Vice-Principal present (excepting the Clerk of Senate).

Items may be proposed for the Senate agenda by any member of Senate. Proposed items will be considered by the Senate Business Committee9. In the event that the Business Committee decides not to add proposed items to the agenda, it shall provide its reasons for its decision to the member submitting the proposal.

The agenda and papers for meetings of Senate will be prepared by the Senate Office two weeks ahead of meetings. Approximately one week before the Senate meeting, the Senate Business Committee shall meet to consider the agenda. It shall provide Senate with its comments in the form of an annotated agenda, sent to Senate members with the remaining papers one week before the meeting of Senate.

**Appointment of officers of Senate**

**Clerk of Senate**
The Clerk of Senate shall be elected by the members of Senate. Nominees for the position shall be members of the academic staff of the University and shall normally be past or, ideally, present members of Senate. (In the event that the person elected is not already a member of Senate, they

---

9 See notes for list of Senate Committees.
would become so automatically by virtue of the Ordinance concerning the composition of Senate – see Section A, above.) In identifying candidates for appointment, Senate shall be advised by a Finding Committee, convened by the Principal, which will also advise Senate on the remit and appointment criteria. The term of office is four years, but may exceptionally be extended by a further period of up to two years.

*Senate Assessors on Court*

Senate Assessors on Court shall be members of the academic staff of the University and normally past or, ideally, present members of Senate. For the purposes of electing Senate Assessors, constituencies shall be established by the Colleges either individually or in combination\(^\text{10}\). When seeking nominations for appointment as Senate Assessors, consideration will be given to the gender balance in the contingent of Assessors.

It should be noted that Senate Assessors do not act as delegates on Court for Senate or their home College. All members of Court are responsible both individually and collectively to Court to fulfil the duties of Court.

*Other Senate Assessors and appointments*

In addition to the Senate Assessors on Court, there are Senate Assessors for Conduct, Complaints and Academic Appeals, together with Senate nominees to the governing bodies of a small number of schools and educational trusts. While it is hoped that it will always be possible to identify these office holders from the membership of Senate, the Senate Assessors for these areas may be selected from across the academic body of the University. It has been agreed that those occupying these positions currently are permitted to complete their scheduled terms of office.

*Committees of Senate*

The Council of Senate has agreed that the committees of the Council of Senate\(^\text{11}\) are formally reappointed as committees of Senate at the first meeting of the new Senate. On appointment as committees of Senate, they shall retain their prior remits, compositions and memberships until revised by Senate either directly or on the recommendation of the committees themselves. (Committees are required to consider on an annual basis whether their compositions and remits remain appropriate.)

*The proposals in Part C were approved by the Council of Senate on 17 April 2017, subject to the approval by the Privy Council of the measures in Part A and by the University Court of the measures in Part B.*

\(^{10}\) It is expected that the individual Colleges will normally form the constituencies, but this measure permits appointments to be made (as is presently the case) on a cross-University basis, where it is not possible to have parity in the number of College nominations.

\(^{11}\) See notes for list of current committees of the Council of Senate.
2. Notes on the proposals

Section A: Composition of the new Senate

In accordance with the view of the Council of Senate on 6 October 2016, the proposed composition corresponds closely to that of the Council of Senate as established by Senate on 6 February 2014.

The key differences produced by the 2016 Act between the membership of the new Senate and that of the current Senate are:

- Professors are no longer members ex officio
- The addition of student members
- Majority of elected members

The removal of professors as members ex officio in particular means that the new Senate will be much smaller than the current Senate: 127 – v- 650+.

The new Senate would be larger than the Council of Senate (by a margin of two members) due to a slight increase in the number of ex officio members and a consequent increase in the number of student members. The overall total number conforms to the terms of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016. While the Act does not prescribe a ceiling for the size of senate/academic boards, the first draft of the Act set a limit on ‘academic boards’ of 120, and although this is relaxed in the Act itself, the Scottish Government expressed concern that the academic board should be ‘of a manageable size and efficiently run’ and the Council of Senate has taken due cognizance of this, while wishing to ensure that the new Senate should provide appropriate academic representation across the University.

