

University Court meeting 11 October 2017

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

The Full Business Case for the Research Hub, part of the Capital Plan approved by Court in December 2016

The annual briefing on progress against the Learning & Teaching Strategy and associated KPIs

An update on the Transformation Programme

The papers also include

Recent University Rankings

Recommendations relating to Remuneration Committee matters

A report two years on from Court's decision relating to to disinvestment in fossil fuels, under the Socially Responsible Investment Policy

The Mental Health Action Plan

The University Risk Register and mitigating actions

The Annual Report to the SFC on Institution-led Review of Quality/Governing Body Statement of Assurance

Proposed changes to the HR Committee remit

Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 21 June 2017 in the Senate Room

Present:

Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member (Vice-Convener, in the chair), Mr Ken Brown Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Professor Lindsay Farmer Senate Assessor, Dr Carl Goodyear Senate Assessor, Professor Nick Hill Senate Assessor, Mr Ameer Ibrahim SRC President, Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson General Council Assessor, Ms Lauren McDougall SRC Assessor, Mr Murdoch MacLennan Chancellor's Assessor, Ms June Milligan Co-opted Member, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Professor Sir Anton Muscatelli Principal, Ms Elspeth Orcharton Co-opted Member, Dr Duncan Ross Senate Assessor, 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 Muffy Calder (Head of College of Science & Engineering and Vice-Principal), Professor James Conroy (Vice-Principal Internationalisation), Professor Frank Coton (Vice Principal Academic and Educational Innovation), Professor Anna Dominiczak (Head of College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences and Vice-Principal), Dr David Duncan (COO and University Secretary), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Professor Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh (Head of College of Arts and Vice-Principal)

Observer: Ms Kate Powell, SRC President elect

Apologies:

Members: Mr Aamer Anwar Rector, Professor Karen Lury Senate Assessor, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr Ronnie Mercer Co-opted Member, Ms Elizabeth Passey Co-opted Member (Convener of Court)

Attendees: Professor Jon Cooper (Vice-Principal Innovation & Knowledge Exchange), Professor Miles Padgett (Vice-Principal Research)

CRT/2016/42. Principal's Contract of Employment

The Principal and Court attendees other than Dr Duncan and Ms Barr were not present for this item. There were no declarations of interest in relation to the item.

Court members had received the report of a Court group that had been convened in the spring to review the Principal's performance in his role, to consider whether the University should offer an extension to his current contract of employment and, if so, on what terms, and to report to the current meeting with recommendations. The process had included the group receiving a presentation from the Principal, setting out his assessment of the University's current performance and his views on the priorities for the next 5-7 years.

The group had made a recommendation to Court to offer Professor Sir Anton Muscatelli a

five-year extension to his contract of employment as Principal and Vice Chancellor of the University, to run until 30 September 2024. Separately, the Remuneration Committee had considered the Principal's salary, in the context of benchmarking data from other institutions, and was recommending an increase to be paid incrementally over 3 years, based on satisfactory performance assessed through the P&DR process on an annual basis. Court noted that in making this recommendation, the Committee had taken account of the budget for salary increases across the University, which was c3% per year including incremental drift.

Court approved the recommendation relating to the extension of the Principal's contract of employment on the terms recommended. Court also approved the proposed salary increase on the terms recommended.

CRT/2016/43. Announcements and Declarations of Interest

CRT/2016/42.1 Announcements

Kate Powell, SRC President elect, was welcomed to the meeting as an observer.

Ken Brown, Ameer Ibrahim and Duncan Ross were attending their final meeting. Court thanked them for all their contributions to Court business and wished them well. Court's thanks to Karen Lury, whose last meeting it would have been, were also recorded in her absence.

On behalf of Court, the Vice-Convener congratulated the Principal on his recent knighthood.

CRT/2016/42.2 Declarations of Interest

The Principal would be updating the meeting about the USS triennial review. The Principal was a USS board member. There were however no conflicts of interest given the factual content of the update to be provided.

CRT/2016/44. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 12 April 2017

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2016/45. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2016/46. Report from the Principal

CRT 2016/46.1 Higher Education developments

CRT 2016/46.1.1 University Funding

Court noted details of the SFC final funding outcome for 2017/18. The SFC had retained its commitment to maintain Teaching and Research funding at 2016/17 funding levels, with the University's total Teaching and Research funding for 2017/18 being £138,114k, a 0.71% increase on 2016/17. The outcome was slightly better than the original forecast for 2017/18, and was mainly due to the continued improvement in Research Excellence Grant funding post-REF 2014, and to minor adjustments in the teaching funding methodology. Court noted that multi-year funding, which had been referred to as a possibility in the past, was not currently occurring.

In time for session 2018/19, the SFC would review the Subject-to-Subject Price Group mappings referring to TRAC (Transparent Approach to Costing) data, to re-allocate subjects to Subject Price Groups. The Council would also review the number of students in each Subject Price Group, compared to the 2012/13 original allocation. Planning & Business Intelligence had begun an analysis of the University's data to assess any potential impact.

The SFC had also confirmed that the Scottish Government had agreed to fund a student intake for two pre-medical entry courses in 2017/18. Twenty additional funded places had been allocated to the University for pre-medical entry courses for students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

CRT 2016/46.1.2 Higher Education and Research Act 2017

On 27 April, the UK Parliament had passed the Higher Education and Research Act 2017. The Act would create the (regulatory) Office for Students (in England), and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), a single, strategic body that would 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 introduced a Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), linked to rises in tuition fees; and the opening of the Higher Education market to alternative providers.

The government had accepted changes to its plans to open the sector to new providers, agreeing to additional safeguards when granting degree-awarding powers. It had 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. The government had rejected a Lords amendment calling for students to be removed from the target to reduce net migration.

CRT 2016/46.2. Transformation Programme

The University's transformation programme was a programme of cultural change aligned to workstreams in the Strategic Plan and the delivery of the Capital Plan approved by Court in December 2016. A transformation team was being recruited and an external independent consultant had facilitated a workshop with SMG to establish programme priorities and ways of working.

Court would be updated further in October.

CRT 2016/46.3 USS - Triennial Valuation 2017

Every three years, pension schemes were required to undergo a valuation in line with pensions law. USS was required to carry out its latest valuation as at 31 March 2017, with the outcome to be submitted to the Pensions Regulator by 30 June 2018. The USS Trustees were currently considering the technical provisions assumptions underlying the valuation. After the 2014 valuation, the USS benefit structure had been altered to move to a hybrid Defined Benefit (DB)-Defined Contribution (DC) scheme. However, USS had shared with employers that pension costs for the DB component at the 2017 valuation might increase markedly compared to the 2014 valuation, due to continuing low gilt yields, lower expected asset returns and increased longevity. The main issue related to the cost of future benefit accrual under DB. A particular issue for discussion between the major stakeholders (UUK representing the employers, and UCU) would be the extent to which the reliance of the pension scheme on the sector covenant was acceptable. The risk for the sector was the possibility of the additional risk of higher future contribution rates *in extremis* (from both members and employers). The trustees would consult formally with stakeholders on the technical provisions assumptions in the early autumn.

Court would be kept informed of developments.

CRT 2016/46.4. Outcome Agreement - Dumfries

The Dumfries consolidated Outcome Agreement was in the process of being drafted. Court agreed to give delegated authority to the Principal to approve the finalised document during the summer, since the agreement required to be submitted to the SFC during that period. Court would receive a copy of the finalised document.

CRT 2016/46.5. University Rankings

There had been three recently published UK League Tables. In the Complete University Guide, the University had risen two places from 29th to 27th since 2016 (30th in 2015 and 2014); and the University had been placed 23rd in the Guardian league table, up from 26th in 2016 (24th in 2015 and 25th in 2014). Glasgow had fallen 2 places in the 2018 QS table to 65th (63rd in 2017). The University had been recognised as one of the Reuters Top 100: Europe's Most Innovative Universities for the first time.

CRT 2016/46.6 Key Activities

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

CRT/2016/47. Report from the Rector

In the absence of the Rector, there was no report.

CRT/2016/48. University Performance, Annual Budget 2017/18, Four-Year Forecast and Capital Plan

Court received a paper providing an update on the University's current performance against its strategic KPIs, the 2017/18 budget, the four year financial forecast and the capital plan anticipated spend profile to 2022/23.

Court noted a summary of the University's annual performance against the Primary and Secondary Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) previously approved by Court. Court noted the largely positive trends in KPIs, where the measures had been recorded over a number of years. Court also received details of trends in league tables, both global and domestic. Court heard that the main challenges to meeting KPIs related to student assessment and feedback, and to staff holding research grants. There were challenges around KPIs for gender equality, carbon footprint and student mobility, where targets were particularly ambitious. With respect to league tables, there was ongoing work to improve performance in the areas of: student satisfaction, where it was noted that a number of local surveys provided useful granular data; Student:Staff Ratios; and Facilities Spend.

With regard to the budget background, Court heard that between 2012/13 and 2015/16, the University had grown turnover by 24% against a backdrop of flat public spending in research and education and in the face of an increasingly competitive global HE market. The budget showed that income would continue to increase year on year over the forecast period. The income growth was possible because a series of considered investment decisions had enabled

the University to continue to enhance its performance and grow its reputation.

The main investment priorities over the next 3 years were: to develop underlying student infrastructure; improve the student experience; develop new student markets; build towards REF 2020; and re-develop the Gilmorehill campus. These goals would be achieved through data-driven decisions, with data visualisation software helping to analyse performance and inform decisions, and a data warehouse being implemented. The Transformation Programme would include development of new processes and systems and introduction of new ways of working.

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 students was expected to increase incrementally to £188.2m per annum (2020/21) from £163.1m in 2017/18.

Court received an update on progress on the capital plan, key achievements including planning permission having been secured for the Western Infirmary site, a delivery partner having been appointed, and Phases 1a and 1b spend forecasts being on track. There had been a shift in projected spend to the outer years, but with the projected overall spend largely the same, and including some flexibility, for example for additional project capability.

Court approved the 2017/18 Budget, the 4-year financial forecast 2016/17 to 2019/20 for submission to the SFC, and the Capital Plan forecast spend to 2022/23.

Court thanked Professor Juster for the briefing.

CRT/2016/49. Capital Expenditure: Infrastructure Full Business Case

Court had received a briefing from Ann Allen, Director of Estates & Buildings, ahead of the current meeting. The briefing had included a discussion of risks associated with this area of capital expenditure, and the management of these. It had been noted that until ground work had begun, and statutory authorities given, the risks associated with these areas remained.

Court was now invited to approve the Infrastructure Full Business Case in the sum of £72.7m, which would fund delivery of the infrastructure and public realm proposal for Phase 1a and Phase 1b of the Campus redevelopment project. This sum compared with a budget in the Capital Plan of £75.5m. The proposal had been considered by Programme Governance Board, CapEx Committee, Estates Committee and Finance Committee, with recommendations for the CapEx's approval by Court having been made.

Court noted a summary from David Milloy regarding Estates Committee's consideration of the Full Business Case. The Committee had received reports which had given it confidence about the management of risk and costs, and it had been satisfied about the contingency costs built into the budget. The Committee had been particularly supportive of the element of the project's budget that was for landscaping and giving the campus a 'sense of place', and Mr Milloy commended this to Court as a very important element. The Estates Committee had considered that the design and legal fees relating to the Dumbarton Road and Church Street should not have been included in the CapEx for the full business case, but had approved the full case nevertheless.

Court noted from Ken Brown that the Finance Committee had expressed a concern about whether there was sufficient cost certainty, in the context of the costs having been untested by

tendering. In particular, the utilities negotiations that would be required contained an element of cost risk. Ann Allen advised that, from a governance perspective, the project would be subject to the agreed processes for the campus redevelopment, and to University financial regulations, therefore if there were any movement in costs, this would require to be transparent and brought through for approval by the relevant bodies. David Duncan advised that Court would receive details about the landscaping and finishing work, so that members could get a sense of what was being achieved for the cost.

With regard to the inclusion of the Dumbarton Road and Church Street design and legal fees, Court heard that this element had been included for practical reasons only, since these fees did not sit obviously with any other project. This work would have its own business case. Court agreed that this element should be separated out from the Infrastructure Full Business Case.

Court thanked all those involved for the progress on the campus development to date. Court approved the Capital Expenditure Infrastructure Full Business Case, subject to removal of the Dumbarton Road and Church Street design and legal fees element (£2.3M). The approval was therefore for £70.4M of expenditure.

CRT/2016/50. Report from the University Secretary

CRT/2016/50.1 Appointment of the Principal

The matter had been considered at the start of the meeting.

CRT/2016/50.2 Remuneration Committee

Court attenders were not present for this item.

The Committee had considered matters relating to remuneration of the Convener of Court. Court noted that the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 permitted such remuneration and that the draft Code of Good HE Governance also made reference to the matter. Court had previously agreed, prior to the introduction of the 2016 legislation, that the post would be unremunerated, but that expenses and lost earnings could be claimed. The advertisement for the post had been drafted accordingly.

Court noted that the backdrop had altered somewhat in light of the legislation, and that other institutions were currently addressing the matter of Convener remuneration. Some members expressed reservations about the principle of remuneration and also about any retrospective remuneration being agreed. The issue of payment of remuneration and the distinction between this and compensation for lost earnings was also discussed. It was agreed that this was an important matter which should be discussed in more detail by the Remuneration Committee over the summer, with a report to be provided to the October meeting of Court. It was agreed that the paper should provide clarity about the principles governing quantum of any remuneration and should provide suggested guidelines for the future for Court's consideration.

CRT/2016/50.3 Court Governance

Court's Governance Working Group had met in May. It had agreed a response to the consultation on the draft (revised) Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, a copy of which response had been provided to Court for information. The response had welcomed the consultation and endorsed its principles, and also agreed with many of the individual proposals. It had however suggested that a shorter, more focused, document would be better, respecting the sector's autonomy and diversity, and allowing some elements of flexibility. It had referred also to the absence of reference to key roles of a governing body, and suggested that clarity on the respective roles of the Rector and Senior Lay Member at the ancient Universities might be provided.

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

The Group had also reviewed the outcome of Court's recent self-assessment of its effectiveness. Court approved recommendations connected to this, covering: Court papers and presentations being more highly focused on strategy, and meetings being as inclusive as possible; a reduction in numbers of Court attenders; more opportunity for Court members to interact with each other; reminders being sent about University events and attendance by members at Court Committees, as observers; and better use of members' skills and expertise being considered as part of the review of Committee remits and memberships, scheduled for next session.

Following good practice as set out in the Code of Good HE Governance, Murdoch MacLennan had undertaken an appraisal of the Convener's performance and had provided Court with a summary.

CRT/2016/50.4 Ordinances regarding elections of Chancellor and General Council Assessors

The current Ordinances for the elections of the Chancellor and General Council Assessors required postal voting and included 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 was 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 be included instead in local regulations. Court approved this approach, noting that a draft Ordinance would now be drawn up and circulated for approval ahead of the formal consultation process.

CRT/2016/50.5 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.

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 had been 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. Court noted that terms of all the Private Placement documents were approved by the Group on 20 June 2017. Court's approval was then given to the Principal and University Secretary being the signatories on these documents.

CRT/2016/50.6 Court Resolution: Amendment to composition of Board of Catholic Education

The Board of Catholic Education had been 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 were governed by a University Resolution, which had been approved following the required consultation with the Senate and General Council. Amendments to the Resolution's text were now required to reflect changes in University structures and in nomenclature.

Court noted comments from Duncan Ross on the clause about possible direct communication with the Education Policy and Strategy Committee, and about the responsibilities of the Board including: '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'. Dr Ross commented that the University's quality assurance provisions, overseen by Senate, should govern the provision, and that an additional body should not be involved. Court noted that the relevant parts of the text were already in the current Resolution governing the Board and were not the subject of the amendments.

Court approved the draft Resolution. There would be a one month formal consultation.

CRT/2016/50.7 Nominations Committee Business

CRT/2016/50.7.1 Finance Committee

Graeme Bissett left the meeting for this item. Court approved a recommendation from the Nominations Committee that Graeme Bissett become convener of the Finance Committee to the end of his term on Court, following Ken Brown leaving Court.

CRT/2016/50.7.2 Audit Committee

Court approved a recommendation from the Nominations Committee that Mr Vincent Jeannin be appointed to the Audit Committee for 4 years from 1 August 2017.

CRT/2016/50.8 Head of School Appointment

Professor Michele Burman had been re-appointed as Head of the School of Social & Political Sciences from 1 August 2017 to 31 July 2019.

CRT/2016/50.9 Security and Safety Matters

Court noted that campus security had been reviewed following recent attacks in the UK. Building cladding had been examined following the recent tower block fire in London and it has been confirmed that the materials did not present a danger. Cyber security was also reviewed regularly.

CRT/2016/51. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2016/51.1 Finance Committee

CRT/2016/51.1.1 Budget, financial forecast and capital plan

The Budget and Four Year Forecast/Capital Plan had been considered by the Finance Committee and recommended to Court for approval. Approval of these items had been given by Court earlier in the meeting under item CRT/2016/48.

CRT/2016/51.1.2 Infrastructure Full Business Case

The Infrastructure Full Business Case had been by the considered by the Finance Committee and recommended to Court for approval. Approval had been given by Court earlier in the meeting under item CRT/2016/49, subject to removal of the Dumbarton Road/Church Street fees element being removed.

CRT/2016/51.1.3 Endowment Investment Report

Court noted an endowment investment report as at 30 April 2017.

CRT/2016/51.1.4 Financial reports

Court noted an overview of performance as at 30 April 2017.

CRT/2016/51.1.5 Student Union deficit

Court noted a comment relating to the level of the QMU deficit, as outlined in the Student Finance Sub-Committee summary. Dr Duncan agreed to take forward discussion about improving the financial position, via this Sub-Committee.