The proportions of the categories of member also conform to the 2016 Act, which requires that:

- More than 50% of the members of the Academic Board members are elected by the academic staff of the institution; and
- At least 10% of the members of the Academic Board are elected from among the students of the institution.

When the Council of Senate was established, extensive discussion took place concerning the ratio of elected staff members to members ex officio and it was agreed that the ratio should be 2:1. This ratio is retained in the proposals for the new Senate. Similarly, it is proposed that the present proportion of student members of the Council of Senate (10%) should be retained in the new Senate. It is also proposed that, for the purposes of ensuring appropriate breadth of representation across the University, the Colleges should form electoral constituencies, with the numbers of members elected by each College determined on the basis of the relative size of each College as measured by its student and academic staff numbers (see below for further detail). Since the proposed ratios for elected staff and student members shall be features of the associated Ordinance, it will be necessary to ensure that these ratios are maintained in the event of any change in the number of members ex officio.

The proposed composition of the Senate includes categories not specified in the 2016 Act:

- The Clerk of Senate
- Directors of Research institutes (DRIs)
- Chief operating Officer (previously, the Secretary of Court)
- Members co-opted onto Senate to permit their appointment as Senate Assessors on Court

---

12 Scottish Government Response to the Education and Culture Committee Stage 1 Report, January 2016
13 That is, research and/or teaching staff.
The role of the Clerk of Senate has existed at the University since 1728 and the Clerk continues to play a key role in leading and managing the academic life of the University. When many of the University’s traditions concerning Senate are annulled by the new Act, the Council of Senate is supportive of the continuation of this tradition. While recent incumbents have also been appointed as Vice-Principal (who are members of Senate ex officio), the Clerk of Senate position differs from the position of other Vice-Principals because he/she is elected to the position by Senate and is not a member by virtue of another position held. (See notes on Part C below regarding the arrangements for the election of the Clerk of Senate.)

The present Senate includes a number of non-academic staff. When establishing the Council of Senate, Senate wished to limit the overall size of the Council, whilst at the same time ensuring it was representative of the academic voice of the University. It was consequently decided to limit non-academic representation to the Secretary of Court (now the University Secretary and Chief Operating Officer) as the representative of the interests of the non-academic staff, and the Council of Senate also takes this view and considers that his/her membership is beneficial to the relationship between Senate and Court.

Again, in the interest of ensuring the size of the new Senate is kept to the necessary minimum, it has been decided that the Director and Depute Director of The Glasgow School of Art, who are members ex officio of the present Senate, would no longer have membership but, in recognition of the relationship between the two institutions, would continue to receive papers and have standing invitations to attend meetings of the new Senate as observers. It is also noted that the holders of the equivalent positions at other validation partner institutions such as Scotland’s Rural University College (SRUC) and Edinburgh Theological Seminary (ETS) do not have membership, and that to extend membership to these colleagues would further contribute to the size of the new Senate. (Note: the number of degrees awarded by GSA is not significantly greater than SRUC.) To provide parity, the Principals of SRUC and ETS shall receive Senate papers and a standing invitation to attend meetings of Senate as observers.

A number of provisions for additional elected members are also removed for the same reason and it is proposed that a number of posts no longer extant should be removed from the Ordinance.

Summary of changes to the composition of Senate
In addition to the removal of professors as members ex officio, addition of student members and increase in the proportion of elected staff members, approval of the composition of Senate will involve the replacement of University Ordinance 192 (as previously amended by Ordinances 195, 196 & 198). The effect of the change to the Ordinance will be to add to the current membership of Senate:

- Heads of School;
- Directors of Research Institutes; and
- University Secretary and Chief Operating Officer

and to remove from the membership:

- the Director of Adult and Continuing Education*;
- the Deans of the several Faculties*;

DRIs are included on the grounds that they have responsibilities equivalent to those of Heads of School.
• the Convener and Joint Vice-Conveners of each of the Joint Councils or Joint Boards of Studies (i) for Architecture; (ii) for Degrees in Music and Drama; for Agriculture and related subjects; (iv) with St Andrew’s College of Education*;
• the Librarian;
• the Director of the Hunterian Museum and Art Gallery;
• the Director and Depute Director of Glasgow School of Art;
• Three members of research staff, to be elected for a period of two years from and by a constituency composed of research staff who will at least in the first year of their membership of the Senatus be members of a Faculty; one shall be a member of one of the Faculties of Arts, Divinity, Law and Financial Studies or Social Sciences; each of the other two shall be a member of one of the Faculties of Medicine, Science, Engineering or Veterinary Medicine;
• Two members to be elected for a period of two years from and by the academic-related staff of the University library; and
• Two members to be elected for a period of two years from and by those members of staff on academic-related pay scales who are neither administrative staff, Library staff, nor research and analogous staff.
* These positions are no longer extant.

**Number of members of the new Senate**
The proposals would provide for the following numbers on the new Senate:

- Ex officio: 38
- Elected membership: 76
- Student membership: 13

**TOTAL: 127**
(Not including any member co-opted onto Senate for the purposes of enabling them to be appointed as a Senate Assessor on Court, or any increase in the number of elected staff or student members appointed as a consequence of such co-options.)

**Composition of the current Senate**
For information, the composition of the present Senate is:

- The Principal (also President of the Senate)
- The University professoriate
- A number of members (n = one-third of the professoriate) elected for a three-year period by and from the academic staff of the University
- Additional members, as specified in University Ordinance 192 (as amended by Ordinances 195, 196 & 198)\(^\text{14}\).

(The membership of the full current Senate is 650+.)

Subject to the endorsement of the Council of Senate and the University Court and the statutory approval procedure for the Ordinances of the University, the measures proposed in Part A shall be reflected in a new Ordinance concerning the composition of Senate.

---

\(^{14}\) See above.
Section B: Method of election of members of Senate

Staff members

The terms of the proposals here are the same as those in place for the Council of Senate.

Traditionally, elections of staff to Senate have been conducted on a territorial basis. The main academic units – previously, the Faculties, now the Colleges – have been regarded as constituencies for the purpose of electing members of Senate. The number of elected members in each Faculty/College was/is determined by the number of professors in the same unit. Elections to Senate have been conducted by Faculty/College offices. Elections to the Council are arranged by the Senate Office and this arrangement is also proposed for the new Senate.

For the Council of Senate, the number of elected members per College is determined by (in equal measure) each College’s proportion of the total student numbers and teaching and research staff numbers in the University (reviewed every three years). A minimum of 20% of the elected members of Council in each College are required to be non-professorial members of Senate. While the 2016 Act does not distinguish between professorial/non-professorial membership, it is proposed that these arrangements are maintained for the new Senate.

The Council of Senate has discussed its concerns about other aspects of the composition of the elected membership of the current Senate and the Council of Senate – specifically, the gender balance. Currently, in academic year 2016-17 the 124 member Council of Senate is only 36% female (compared to 29% for the full Senate). Within the Elected Membership, 40% are female and 42% female among the Student Membership (in 2015-16). While the new Senate will be able to do little directly about the gender composition of the ex officio membership, it had been hoped that it would be possible to specify within the rules concerning the election of staff and student members of Senate minima for gender representation, on the basis of a 40% male, 40% female and 20% any gender split. However, legal advice is that such stipulations would be open to challenge and likely to be unlawful. It is very strongly hoped, though, that in practice these thresholds will be met and the Senate Office is requested to take informal action in support of this.

The Council of Senate considered whether a more granular, School and Research Institute-level, rather than College-level, approach to elections would be desirable. However, it was felt that the current system worked well and that to move to a more granular model would make it more complicated. It was also to recognise that it would not be in line with the ethos of the College structure and that academic matters for consideration at Senate frequently have implications that extend beyond individual Colleges, Schools, RIs or Subjects.

Student members

In practice, the student members of the Council of Senate comprise the SRC sabbatical officers and other members of the SRC Council from across the University and include both undergraduates and postgraduates. However, legal advice obtained suggests that this will not be likely to meet the requirement of the 2016 Act as it would restrict student eligibility to stand for election to Senate to those already occupying SRC positions. The Act requires that all students have the opportunity to stand for election to Senate: student members of Senate are to be ‘elected from among the students of the institution by the students of the institution’. To conform to the new Act, it has been agreed with the SRC that sabbatical and a number of SRC Council positions will be advertised as also conveying membership of Senate.