CRT/2016/51.2 Estates Committee

Court noted the report, including: Estates Committee's approval of the Infrastructure Full Business Case, subject to a number of recommendations being addressed, ahead of it being considered by the Programme Governance Board, Finance Committee and Court; and Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications relating to: James Herriot (McCall) Building External Fabric Works £840k; Thomson Building (Anatomy) upgrades £1,822,228; 13 Professors' Square - conservation works £1,215,500; Programme Delivery Management Service (PDMS) Fees £19.8m; relocation of Forensics from the Joseph Black Building to Glasgow Royal Infirmary £1.449m; Psychology, Hillhead Street (additional space) £160k; and Institute for Health and Wellbeing (design fees and development of full business case) £1.94m.

CRT/2016/51.3 Audit and Risk Committee

The Committee had received: internal audit reports on reviews of Marketing and Communication, and SCENE bank accounts; and the updated Risk Register. The Committee had discussed a draft Internal Audit Risk Assessment and Plan 2017/18. The Committee had approved the External Auditors' approach to preparing the financial statements for the year to 31 July 2017.

Court received the current University Risk Register, which was being provided to each June meeting of Court, as previously agreed during the review of Court's involvement in Risk Management arrangements. Court noted that two members of the Audit and Risk Committee had attended the annual risk workshop, as part of these arrangements. It was proposed that discussion on the register should take place at the Strategy Day in September.

Court noted the report.

CRT/2016/51.4 Human Resources Committee

The Committee had discussed its remit, considering matters of membership and meeting format, as well as the aims of the Committee. The discussion would continue at a future meeting. The Committee had received a presentation regarding the People aspects of the University Research Strategy and the wider work of the Research Strategy and Innovation Office. The Committee had discussed a replacement for the existing competency procedure, and minor amendments to the Management of Organisational Change policy, to enable changes to the University approach to redeployment.

The HR Director's strategic update had included briefings on Strategic Recruitment, the Strategy Transformation Programme, the University's response to Brexit, the positive impacts of the Early Career Development Programme and other initiatives delivering a more diverse senior community.

The report was noted.

CRT/2016/51.5 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

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

The report was noted.

CRT/2016/52. Communications from Council of Senate 21 April and 1 June 2017

CRT/2016/52.1 Proposals for Composition of Senate

Court received a paper containing proposals for the composition and operation of Senate in light of the requirements of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016.

Proposals for the composition of the 'new' Senate required revision of the relevant Ordinances and therefore required that the associated statutory procedure be followed, culminating in approval by the Privy Council. A key aspect of the composition of the new body was that it would require to be smaller (c120) than the current body (c550). There would also be a higher proportion of elected members and the body would include student members. It was noted that although the proposals did not provide for non-academic staff such as Library staff to be members of Senate, such staff would be invited to attend for items of business where relevant, and the University Secretary was a member of the new body and as such would represent non-academic interests.

Proposals concerning the method of election of students and staff to the new Senate were being made in the context of the 2016 Act requiring that 'the election process is to be conducted in accordance with rules made by the governing body of the institution'. Proposals were therefore being made by the Council of Senate, for approval and adoption by Court. Transitional arrangements were also being proposed.

A number of other operational measures had been drafted for the proposed new Senate, which measures Senate was permitted to establish in its own right. These had been considered and approved by the Council of Senate, acting on behalf of Senate, at the Council of Senate's meeting on 13 April 2017.

Court endorsed in principle the proposals relating to the composition of Senate; approved the

Court Wednesday 21 June 2017

proposed method of election of members of Senate and transitional arrangements for establishment of the new Senate; and noted the proposed operational details for Senate. With regard to the composition of Senate, an Ordinance reflecting the proposals would now be drafted and taken forward to approval through the statutory process for the development of University Ordinances.

CRT/2016/52.2 Meetings of Council of Senate 21 April and 1 June 2017

In April, the Council of Senate's business had included consideration of proposals for the composition of and election to Senate; receipt of a report from the Student Support and Development Committee; and receipt of the Convener's and Clerk of Senate's reports. In June, the Council of Senate had received an update on the Estates Strategy, a briefing on the University budget, and a consultation paper relating to Senate Assessors on Court and possible future arrangements for the election of academic and other staff representatives to Court, in light of the requirements of the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016.

The Communications were noted.

CRT/2016/53. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

CRT/2016/54. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Court will be held on Wednesday 11 October 2017 at 2pm in the Senate Room.

Court Context Card 11 October 2017 - Principal's Report

Speaker	Professor Anton Muscatelli	
Speaker role	Principal	
Paper Description	For information	
<i>Topic last discussed at Court</i>	Last report to Court was June 2017	
<i>Topic discussed at Committee</i>	NA	
<i>Committee members present</i>	NA	
<i>Cost of proposed plan</i>		
<i>Major benefit of proposed plan</i>		
<i>Revenue from proposed plan</i>		
<i>Urgency</i>	NA	
<i>Timing</i>	Various	
<i>Red-Amber-Green Rating</i>	Various	
<i>Paper Type</i>	For information / discussion	
<i>Paper Summary</i>	<p>Updates on areas listed in the paper as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transformation Programme 2. Student Admissions including RUK 3. USS - Triennial Valuation 2017 4. League Table Rankings and NSS 5. Russell Group 6. TEF 7. Outcome Agreement - Dumfries (Attached at Annex) 8. Graduation in dual and joint degrees at Nankai University and UESTC 9. Key activities 10. Senior Management Group business 	
<i>Topics to be discussed</i>	In line with paper's headings	
<i>Action from Court</i>	To note/discuss if wishes	
<i>Recommendation to Court</i>		
<i>Relevant Strategic Plan workstream</i>	Empowering People, Agility, Focus	
<i>Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve</i>	NA	
<i>Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve</i>	NA	
<i>Risk register - university level</i>		
<i>Risk register - college level</i>		
<i>Demographics</i>		
<i>% of University</i>	Items mainly relate to the University as a whole	
<i>Operating stats</i>		
<i>% of</i>		
<i>Campus</i>	All locations	
<i>External bodies</i>	UCAS; USS; league table compilers; UK Government; Scottish Government; SFC	
<i>Conflict areas</i>		
<i>Other universities that have done something similar</i>		
<i>Other universities that will do something similar</i>		
<i>Relevant Legislation</i>	Pensions legislation; Higher Education and Research Act	
<i>Equality Impact Assessment</i>		
<i>Suggested next steps</i>		
<i>Any other observations</i>		

Court - Wednesday 11 October 2017

Principal's Report

Items A: For Discussion

1. Transformation programme

At the Court meeting in June, Court received a brief report on actions taken with respect to the Transformation programme. The Transformation programme aims to engage with staff and students to define the services they need and then to effect change to improve our business processes, enhancing efficiency and effectiveness and ultimately improving the University experience for staff and students. It brings together the three workstreams (Focus, Agility, and Empowering People) set out in the Strategic Plan 2015-20. An external independent consultant had facilitated a workshop with SMG to establish priorities for the transformation programme and ways of working, and had helped design the new office's working methodology. A transformation team is being established.

A Vision and Charter has now been drawn up for the Transformation programme and Professor Neal Juster will brief Court further at its meeting on 11 October.

2. Student Admissions including RUK

Admissions to the University for 2017/18, for Undergraduate and Postgraduate (PGT/PGR), Home, RUK and International students, are summarised below.

Undergraduate

A total of 4,952 undergraduate students will be admitted to the University this September versus a total target of 4,868. The sections below detail the intake by funding category.

Non RUK (Scottish & EU Admissions)

A total of 3,594 students were admitted from Scotland and EU versus a funded target of 3,518 (76 above target).

MD20/MD 40

Within the 3,518 Scottish Funded Target, the University was required to recruit a minimum of 845 students from areas of Multiple Deprivation (MD20/40 postcodes). A total of 889 students have been admitted in this category, meeting our SFC funded target.

RUK Admissions

A total of 772 RUK students have been admitted this year compared to 751 in 2016.

International

A total of 586 International students have been admitted this year compared to 507 in 2016 and 462 in 2015.

Postgraduate PGT/PGR

A total new intake of 5,703 PGT students (split 2,509 UK/EU, 3,079 International and 115 Online) have now registered at the University compared to 4,690 in 2016 (split 2,099 UK/EU, 2,519 International and 72 Online). This represents a year on year growth of 21.6% (19.5% UK/EU, 22.2% International and 59.7% Online).

A total new intake of 525 PGR students (split 392 UK/EU, 111 International, and 22 Online) have now registered at the University compared to 415 (split 325 UK/EU, 69 International, and 21 Online) at the same point in 2016, representing a 26.2% Year on Year growth (split 20.6% UK/EU, 60.8% International, and 1.0% Online).

3. USS – Triennial Valuation 2017

As Court has heard previously, 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 Trustee is currently consulting formally with Universities UK (UUK), which represents the sponsoring employers on the technical provisions assumptions.

The Trustee's consultation closed at the end of September and a conclusion on the technical provisions by the Trustee will be reached in the next few weeks.

I will provide a verbal update to Court on the consultation.

4. League Table Rankings and NSS

The University was recently named Scottish University of the Year by The Times and The Sunday Times Good University Guide 2018. The University rose nine places in the associated national league table, to 20th. Glasgow gained in six of the nine performance indicators used to rank universities in the annual undergraduate guide, and was also shortlisted for the overall University of the Year award for the whole of the UK. There were improvements in rankings for graduate prospects, completion rates, teaching quality and student experience. Entry standards also rose using the new UCAS tariff system and the proportion of students graduating with a first or 2:1 went above 83%. The University was also top in three subject tables: animal science, dentistry and education, second placed in four subject tables (Medicine, Nursing, Sports Science and Veterinary Medicine), third place in three (Civil Engineering, Agriculture and Social Policy). In total, 26 subject tables out of 47 were in the top 10.

At the time of the June Court report, we had details from three League Tables: the UK's Complete University Guide (up to 27th from 29th); the Guardian league table (up to 23rd from 26th); and in the QS table we were down to 65th from 63rd. Since then, and in international league tables, the University has been placed 80th in the THE World Rankings, up from 88th last year.

This year's National Student Survey (NSS) outcome was published in August, with excellent results for the University, which overall was rated joint 1st in the Russell Group of research intensive institutions, 3rd in Scotland and joint 17th overall in the UK (15th if small, specialist institutions are excluded). 19 subjects are in the top 10 for the UK with 3 at number 1 - Italian Studies, Pharmacology, Toxicology & Pharmacy and Archaeology.

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

Items B: For Information

5. Russell Group

In September, I became Chair of the Russell Group. In early statements in this capacity, I have stressed the value of the HE sector to students, the economy and society, and emphasised how research intensive universities are engines of social mobility and economic growth that are key to the future success of the UK. I have particularly emphasised the need for Russell Group Universities to demonstrate the public good which is generated from the public investment received. I've also argued that the sector should play a significant role in the UK's industrial strategy and in Brexit negotiations.

6. Teaching Excellence Framework

As Court is aware from previous reports, the Higher Education and Research Act 2017 introduced a Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). The outcomes of TEF-2 were published in mid-June. Five Scottish Universities decided to join the TEF and this self-selecting group, as predicted on the basis of the core metrics, generally fared well. The Russell Group had mixed fortunes although, overall, the outcome for the group was better than initial expectations based on metrics alone. There were some high-profile "bronze" awards including to LSE and Southampton. Some relatively low ranked universities secured gold TEF status and are now heavily pushing the outcome in their marketing materials.

The government has now committed to running subject-level TEF-3 pilots over the next two years. The sector has expressed concerns over the two methodologies being trialed and the associated workloads associated with these pilots. Commitment to engaging with the pilots is mixed in the rest of the UK and very limited in Scotland.

Within the provisions of the UK Higher Education and Research Bill was a commitment to a statutory, independent review of TEF within one year, delaying the introduction of measures linking the TEF to differentiated tuition fees. The boycott of the NSS and other analysis of the

metrics has highlighted the flaws within the core methodology and so it is possible that a review will suggest significant reform of the TEF. With this in mind, we are continuing to monitor developments ahead of any possible reconsideration of entry into the TEF. It is possible, however, that some academic staff may engage with the TEF-3 pilots as reviewers to provide the University with more insight into the process.

7. Outcome Agreement - Dumfries

At the June meeting, Court gave me delegated authority to approve the finalised Outcome Agreement for Dumfries, since the agreement required to be submitted to the SFC during the summer. The document has now been submitted.

8. Graduation in dual and joint degrees at Nankai University and UESTC

Over the past few years, Court has received updates on our Trans-national Education agenda. This has included collaborative arrangements with partners in China, two of which comprised the creation of a joint Graduate School with Nankai University in Tianjin (focusing on Social Sciences) and a Joint Educational Institute with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC) in Chengdu (focused on Engineering, largely UG). I am pleased to report that in July, the first cohorts of students graduated from these institutions, with 29 MSc degrees in International Relations, Environmental Management, and Urban and Regional Planning (Nankai); and 109 BEng (Honours) Electronic and Electrical Engineering jointly-delivered degrees (UESTC), these students receiving two degrees, one from each institution.

A new Masters programme – MA Translation Studies – was launched at Nankai University in September 2017.

9. Key activities

Below is a summary of some of the main activities I have been involved in since the last meeting of Court, divided into the usual 4 themes: Academic Development and Strategy; Internationalisation activities; Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University; Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events. In order to cut the length of this report, I have, in the main, provided brief headings and can expand on any items of interest to Court.

Academic Development and Strategy

10 July: Attended an NHS/UoG Joint Strategy Group Meeting.

14 July: Participated in the interviews for the new Director of the CRUK Beatson Institute for Cancer Research.

14 August: Chaired the interview panel for Daniel Jack Chair in Economics.

8 September: With the Head and Deputy Head of the College of Science & Engineering, met with Jon Stanton CEO, Weir Group.

27-28: SMG visited Uppsala University, Sweden to meet its senior team as part of our SMG development programme.

Internationalisation Activities

24 June – 1 July: Trip to China to attend the University of Nankai and University of UESTC graduations as noted in Item 8 of the report.

1 September: Met with the Vice Chancellor, University of Malaysia, who was visiting the University.

26 September: Met with the Slovak Ambassador to Hungary, Rastislav Kacer.

Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

3 July: Attended and gave the vote of thanks at the Naomi Eisenstadt Lecture - Review of the life chances of Young People. An Honorary Research Fellow at Oxford, Naomi was appointed Independent Advisor on Poverty and Inequality by the First Minister in summer 2015. This event marked the launch of her second report, *A Strong Start to Adulthood*, following the request of the First Minister to pick up on Action 10 of her first report to review and focus on the life chances of young people in Scotland.

4 July: The University was hosting a visit by the EPSRC Council and I joined them for lunch and in partnership with colleagues, provided a presentation and overview of the University.

6 July: Attended a Russell Group Staff away day as part of my preparation towards assuming Chair of the Russell group in September. For the same purpose, over 16/17 August, I participated in a filmed interview, which covered personal and professional aspects of my life, and an overview of the challenges and opportunities facing HE.

6 July: Participated in a CASE Governance Steering Committee Conference Call.

USS and USS related activity:

- 11 July attended a USS Board training session and USS Ltd Trustee Board meeting and on 15 August participated in a dial in Board meeting;
- 19 July & 13 September attended a USS Investment Committee Meeting;
- 16 August: Participated in discussions with the Chair of Employers Pensions Forum and Director of USS;
- 14 September took part in a teleconference to discuss the future of Universities Superannuation Scheme Limited (USSIM);
- 18 September attended USS Chairman's dinner for Directors, the Chairs of USSIM and the JNC, the group Chief Executive officer and the Chief Investment officer. The following day attended USSIM strategy day, followed by a meeting of the Trustee Board;
- 29 September took part, with the Director of Finance in a follow-up interview with PwC as part of the USS's Covenant review process.

13 July: Attended the keynote address given by Lord McConnell and contributed as 'discussant' at the Council for European Studies Conference hosted by the University.

19 July: Met with the Permanent Secretary, Sir Andrew McCormick in London.

19 July: Co-hosted a dinner held in the Telegraph Offices, London where Murdoch MacLennan shared his thoughts on developing a generation of leaders, reflecting on his thirteen years in charge of the Telegraph Media Group.

20 July: While in London, I took the opportunity to meet with Amy Braier, Pears Foundation; Paul Ramsbottom of the Wolfson Foundation; and Andrew Neil.

21 July: Met Claire Mack, and on 24 July Alison Muckersie, new Commissioners on the Commission for Economic Growth to brief and introduce them to the work of the Commission.

10 August: Met with Iain MacRitchie, the founder, Chairman and Trustee of MCR Pathways, an organization that seeks to uncover, nurture, develop and help realise the skills and capabilities in 'looked after' young people,

11 August: Along with Director of Communications and Public affairs travelled to Dumfries campus to meet Oliver Mundell MSP for Dumfriesshire and a member of the Education Committee, Scottish Parliament.

25 August: Attended an SFC Council Business Meeting and on 10 October, an SFC Finance Committee Meeting.

29 August: Provided an interview for the THE.

30-31 August: Attended and participated in CASE conference, including chairing a panel session on *Universities and influence: how institutional advocacy really works* and a CASE briefing session on Brexit – *What do I need to know now and what should I be doing about it?* I also contributed to the closing Plenary session which focused on *10 Big Ideas to Secure the Future of Education*.

1 September: Met with Carol Monaghan MP for Glasgow North West who in addition to our meeting had taken the opportunity to visit our Quantic facility.

1 September: Took part in Council of Economic Advisers teleconference.

1 September: Attended The Scottish Economy Book launch, which was hosted at the University.

3-4 September: Attended the THE World Academic Summit and participated in a panel session *Cities and Universities – mutual dependency for mutual growth?* Other panel members were Jo Beall, Director of Education and Society, British Council; Ronald Daniels, President John Hopkins University; Cheryl de la Rey, VC University of Pretoria; Chorh Chuan Tan, President of the National University of Singapore.