Transitional arrangements

Continuity of business is seen as essential when the new Senate is established. It is proposed that elected staff members of the Council complete the terms of their appointments as members of the
Council as members of the new Senate, and that they may stand for re-election for a second consecutive term if they have not already been so re-elected. This will also facilitate measured turnover in membership of Senate, as the initial periods of appointment to the Council were staggered and it would be helpful to preserve this in the transition to the new body.

Under the terms of the 2016 Act, the rules concerning the election of members to the new Senate in Part B are set by the University Court and are recommended to Court for adoption.

Section C: Meetings of Senate and the appointment of officers and committees of Senate

Meetings of Senate
The schedule of meetings and arrangements for issuing papers has been in place for c. 10 years. Provisions for convening extraordinary meetings are specified in the Standing Orders of Senate.

The Senate quorum
The 2016 Act is silent on the size of the quorum of the Academic Board and, without an explicit modification of legislation in the replacement Act, existing legislation remains unchanged. This means that the quorum of Senate is one-third of the membership of Senate as established in the 1858 Universities (Scotland) Act15. (See note below on cultural consequences of the establishment of the new Senate.)

Outwith meetings
Under the terms of Senate’s Standing Orders, the Principal and Clerk of Senate may act on Senate’s behalf on any urgent matter between ordinary meetings of Senate. A record of action taken is provided to the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

Standing Orders of Senate
Standing Orders for the new Senate will be submitted for approval at the first meeting of the new body.

Appointment of Officers of Senate

Clerk of Senate
The proposed procedure for appointment has been in place largely unchanged since 2001. It is recognised that, if it is expected that the nominees for appointment as Clerk of Senate are members of the new Senate, the pool from which the Clerk is appointed will be small relative to that of the much larger present Senate. While present/past membership is not a condition of appointment, it is hoped that nominees will have been members and expected that (as is already the case) the criteria for appointment will include evidence of past engagement with academic affairs in the university beyond nominees’ immediate subject area.

Senate Assessors on Court
There are presently six Senate Assessors on Court. However, the composition of the University Court is also affected by the new legislation and Court is also currently considering its future composition in light of the changes. This has informed the wording of the measures concerning the

15 In Part 3 of the 2016 Act, where the Consequential Modifications to the Universities (Scotland) Acts of 1858, 1889 and 1966 are set out, there is again no mention of the modification of the quorum of the Academic Board as it replaces Senate.
election of Senate Assessors. Assessors have in the past mostly been appointed from a constituency formed by one of the Colleges (previously, from a constituency formed by one or more of the then faculties). However, the number of Assessors on Court does not equate to the number of Colleges and so the present approach is to appoint some Assessors from the Colleges and some on a cross-University basis. This practice will continue.

The essential stipulation is that Senate Assessors on Court are appointed from the membership of Senate. (At present, they are elected from the constituency of the full Senate, not the Council of Senate.) In the past, it has been at times difficult to identify members of Senate to stand for election as Senate Assessors. With a significantly smaller body, it may be expected that this difficulty will increase, and that there will be a commensurately increased requirement for members to take on Senate-related responsibilities. As a result, it has been agreed to allow any member of academic staff to stand for election as an Assessor, and, in the event that they are not already a member of the new Senate, to include provision in the composition of the new Senate for their co-option as Senate members (see above). (There is already provision in University Ordinances for anyone appointed as an Assessor to retain membership of Senate for the duration of their appointment as an Assessor.)

There is concern with respect to the cohort of Senate Assessors to secure a good gender balance as well as territorial representation. Consideration has been given to the possibility of requiring gender-based appointments, and it has been agreed that the selection process should be mindful of the gender balance, but that this should not be prioritised above academic discipline. When seeking nominations for appointment as Senate Assessors, consideration will be given to the gender balance in the contingent of Assessors.

Other Senate Assessors and appointments
In addition to the Senate Assessors on Court, there are Senate Assessors for Conduct, Complaints and Academic Appeals, together with Senate nominees to the governing bodies of a small number of schools and educational trusts. It has been practice for Senate Assessors and nominees for these areas to be selected from the membership of Senate. As in the case of the Senate Assessors on Court, even with 650 members, the process of identifying such office holders has not always been easy. With the dissolution of the current Senate and the establishment of a much smaller body, it is anticipated the selection of suitable people to fulfil these vital important roles will be even more difficult. While it is hoped that it will be possible to appoint from the membership of Senate, it has been agreed that the Senate Assessors for these areas should be selected from across the academic body of the University. It has also been agreed that staff holding these offices currently should be permitted to complete their periods of appointment.