- While there, I took part in a THE filming session as part of a promotional video for Teaching Excellence Summit that the University is hosting next summer.

- I also met with Professor Jan Palmowski Secretary General The Guild of European Research-Intensive Universities.

4 September: Principally in connection with the Russell Group, I met with Branwen Jeffreys, BBC, to explore possibilities of a more extended interview at some point in the future.

Late afternoon, I met with Jo Johnson, Minister of State for Universities, Science, Research and Innovation and Tim Bradshaw, acting Director of the Russell Group.

6 September: Gave an interview to Sue Leonard of the Sunday Times.

6 September: Attended the UUK Annual Conference, Brunel University, and as part of a small panel, gave a presentation on the theme, *Maintaining and Developing a local leadership role*.

7 September: Delivered a talk and presentation to THE 'global team' on *International challenges and opportunities for Higher Education*.

11 September: Met with a delegation from German Federal Ministry of Economics and provided a presentation on the University, possible implications of Brexit, and our future plans.

11 September: Attended, with the Senior Vice-Principal, the Principals' Dinner in St Andrews which includes the Principals and their deputies of St Andrews, Aberdeen, Edinburgh and Dundee.

14 September: Met with Linda Hanna, Strategy & Sectors Scottish Enterprise.

14 September: Attended a Russell Group DVCs Meeting in Edinburgh and gave a presentation on *Issues and Priorities for the Russell Group*.

14 September: Attended a dinner hosted by the Chamber of Commerce with the First Minister as guest speaker.

20 September: Met with Ruth Davidson, Leader of the Scottish Conservatives.

21 September: Delivered keynote address and presentation at the Institute of Development Professional in Education (IDPE) conference and participated in a roundtable discussion following the presentation. The topic was *Brexit and Higher Education*.

22 September: Took part in a teleconference discussion with the President of Italian Rectors, Professor Gaetano Manfredi and Tim Bradshaw, Russell Group.

22 September: Gave an interview to BBC Newsdrive.

3 October: With the Head of Planning and Business Intelligence visited THE in London for discussions with Phil Baty, editor of THE and Baerbel Eckelmann to discuss the teaching excellence rankings.

3 October: Attended a Senior FinTech Steering Committee meeting in London.

4 October: Took part in teleconference discussion with NCUB regarding Transforming Growth.

5 October: Hosted a discussion, requested by Dr Stuart Fancey SFC, with colleagues around areas of research, innovation, capital and climate change.

6 October: With the Director of Communications and Public Affairs, Peter Aitchison and Public Affairs and Public Policy Officer, Sean McGivern, met with the Leader of Glasgow City Council Susan Aitken.

6 October: Met with Patrick Grady MP, Dr Liberty Vittert, Lecturer in Statistics at Glasgow & Cathy Belly, Director of Development.

6 October: Met with Mark Bevan, the new Chief Executive, SCDI.

9 October: Met with John Scally, National Library of Scotland.

Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

4 July: Participated, as did other members of the senior management team, in a Visionary Interview led by an external consultants, as one, of a number of methods being used to gather information about the key behaviours that are important for effective performance in Professional Services staff within the University. These key behaviours will form part of the information used to create the Glasgow Professional Competency Framework. The Framework will be deployed to provide a clear and consistent sense of behavioural expectations of all Professional Services staff and will be integrated into our future HR processes and talent management practices.

5 July: Presided at the Graduation Ceremony in Dumfries.

29 August: Provided a filmed video message for an event in Shanghai which brings alumni together from a range of Universities, including Glasgow.

8 September: Convened the first meeting of the GUS Book Project Editorial Board.

11 September: Delivered the annual Freshers Address in the Bute Hall.

14 September: Took part in a film clip to celebrate University's accolade of Scottish University of the Year.

15 September: Provided the welcome address to the conference "*Celebrating One Hundred Years of Russian Teaching at the University of Glasgow - Past, Present and Future*" and hosted a lunch reception in the Lodging. The Russian Consul General, Andrey Pritsepov, presented the

Chronicles of Ivan the Terrible, also known as the “Tsar Book”, to the University of Glasgow at the reception.

15 September: Attended the ribbon cutting ceremony and reception for the new Mathematics & Statistics Building.

25 September: Introduced and gave the welcome to the *200 years of the Regius Chair of Chemistry Symposium* and later in the day, attended the current Regius Chair, Professor Lee Cronin’s, Inaugural Lecture and thereafter hosted a Lodging dinner.

6 October: Took part in video clip regarding the Research Hub & Transformation Programme.

6 October: Attended the Charles Kennedy Memorial Debate and dinner that followed.

10 October: Provided the welcome to Scottish Centre for War Studies - Harry Rankin Memorial Lecture and Dinner.

Continued monthly meetings with the SRC President and sabbaticals

10. Senior Management Group business

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

SMG Meeting of 20 July 2017

- Update on Professorial Zoning

SMG Meeting of 15 August 2017

- SFC Review of Actual Student Places in each Subject Price Group
- Return on Investment: in-Country Officers
- SRC: The year ahead: SRC President and sabbaticals
- NSS results
- TEF outcome analysis
- Knowledge Exchange strategy
- SFC GCRF Block Grant Allocation
- Online Learning Partnership Update

SMG Meeting of 21 August 2017

- Access to EU Research Funding post-Brexit
- Slavery and the University of Glasgow – update
- External Launch of the Research Beacons
- Excellent Service Awards and Excellent Community Engagement Awards
- Admissions update

SMG Meeting of 28 August 2017

- Research Hub Business Case
- Early Career Development Programme

- Professorial Reward & Pay Progression
- Recruitment Process Review
- Centre for Chronic Diseases
- Gaelic Language Plan

SMG Meeting of 4 September 2017

- External Launch of the Knowledge Exchange & Innovation Strategy
- Securing Funds from RCUK for Postdoctoral Staff Training and Development
- Changes to Principal's Advisory Group (PAG)
- RCUK GCRF Collective Fund Hub Call
- Professorial Reward and Pay Progression

SMG Meeting of 11 September 2017

- Preparing for REF 2021: Consultation on Initial Decisions, and Plans for Nominating Sub-Panel Chairs
- Mental Health and Wellbeing Action Plan

SMG Meeting of 20 September 2017

- 2018-19 Proposed Planning round approach
- College Articulation Update
- Update on SFC Review of Actual Student Places in each Subject Price Group
- Incentivised Recruitment Policy

SMG Meeting 25 September 2017

- Recruitment Review: Update
- Transformation Programme – Vision & Charter
- Student numbers & Teaching space
- Long Service Awards
- Sustainability: Working Group and Development Goals

SMG Meeting 2 October 2017

- Update on admission numbers

Court Context Card 11 October 2017 - University Secretary's Report

Speaker	Dr David Duncan	
Speaker role	COO and University Secretary	
Paper Description	For information / some items for discussion/decision/approval	
<i>Topic last discussed at Court</i>	Regular report to Court	
<i>Topic discussed at Committee</i>	NA	
<i>Committee members present</i>	NA	
<i>Cost of proposed plan</i>		
<i>Major benefit of proposed plan</i>		
<i>Revenue from proposed plan</i>		
<i>Urgency</i>	High item A1; Medium/Low rest	
<i>Timing</i>	Immediate where relevant	
<i>Red-Amber-Green Rating</i>	Green	
<i>Paper Type</i>	Decision/Discussion/Information	
<i>Paper Summary</i>	<p>Report from Secretary on a number of items for Court's discussion/decision and/or information, as follows (A items only):</p> <p>A1 Court's approval is sought for the suggested approach by Remuneration Committee to the annual review of SMG salaries; Court is asked to approve a revised remit and membership for the Remuneration Committee</p> <p>A3 The Mental Health Action Plan is provided to Court for information, and discussion if members wish.</p>	
<i>Topics to be discussed</i>	As above plus any B items Court members may wish to discuss	
<i>Action from Court</i>	Listed under each item: specific decisions requested under:	
<i>Recommendation to Court</i>	A1 as above under relevant A item	
<i>Relevant Strategic Plan workstream</i>	Empowering People, Agility, Focus	
<i>Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve</i>	NA	
<i>Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve</i>	NA	
<i>Risk register - university level</i>		
<i>Risk register - college level</i>		
<i>Demographics</i>		
<i>% of University</i>	100% Cross University application on several items	
<i>% of college</i>		
<i>Operating stats</i>		
<i>% of</i>		
<i>Campus</i>	All locations	
<i>External bodies</i>	Committee of Scottish Chairs; Investment Managers; Scottish Government; Glasgow City Council; QM Union	
<i>Conflict areas</i>		
<i>Other universities that have done something similar</i>	Other Scottish HEIs will be discussing Remuneration issues, and mental health policies	
<i>Other universities that will do something similar</i>		
<i>Relevant Legislation</i>	Higher Education governance; Financial regulations (investments)	
<i>Equality Impact Assessment</i>	relevant to Mental Health Action Plan	
<i>Suggested next steps</i>		
<i>Any other observations</i>		



Court - Wednesday 11 October 2017

Report from the University Secretary

SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Remuneration Committee

Remuneration Committee will conduct the annual review of the salaries of SMG members in the autumn. In line with established practice, it will submit a full minute of that meeting to the December meeting of Court, summarising the decisions it has made and setting out their rationale.

Court may recall that in 2014 the Committee of Scottish Chairs issued a Guidance Note for Remuneration Committees. One aspect of it is that 'each year, in advance of the committee's annual review of senior salaries, the governing body should provide policy guidance to the committee'. On behalf of the Remuneration Committee, I am seeking Court's view on whether it is content with the statement provided in **Annex**, which reflects the policy guidance that Court has approved in each of the last two years.

Is Court content to proceed in this way?

Please see attached paper relating to:

Other remuneration issues (**Annex**).

As part of this paper, Court is asked **to approve** a revised remit and membership for the Remuneration Committee. Is Court willing to approve this ?

A.2 Socially Responsible Investment Policy SRIP

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

A.3 Mental Health Action Plan

As also noted in the HR Committee report, I have recently assumed the role of Mental Health Champion within the University. Mental health accounts for the highest number of lost staff days within the University, and there has been a significant increase in student demand for University counselling services in recent years. Court members may have seen media reports on Higher Education Statistics Agency data showing that 1,180 students, who

experienced mental health problems, left UK universities early in the 2014-15 academic year, the most recent year in which data is available; this represents a 210% increase from 2009-10.

A joint University/SRC mental health action plan has been developed and will be launched on 10 October (World Mental Health Day). It is at

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/courtoffice/mentalhealthactionplan/>

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Court Strategy Day

Court's annual strategy day took place on 29 September, with an overarching theme of how we can enhance the University's competitive position, taking into account current and emerging changes in the external environment. There were main sessions on the University's competitive position, the University as a student destination of choice and on the political context, with opportunities for group discussion and more informal interaction. Court also had a presentation on the Full Business Case for the Research Hub. Feedback received to date indicates that Court members found the day useful and informative.

B.2 Nominations Committee and Committee memberships business

i) New Court Co-opted member

A vacancy arising from Ken Brown leaving Court was advertised over the summer. Interviews were held on 3 October and it is hoped that the Nominations Committee will be able to make a recommendation to Court at the meeting on 11 October, for a co-opted appointment to be made for a 4 year term.

ii) Co-opted members – terms of office

Graeme Bissett and David Milloy will end their first term on Court on 31 December 2017. The Nominations Committee **recommends to Court** that Graeme and David be reappointed to Court for 4 years from 1 January 2018. Both are willing to continue on Court.

iii) Remuneration Committee convenership

Over the summer, the Nominations Committee recommended to Court, and Court agreed, that June Milligan take on the convenership of the Remuneration Committee, following Ken Brown's departure from Court.

iv) Finance and Remuneration Committee vacancies

Over the summer, the Nominations Committee also recommended to Court, and Court agreed, that Gavin Stewart and Ronnie Mercer fill vacancies on, respectively, the Finance Committee and Remuneration Committee, that were created following Ken Brown's departure from Court.

B.3 *Scottish Code of Good HE Governance*

Following the consultation on the draft Code, which took place earlier in the year, a final draft has been issued and will be considered by the Committee of Scottish Chairs on 3 October. Once the finalised Code is published, there may be areas for further consideration by the Court Governance Working Group and thereafter by Court. I will report further at the December meeting.

B.4 *Court Business 2017/18*

The Schedule of Court Business for the coming year is at **Annex**, for reference. It is also available on the Court website at <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/courtoffice/universitycourtandcourtmeetings/> along with other resources for Court members.

A Fast Facts document was circulated for the Court Strategy Day and is also available from the Court Office, as is a list of acronyms used in HE and the University.

The attendance lists for meetings of Court and its Committees for 2016/17 have been reviewed; there are no issues to report in connection with this.

B.5 *Senate Assessors on Court*

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

B.6 *Glasgow City Council Assessor on Court*

Cllr Susan Aitken, Leader of the City Council, was nominated by the Council to be on Court, from June 2017.

B.7 *Court attendance by SMG members*

At the last meeting of Court, the Court Governance Working Group recommended that the number of attenders at Court meetings be reduced to a minimum and that only papers' authors, or executives whose expertise is likely to be required at a particular meeting, be invited to attend. Court agreed with the recommendations. On this basis, most SMG members will not now routinely attend Court meetings. The Senior Vice-Principal, the Director of Finance and the University Secretary will continue to attend all meetings of Court.

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

B.8 *Resolution 677 Board of Catholic Education*

At the last meeting, Court approved a draft Resolution amending the membership, remit and responsibilities of the Board of Catholic Education, to

reflect changes in University structures and in nomenclature since earlier Resolutions. There was a month's consultation on the draft, as required by statute. A small number of comments were received from members of Senate, all of which were dealt with by response from the Head of School; and there was one comment which suggested minor (clerical) changes to the draft, which were made. I have since approved the Resolution on Court's behalf.

B.9 *QM Union*

At the last Court meeting, there was concern about the level of the QMU deficit, as outlined in the Student Finance Sub-Committee summary. Since then, progress has been made in improving the financial position, including: the QMU identifying a level of reserves below which it may not go; the QMU being required to budget for surplus/break-even, breaking that down by month to enable monitoring; monthly meetings with the University to monitor the 17/18 budget and spend; and the QMU putting in place arrangements whereby there is close scrutiny of expenditure and plans by its Finance Committee.

B.10 *Honorary Degree Nominations*

In line with the previously agreed arrangement with Senate to allow members of Court to submit observations on nominations for honorary degrees, the Clerk of Senate John Briggs will advise Court of the 2017/18 nominations, on a confidential basis, under the *Communications from Council of Senate* agenda item. Members of Court should contact the Clerk of Senate should they have observations to make.

Advice to Remuneration Committee, 2017

Proposed method of reviewing senior management salaries

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

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

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

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

Guidance Note on the operation of remuneration committees in Scottish higher education.

The context

Effective governance is vital to the success of Scotland's higher education institutions, and the remuneration committee is an important part of the governance framework. This guidance note considers the work of remuneration committees and is intended to clarify key principles and elements of good practice. Higher education institutions are autonomous bodies, and each institution must develop its own approach, consistent with the character of the organisation and the expectations of its stakeholders.

The reputation of higher education can be damaged by pay packages for senior staff that are perceived to be out of line with pay and conditions elsewhere.

Remuneration committees face a challenge in responding to the global market for talent, while ensuring that pay is clearly justified by performance and that salary increases are sustainable. This is an important reputational issue and therefore one that is of concern to the governing body.

A further important consideration for remuneration committees is that they should operate in a spirit of openness with regard to their policies and practice. There is a legitimate public interest in the remuneration of senior executives in higher education, and there has often in the past been a perception of secrecy surrounding pay decisions. Scottish higher education strives to apply the highest standards of governance, and in that context it is important to demonstrate transparency around remuneration policies and processes.

General Principles

Good governance requires that the governing body has in place a policy and arrangements for determining the pay of senior staff. These must ensure that senior staff are appropriately remunerated with regard to performance and retention. They must also be robust and proportionate in their use of the University's funds.

Remuneration committees must implement the policy approved by the governing body. They must make pay decisions that are justified, fair and equitable. They must also report to the governing body in sufficient detail to demonstrate that they have applied the policy approved by the governing body and that they have done so in a sound and rigorous manner.

Terms of Reference

Membership. The remuneration committee should include at least three independent members (not necessarily members of the governing body), one of whom should be a member of the finance or equivalent committee, and from among whom a committee chair should be appointed. Among them, these members must have substantial remuneration committee experience. In addition, the membership should include the chair of the governing body.

The Principal should be consulted on remuneration relating to other senior post-holders and should attend meetings of the committee, except when the committee discusses matters relating to his/her own remuneration.

It is essential that the committee is serviced by an officer of appropriate seniority to provide the necessary advice and guidance. This should be the secretary of the governing body or the director of human resources. The committee's secretary must have the means to commission external professional advice as required.

The Remit of the remuneration committee should be established by the governing body, which should review it at least once every three years. The committee must have responsibility, operating within policies approved by the governing body, for setting the salaries of the members of the University's senior management team. It should also be required to ensure that appropriate and robust arrangements are in place for determining the salaries of all other senior staff (professorial and equivalent).

The committee should oversee implementation of the University's severance policy, and should have specific responsibility for determining any severance payment to a member of the senior management team.

Method of Operation

The policies and processes used by the remuneration committee in reaching decisions on individuals should be discussed by the whole governing body. Each year, in advance of the committee's annual review of senior salaries, the governing body should provide policy guidance to the committee.

The committee's decisions on pay must be evidence-based. They should be informed by a robust system of monitoring individual and team performance against agreed objectives.