Appointment of Committees of Senate
Legislation permits Senate to establish any committee it wishes and to appoint members to these committees from wherever it wishes. Already, many Senate committees contain members who are not members of Senate. Again, with the much smaller new Senate, there is need to appoint correspondingly more non-Senate members to Senate committees. The Council of Senate has a number of committees and other bodies to assist it in carrying out its business. These are:

- Research Planning & Strategy Committee
- Education Policy & Strategy Committee
- Student Support and Development Committee
- University Ethics Committee for Non-clinical Research
- Council of Senate Business Committee
- Honorary Degrees Committee
- Senate Appeals Committee
• Senate Conduct Committee
• Senate Conduct Appeals Committee
• Academic Standards Committee
• Academic Dress Committee
• Gifford Committee
• Military Education Committee
• Degree Ceremonies Committee

Formally, the Council of Senate is a committee of Senate. At the appropriate point, the Council of Senate will be dissolved and the other committees listed above reappointed as committees of the new Senate, with the Council of Senate Business Committee becoming the Senate Business Committee.

**Joint Senate/Court Working Group**

Occasionally the Principal - either on his/her own initiative, or having received advice from Senate or Court - may decide that an issue is of sufficient importance to the academic work of the University that a formal Joint Senate/Court Working Group should be established. The Group would have a remit to consider the matter and to formulate recommendations to Senate and Court, and its establishment would require the approval of both bodies16.

**Likely cultural effects of the changes**

The University of Glasgow Senate has existed as currently constituted since the 1850s. The main change since then has been the accelerating expansion of Senate’s membership - it currently numbers 650+. In addition to a small number of members ex officio, Senate currently comprises all professors of the University, together with a number of elected members (n = one-third of the size of the professoriate).

While the 2016 Act will have little impact on the role of Senate, the reduction in numbers will affect functioning. Senate will no longer comprise all senior academic staff, and it is consequently hoped that colleagues whom it will not be possible to include within the ex officio membership, such as the Deans for Research, Learning & Teaching, Graduate Studies and for Transnational Education, will seek election to the new body. It will also be necessary for elected members to be active in ensuring they are informed of colleagues’ views on matters coming before Senate to help ensure decision-making is well-informed. The reduction in size also means that, in appointing officers of Senate, it will be necessary in future to permit the appointment of post-holders who are not Senate members. However, it is very much hoped that colleagues with interest in such roles will also have evidenced their interest partly through having sought membership of Senate also.

---

16 Provision for such groups was made several years ago – please see [http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_239124_en.pdf](http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_239124_en.pdf)
University of Glasgow

University Court – Wednesday 21 June 2017

Communications to Court from the meetings of Council of Senate held on 21 April 2017 and 1 June 2017

Dr Jack Aitken, Director, Senate Office

(All matters are for noting)

Meeting held on 21 April 2017

1. Principal’s Q&A

No questions had been submitted prior to the meeting, however a question was received regarding the Personal Development Review (PDR) process for Postdoctoral Researchers. Points were raised concerning the process and equitable treatment by reviewers, the performance outcomes and their basis in evidence and lack of an appeal mechanism. It was also asked whether performance outcomes were monitored.

The Principal clarified that Human Resources were responsible for the PDR process, and in consequence, it was the remit of Court rather than Council of Senate. However, it was clarified that reviewers were selected on the basis of ensuring that reviews were carried out by someone within the line management structure, while being cognisant of the number of reviews any one reviewer was expected to undertake. It was clarified that there was not an appeal process for performance outcomes, but that the purpose of the discussion was to agree on the performance outcome. It was also highlighted that the objective setting was an important part of the process that influenced the review stage. It was noted that performance was monitored by profile, rather than on an individual basis.

2. Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016

A paper on the recommendations agreed by Council of Senate would be received by Court on 21 June 2017.

Council of Senate received the final report of the HE Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 Working Group concerning the implementation of the Act at the University of Glasgow in respect of its implications for the University Senate. The Clerk of Senate reported that, since the last meeting of Council of Senate on 2 February 2017, the Working Group had received further legal advice which had enabled it to conclude its recommendations.

The report comprised of three sections:

A. Composition of the new Senate

Section A referred to the composition of the new Senate and would ultimately require Privy Council approval. Council of Senate was asked to endorse the proposals in Section A for onward transmission to the University Court for endorsement and the commencement of the procedure for a new Ordinance concerning the composition of Senate.
With the endorsement of the Council of Senate and the University Court and subject to the statutory approval procedure for new Ordinances, the measures proposed in Part A shall be reflected in a new Ordinance concerning the composition of Senate.

Section A was endorsed.

B. Method of election of members of Senate and Transitional Arrangements for establishment of the new Senate.

Section B referred to the method of election of members of the new Senate and the transitional arrangements between Council of Senate and the new Senate. This did not need Privy Council approval.

Members of Council of Senate raised some concerns about not seeking cover for maternity leave and about the approach to managing the gender balance; it was argued that the latter did not go far enough to establish a more representative gender balance. These concerns were noted; the restrictions concerning the desire for an equitable gender balance had frustrated the Working Group also, but, as noted above, were in line with the clear legal advice received. It was agreed that the aim was to encourage a better balance of representation and that the proposals be endorsed, but that there would be review.

C. Arrangements for meetings of Senate and appointment of officers and committees of Senate

Section C referred to arrangements for the meetings of the new Senate and the appointment of officers and committees of the new Senate. Council of Senate was asked to approve the following proposals which would then be reported to Court for its information.

Section C was approved as recommended.

3. Student Support & Development Committee: Report from the meeting held on 23 March 2017

Council of Senate received a report from the Student Support & Development Committee held on 23 March 2017.

The Clerk of Senate provided an update regarding the item on Counselling and Psychological Services (CaPS). It was reported that actions were being actively taken to address the challenge. As had been discussed at previous meetings of Council of Senate, it was recognised that CaPS had experienced increasing pressure, and that following discussions at Council of Senate in October extra resources were to be made available. The Clerk of Senate reported that a number of actions had already been taken, including:

- More efficient triaging of cases;
- Training of student peer supporters;
- Sharing of best practice across the institution;
- Training for selected staff in Schools and RIs.

In addition, a Student Mental Health Policy had been developed, an initiative led by the SRC, where there was scope for further development.
It had also been reported at SSDC that there was a need to develop a coherent policy across the University, and, as part of this, it had been suggested by SSDC that a Mental Health and Well-Being Champion be appointed to liaise, synchronise and develop activities and policy. It was highlighted that there were a number of Champions for protected characteristics who were members of SMG which meant that they were a voice and conduit to discussion at SMG. There was recognition that there would be benefit in a Mental Health and Well-being Champion having a close to link to the academic base in this area.

There was discussion about whether there should be a single champion, or one in each College. It was noted that the Champion would not be a substitute for existing support and the role would be about linking the existing activity, and bring this together at a strategic level. Council of Senate agreed that there should be a Senior Management level Champion that Colleges would feed into. It was also recognised that this was not just a matter that affected students and therefore should also be referred to the HR Committee for discussion.

Council of Senate was interested to find out whether there was evidence of particular issues that were impacting on students to establish whether changes could be made to the way things are done to try to help ease the pressure. It was noted that this was seen as part of the role for the Champion, but that CaPS were also looking to better understand in order to take appropriate action.

4. Convener’s Business

4.1 Brexit

The Principal reported that the Scottish Government had committed to fund EU students for 2018-19 for the duration of their studies in December 2016. This meant that the University was in a position to communicate this to applicants, which had not been possible at this stage last year, a factor which had impacted on recruitment.

A series of legal seminars had been arranged for EU and non-EU nationals to provide one to one support where necessary, although there was recognition that it was only possible to provide limited reassurance. The Principal encouraged members to support their colleagues as best they could.

Some concerns were raised about the fact that the legal advice received via the seminars had been worrying: it was reported that attendees had been advised that, if they did not take out health insurance, there was a risk to their status. It was also highlighted that there were reports that the same would also apply to students. It was reported that the health insurance matter was being lobbied on.