In addition, the remuneration committee must consider comparative information on salaries and other benefits and conditions of service in the higher education sector. Useful UK sources are: the CUC database of salaries, benefits and conditions of service for heads of institution; and the UCEA data on the salaries of senior university staff. Benchmark data of this sort provides useful indicators and a framework for the exercise of judgment: it should not be used in a mechanistic or formulaic manner. It is important also that the benchmarks selected should be regularly reviewed by the remuneration committee.

It is essential that the remuneration committee should meet often enough and for long enough to ensure that its business is transacted thoroughly and with attention to detail.

Severance Payments

The University should have a policy on severance payments, approved by the governing body, and consistent with the terms of the SFC financial memorandum.

The remuneration committee should oversee the implementation of the severance policy. Its specific approval should always be required for any severance payment that:

- exceeds a threshold sum, as defined by the governing body;
- departs from the standard severance terms approved by the governing body;
- or
- applies to a member of the senior management team.

In considering these matters the remuneration committee must represent the public interest and avoid any inappropriate use of public funds. It should be careful not to approve a severance package which staff, students and the public might reasonably deem excessive.

Reporting

The remuneration committee's reports to the governing body should provide sufficient detail (including clarity on the nature of benchmark data the committee has used) to enable governors to assure themselves that a fair, sound and rigorous process has taken place, since overall responsibility for this rests with the governing body.

The remuneration committee should identify those posts in the senior team which are regarded as forming the senior executive team, and it should publish the salaries of this group of staff by salary band.

Transparency serves to maintain trust in an organisation, and institutions should think carefully about what information they can place in the public domain. This is a sensitive subject, with considerations of personal and commercial confidentiality set alongside a legitimate public interest in the salaries of senior university managers. Practice at several Scottish higher education institutions is that reports provided to the governing body are made publicly available.

Review

The work of the remuneration committee should be included within the institution's Internal Audit Plan.

There should be external review of the remuneration committee's practices. This may take place through the appointment of an external expert to act as an observer on the committee and/or through a periodic effectiveness review, conducted by an external expert.

Committee of Scottish Chairs, August 2015

Remuneration Committee

In recent weeks, there has been considerable media coverage of the issue of pay for Vice Chancellors (Principals) and other senior managers in British universities. Much of this has focused on how pay levels are determined and whether the processes used by universities are robust, fair and transparent. This paper outlines the arrangements that are in place at the University of Glasgow and raises the question of whether any changes should be implemented.

1. Who determines the pay of the Principal and senior managers?

Senior members of staff at the University — those in professorial positions or equivalent — are not covered by the national pay negotiations between the employers' association and campus trade unions. The pay of the Principal and other members of the Senior Management Group is determined by the Remuneration Committee, which is a sub-committee of the University Court. This approach accords with the requirements of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance. It is similar to that used in the private sector.

The pay of other professorial staff is determined by the University's Professorial Staff Performance & Reward Policy.

2. How is the membership of the Remuneration committee determined?

As with all sub-committees of Court, appointments to the Remuneration Committee are made by Court on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee.

The Remuneration Committee currently comprises a Convener, four other lay members (including two members of Court) and the Principal (who leaves the room when his own remuneration is under discussion). The current chair is also the chair of the Human Resources Committee. At present, two of the lay members are not members of Court — they were appointed specifically for their professional expertise in reward and remuneration.

The Chief Operating Officer & University Secretary, and the Director of Human Resources are in attendance to advise the committee (the former leaves the room when his remuneration is under discussion).

3. Should we consider amending the membership of the Remuneration Committee?

If Court agrees, it is proposed to amend the membership to remove the Principal as a member. The Principal would still attend for part of the meetings in order to advise on the performance of those who report directly to him. The Chief Operating Officer & University Secretary would also be in attendance for part of the meeting to advise on governance matters. The Director of Human Resources would attend for the whole of the meetings. For the avoidance of doubt, no officer would be in attendance while his or her own remuneration was under discussion.

Court might also wish to consider extending the membership of the Remuneration Committee to include staff and student representation.

If the proposal that the role of Convener should be remunerated is accepted, Court may take the view that the Convener should cease to be a member of the Remuneration Committee.

4. What is the remit of the Remuneration Committee?

The current remit of the Remuneration Committee is set out in Appendix A.

If Court agrees, it is proposed to amend the remit to cover the remuneration of the role of Convener of Court. In addition, it is proposed that the Remuneration Committee should exercise general scrutiny of expenses claimed by the Principal and members of the Senior Management Group (Appendix B - these are approved by the Principal and, in the case of the Principal himself, by the University Secretary).

5. To whom is the Remuneration Committee accountable?

The Remuneration Committee is accountable to the University Court.

6. Is the work of the Remuneration Committee sufficiently transparent?

The Remuneration Committee submits its minutes to the Court, for discussion if members so wish.

In recent years, at the December meeting of Court, members have also received details of senior management salaries, showing, in £10K bands, the salaries for all senior managers who are remunerated above a certain level.

The remuneration of the Principal is detailed in the University's annual financial statements. Summary information on other salaries over £100,000 a year is also provided in the financial statements.

7. What information does the Remuneration Committee use to determine pay levels of the Principal and senior managers?

The Remuneration Committee takes account of:

- a. Assessments of the performance of the Principal and other members of the Senior Management Group.
- b. Data on rates of pay in competitor universities (as provided annually by the Universities and Colleges Employers' Association - UCEA).
- c. Data on Vice Chancellor pay compiled by the Committee of University Chairs (CUC).
- d. Advice from the University Court.
- e. The average rate of increase in University pay (which in turn is affected by the annual cost of living increase, incremental drift and new appointments).
- f. Information provided by the Director of Human Resources to ensure that full account is taken of equality issues (with particular regard to gender equality).

8. How do pay levels at the University of Glasgow compare with those at competitor institutions?

The Principal's pay is towards the lower end of the scale for remuneration of the 24 Russell Group universities. In Scotland, he was the third highest-paid head of the 15 HE institutions during academic year 2015-16.

The pay of other members of the Senior Management Group is broadly aligned with average rates of pay applying across the Russell Group.

9. Have pay levels for the Principal and senior staff been increasing more rapidly than those for other members of staff at the University?

The data for the past five years shows that the pay of the Principal and his direct reports has on average been increasing at a similar rate to that of the average member of staff, once cost of living increases and incremental drift are taken into account. The financial statements show that the Principal's pay increased by 3.2% in 2013, 5% in 2014, 1.8% in 2015 and 0.72% in 2016. It is currently £278k (excluding pension contributions) and, as already agreed by Court, will rise to £288k from 1 October 2017.

10. What are the implications of the Revised Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance (Appendix C)?

This Code was published in late September and approved by the Committee of Scottish Chairs on 3 October. The main new requirement is that the Remuneration Committee is expected "to seek the views of representatives of students and staff of the institution, including representatives of recognised trade unions, in relation to the remuneration package of the Principal and the senior executive team". We will need to consider how this expectation can best be met and come back to Court with recommendations.

David Duncan
Chief Operating Officer and University Secretary
2 October 2017

Remuneration Committee – current remit

Remit

- 1 To formulate the University's remuneration policy, and to review that policy annually, recommending changes to Court as appropriate
- 2 To determine salaries for members of the Senior Management Group, having regard to:
 - Their performance in advancing the University's strategic objectives,
 - The need to offer salaries that are competitive with those of other major UK universities, as reflected in robust comparative data, and
 - The budget approved by Court
- 3 In the absence of the Principal, to determine the Principal's salary
- 4 Annually, to determine the University's policy on the performance-related reward of professorial and senior administrative staff (all level 10 staff)
- 5 To advise Court on the University's policy on severance arrangements for staff, and, within parameters agreed by Court, to implement that policy, considering, on an individual basis, any severance proposal that:
 - Departs from the parameters agreed by Court, and/or
 - Pertains to for a member of the Senior Management Group.
- 6 To ensure that the Committee's membership includes the skills and experience necessary to address its remit effectively. To this end, the Committee may request that the University Court appoint one or more additional co-opted members to the Committee. The Chair of the Committee will participate in the selection process for a new co-opted member.

Membership

Convener (lay), Principal, 4 external members, including lay members of Court

Remuneration Committee – proposed new remit

Proposed revised terms of reference:

- removing the Principal as a member of the committee
- introducing a reference to the expenses incurred by senior management
- requiring the committee to determine any remuneration of the Convener of Court
- introducing a reference to oversight of contracts of employment for senior staff
- requiring the committee to seek the views of representatives of staff and students on the remuneration of the Principal and his senior executive team.