4.2 Scottish Funding Council and Skills and Enterprise Review.

It was reported that there had been concerns about the creation of a Super Board that would merge together current activity of Scottish Enterprise, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, Skills Development Scotland and the Scottish Funding Council, and that this would impact on the constitution. Council of Senate was advised that the four existing boards would stay in place and Scottish Government had provided assurance that Scottish Funding Council would continue to receive its own budget.

It was noted that the University had been given very late notice of recruitment targets for controlled places on some courses, for example Nursing and Teacher Education. It was
reported that through dialogue with the Scottish Funding Council and Scottish Government the HE sector was aiming to ensure that this would improve in future.

5. Clerk of Senate's Business

5.1 Rectorial Election

The Clerk of Senate formally reported the outcome of the Rectorial election held on 21st March 2017. The Council of Senate found that Mr Aamer Anwar had been elected as Rector of the University for the period 31 March 2017 until March 2020. The single-transferable voting method was used and Mr Anwar achieved the threshold for election on the first count.

5.2 Election of Senate Assessors on Court

At the end of this session, Dr Duncan Ross and Professor Karen Lury would be standing down as Senate Assessors on Court. Therefore, nominations for their successors would be sought.
Meeting held on 1 June 2017

1. Estates Strategy Update

Mrs Ann Allen, Director of Estates and Buildings provided an update on the Estates Strategy. Mrs Allen reported that over the last twelve months:

The Capital Plan had been approved by Court in December 2016 and the Master Plan had been approved in February 2017, which was a key milestone. Mathematics and Statistics had also moved in to their new temporary building ahead of work starting on the Learning and Teaching Hub, enabling works had started and demolition was expected to start in the September 2017, to prepare for construction starting in January 2018 with completion expected at the end of 2019. The full business case for infrastructure would be received by Court in June 2017.

The Research Hub was Stage 4 and the design and target price were expected to be finalised in August 17 with consideration of the Full Business Case to Court October 17. The Research Hub Director had been appointed and planning was underway with construction due to start in April 2018 and completion expected in 2020.

The following stages would include the Joseph Black Building, Institute of Health and Wellbeing Adam Smith Business School and PGT support, College of Arts and the School of Engineering. In terms of additional investment, Mrs Allen reported that changes to the service model had been implemented in February 2017. Estates and Buildings and Campus Services had been merged, to form a single Directorate to align services to new ways of working and to make the services as effective as possible and would provide opportunities to trail and test new ways of working. £30.7m spend per annum on smaller projects and maintenance. Continued short term challenged of space needs.

Mrs Allen reported that there were opportunities for student engagement with industry in terms of:

- Building on existing relationships
- Building new relationships
  - Atkins
  - Grahams
- Within Estates and Commercials Services
  - Internships
  - Talks and visits

There were also opportunities to develop a smart campus through:

- Innovation in construction
- Sensors
- Digital
- Environmental
  - Research bids
  - Internships
- Commercial opportunities
- Encouraging mixed use
- Active environments
- retail shops, café, hotels, sports and recreation facilities residential flats
It was reported that development of all projects were dependent on a sound business case that was able to demonstrate benefits, that it delivered to the University of Glasgow strategy, appropriate costings and assurances regarding delivery.

2. Draft Budget

Senior Vice-Principal, Professor Neal Juster, provided a presentation on the University’s draft Budget for 2017/18 and four-year financial forecast. The final draft Budget would

Research Policy and Strategy Committee and the Library Committee were in favour. The proposals had received mixed responses from publishers. It was noted that the decision making process would be lengthy. If Council of Senate were in favour, it was proposed that there would be a consultation across University in summer 2017, and the outcome would be reported to SMG for a decision in quarter four of 2017.

It was clarified that the Library would be able to provide advice to staff regarding contracts. It was also noted that it was anticipated that the licence would make returns to the REF more straightforward.

There was discussion about how the licence would work in terms of the pre-print server, as this was not the same as papers of the final accepted version. It was noted that it would be interesting to see what other institutions were considering regarding this.

It was agreed to take a vote to establish whether there was an appetite to move quickly, and for consultation to be reported to Council of Senate. Council of Senate were in favour of proceeding quickly.

3. Education Policy and Strategy Committee - Report of meeting held on 3 May 2017

Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy

A proposed policy on Accessible and Inclusive Learning had been developed by a working group, established by EdPSC in response to its consideration of changes in legislation, which included the expectation that higher levels of support would be provided as a matter of routine.

Professor Coton reported that the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy would be circulated to members of Senate for approval ahead of the forthcoming academic year.

4. Convenor’s Business

Complete University Guide

Professor Juster reported that the Complete University Guide had initially been published with some incorrect data which had caused the University to fall in the table. This was due to errors in the HEIDI data, which meant that entry requirements were understated. The Guide had been republished and UoG had increased by 2 places, not fallen by 7 as initially reported.

5. Clerk of Senate’s Business

Senate Assessors on Court – Consultation Paper

The Clerk of Senate introduced a paper for consultation regarding Senate Assessor on Court. It was reported that to consider the implementation of the HE Governance Act specifically with regard to Senate representation on Court, a Court-Senate Working Party had been established.
The Working Group, mindful of the restrictions to University membership on Court imposed by the legislation, had reached a position on which it now wishes to consult with Council of Senate to seek Council’s view before the Working Group goes any further in its thinking. It was reported that there were some key elements from the legislation which define a framework for future governance, and these were:

There were some key elements from the legislation which defined a framework for future governance, and these were:

- Court should comprise no more than 25 members.
- There should be “a clear lay majority” among Court’s membership. Currently, Court is made up of 14 lay members and 11 University members, so providing the required clear lay majority (see Note below).
- With regard to the structure of the University membership of Court, the HE Governance Act is quite prescriptive and requires that among the 11 University members of Court there must be at least:
  - two persons elected by the staff of the institution from among their own number;
  - one person nominated by a trade union from among the academic staff of the institution;
  - one person nominated by a trade union from among the support staff of the institution; and
  - two persons nominated by a students’ association of the institution.

A consequence of Point 3 above was that of the 11 places available for University membership of Court, six were already committed to particular persons by the legislation, leaving only five places for other members. It seemed reasonable therefore, that one of these remaining five positions should be reserved for the Principal, as the Principal was not a member of Court by legislation. This leaves only four positions for Senate Assessors on Court, a reduction of two from the present complement of six Senate Assessors.

The interim position which the working party has reached is as follows:

Four Senate Assessors, as currently constituted, would continue to be elected by Senate onto Court.

Of the two positions to be elected by the staff of the institution, as provided for in the legislation, it was suggested that one should be elected by the academic staff and one by the support staff of the University. With reference specifically to the elected academic staff member, the voting constituency would be exactly the same as that for the election of members of the new Senate - that is those staff on R&T, T-only and R-only contracts. This person could, therefore, be essentially elected as a fifth Senate Assessor. The opportunity to modernise the nomenclature might be considered. One suggestion might be that these members are called Elected Academic Members on Court, but on the understanding that they continue to fulfil current Senate Assessor duties.

The legislation required that there must be one person nominated by a trade union from among the academic staff of the University. This person, although representing additional interests from those of the five Senate Assessors/Elected Academic Members, would nonetheless also bring an academic perspective to discussions on Court, although not necessarily from a traditional Senate Assessor perspective.
The consequence of this possible arrangement was that there would remain on Court six academic staff members, as now, to ensure that the academic voice of the University, from across all four Colleges, continued to be heard, but recognising that only five, rather than six, would be fulfilling the tasks of current Senate Assessors, as currently understood.

Members queried who the electing body would be as the new Senate would be a smaller constituency than currently. It was clarified that the election would be open to all R&T, T-only and R-only contracts.

One member of Council of Senate proposed that constraining the size of Court to 25 was not in the spirit of the of the HE Governance (Scotland) 2016 Bill and it was suggested that a more inclusive approach might be favourable. It was recognised that that the Code of Good Governance made a clear recommendation regarding the size of Court not exceeding 25. It was highlighted that this was a matter for Court although Council of Senate could express its views.

There was discussion around the suggestion that each College should have a representative Senate Assessor on Court and one additional from any College, in order to ensure that a spread from across the Institution was maintained.

Council of Senate were generally supportive of broadening of Academic expertise being represented by Senate Assessors on Court.