Remit

- 1 To formulate the University's remuneration policy, and to review that policy annually, recommending changes to Court as appropriate;
- 2 To determine the salaries of the Principal and other members of Senior Management Group, having regard to:
 - Their performance in advancing the University's strategic objectives,
 - The need to offer salaries that are competitive with those of other major UK universities, as reflected in robust comparative data, and
 - The budget approved by Court;
- 3 Annually, to determine the University's policy on the performance-related reward of professorial and senior administrative staff (all level 10 staff);
- 4 In the absence of the Convener of Court, to make recommendations on the nature and level of any remuneration for the Convener of Court, subject to approval by Court;
- 5 To advise Court on the University's policy on severance arrangements for staff, and, within parameters agreed by Court, to implement that policy, considering, on an individual basis, any severance proposal that:
 - Departs from the parameters agreed by Court, and/or
 - Pertains to for a member of the Senior Management Group
- 6 To maintain oversight of contracts of employment for senior staff;
- 7 To receive an annual report on expenses incurred by members of the Senior Management Group.
- 8 To ensure that the Committee's membership includes the skills and experience necessary to address its remit effectively.
- 9 To seek the views of representatives of students and staff of the institution, including representatives of recognised trade unions, in relation to the remuneration package of the Principal and the senior executive team.

Membership

Chair (lay member of Court), 2 other lay members of Court (one of whom will be the Convener of Court), 2 other co-opted members

In attendance: Principal, COO/University Secretary, Director Human Resources

Extract from Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance (revised 2017)

The governing body must establish a remuneration committee to determine and review the salaries, benefits and terms and conditions (and, where appropriate, severance payments) of the Principal and such other members of staff as the governing body deems appropriate. The policies and processes used by the remuneration committee must be determined by the governing body, and the committee's reports to the governing body should provide sufficient detail to enable the governing body to satisfy itself that the decisions made have been compliant with its policies.

78. Membership of the remuneration committee should have a majority of lay members. A majority of these lay members should be members of the governing body (others may be external lay committee members). The membership should include the Chair of the governing body. The committee chair should be a lay member of the governing body and should not be the Chair of the governing body. The Principal should be consulted on remuneration relating to other senior post-holders and should attend meetings of the committee, except when the committee discusses matters relating to the Principal's own remuneration.

79. The policies and processes used by the remuneration committee in reaching decisions on individuals must be discussed by the whole governing body and approved by that body. The remuneration committee's reports to the governing body should provide sufficient detail of the broad criteria and policies against which decisions, including in relation to any unusual severance payments, have been made.

80. In addition, the remuneration committee is expected to seek the views of representatives of students and staff of the institution, including representatives of recognised trade unions, in relation to the remuneration package of the Principal and the senior executive team. This requirement may be implemented in part through relevant members of the governing body serving as members of the remuneration committee or attending its meetings, or may be achieved through separate consultation with representatives of the student and staff communities. The relevant process should form part of the policies and processes approved by the whole governing body, as outlined above.

81. The remuneration committee is expected to represent the public interest and avoid any inappropriate use of public funds. The remuneration committee is expected to seek and make use of sufficient relevant information to reach well informed evidence-based decisions. This should include appropriate comparative information on salaries and other benefits and conditions of service in equivalent positions in the Higher Education sector and elsewhere, including other organisations that similarly receive public funding; national pay awards and rates of pay used throughout the institution; and assessments of relevant individuals' performance. The remuneration committee should oversee contracts of employment for senior staff and should ensure that these do not specify periods of notice of more than 12 months and do not require the payment of pension enhancements (except where these follow from pension scheme rules). The remuneration committee is expected similarly to act proportionately and with regard to the appropriate use of funds when considering severance arrangements for senior staff.

ANNUAL SCHEDULE OF COURT BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

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

Court Context Card - 11 October 2017: Finance Committee Report from its meeting on 18 September 2017

Speaker	Graeme Bissett
Speaker role	Finance Committee Convener
Paper Description	Finance Committee Report to Court
<i>Topic last discussed at Court</i>	Jun-17
<i>Topic discussed at Committee</i>	Sep-17
Committee members present	Court members present at last meeting: G Bissett, N Hill, S Kennedy, R Mercer, Principal, E Orcharton, E Passey, K Powell
Cost of proposed plan	see separate Research Hub FBC paper
Major benefit of proposed plan	
Revenue from proposed plan	
Urgency	High
Timing	Immediate
Red-Amber-Green Rating	Green
Paper Type	
Paper Summary	
FC/2017/07	Finance Committee approved 7 Capex applications, summary attached
FC/2017/09	Finance Committee approved the Remit and Annual Agenda Plan
FC/2017/12	Finance Committee noted the Investment Reports
FC/2017/15	Finance Committee noted an update on the Capital Projects
FC/2017/18	Finance Committee noted a report showing the Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2017
Topics to be discussed	Research Hub Full Business Case For Court discussion if Court wishes: progress of Capital Projects; Committee Remit (unchanged); Capex Applications approved; Investment Reports; Period 12 Overview of Performance.
Action from Court	To approve Research Hub Full Business Case; Other items for discussion if Court wishes, and noting .
Recommendation 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	
Risk register - university level	5. Financial Resource
Risk register - college level	
Demographics	
% of University	100% undergraduates 100% postgraduates 100% home students 100% overseas students 100% staff
Operating stats	
% of	100% revenues 100% of costs 100% of profits 100% real estate - land 100% real estate - buildings 100% of total assets 100% of total liabilities
Campus	All
External bodies	Investment managers
Conflict areas	
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	

DRAFT

University of Glasgow

Finance Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Monday 18 September 2017

in Committee Room 251, Gilbert Scott Building

Present:

Mr Graeme Bissett (Convenor), Mr Robert Fraser, Prof Nick Hill, Dr Simon Kennedy, Mr Ronnie Mercer, Prof Sir Anton Muscatelli, Ms Elspeth Orcharton, Ms Elizabeth Passey (via teleconference), Ms Kate Powell

In attendance:

Mrs Ann Allen, Dr Neil Bowering (Item 08), Mr Gregor Caldow, Dr David Duncan, Prof Neal Juster, Mr Martin Munro (Item 08), Ms Fiona Quinn

Apologies:

Ms Heather Cousins, Mr Gavin Stewart, Mr Iain Stewart

FC/2017/01. Summary of main points

- Finance Committee considered the full business case for the Research Hub and feedback from the Convenor of the Estates Committee. It was noted that the costing remained subject to final clarification, though within a relatively small range. Finance Committee were supportive of the project in the overall context of the campus development plan and acknowledged that the project could not be determined by a fully quantitative financial analysis. The Committee noted the schedule of benefits set out in the business case but requested more information on the incremental financial impact of the project. The decision on recommendation or otherwise was deferred pending receipt of these details, which would be incorporated into the business case presented to Court.
- The Committee approved the revised format for Capex applications including the summary schedule. A total of seven Capex applications were considered (in addition to the Research Hub) and approved, with aggregate capital spend of £14m and including four projects which would be fully funded by external grant.
- A new report providing an overview of progress on the campus development was noted and the Governance arrangements for capital projects were reviewed and noted.
- The Committee approved the updated format of reporting on investment performance and comments from the Investment Advisory Committee. The report provided a succinct view of endowment investment performance against targets and now included reporting on the stewardship of cash funds raised from the recent bond issue which will be progressively used to fund the campus development.

- The Committee noted the overview of performance which incorporates a view on short- and long-term cashflow. The results for the year ended 31 July 2017 disclosed an operating surplus of £12.9m compared to budget of £1.0m. The equivalent figures under the FRS102 accounting basis were actual of £46.3m and budget of £28.7m.
- Cash generated from operations in the year was £40.4m compared to budget of £27.8m. At year-end, the University had liquid funds of £393.6m, which reflected the receipt of cash from bond issues of £175m. £120.1m of liquid funds was designated for specific use (primarily grant awards) leaving £273.5m of uncommitted liquid funds.
- The Committee noted that the projected use of liquid funds in the next four years would result in liquid funds available in 2021 of c£70m. Although ahead of the plan approved by Court in December 2016, it was noted that this medium-term cash flow view required to be carefully monitored to ensure adequate liquid funds were available, allowing for funds designated for specific use.
- The Committee considered its annual programme and remit and proposed no changes.

FC/2017/02. Welcome and Farewell

The Convenor welcomed Kate Powell (SRC President), Prof Nick Hill and Dr Simon Kennedy (Senate Assessors) to their first meeting of Finance Committee.

The Committee thanked Carl Goodyear for his contribution to the committee over the years.

FC/2017/03. Declarations of Interest

No declarations were reported.

FC/2017/04. Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 31 May 2017

The minutes of Finance Committee held on 31 May 2017 were approved.

FC/2017/05. Matters arising

CA/2016/69. Capital Plan Update 2017-2023: VAT on new buildings

In response to a question from the Committee, the Director of Finance confirmed that it was still too early to forecast details of VAT which might be reclaimed on new buildings. The precise use of space within buildings as well as a breakdown of funding sources was required before this could be calculated.

FC/2017/06. Capital Governance and Reporting Formats (paper 5.1.1)

The Committee noted that the Director of Estates would report on governance arrangements later in the meeting. The Committee received a paper setting out proposed updates to the format of Capex requests coming to Finance Committee for approval.

The Committee approved the proposed format, noting that it would also be helpful to see one additional column in the summary table to denote whether the funding requested was accounted for within the existing Capital Plan.

FC/2017/07. Capex applications: Summaries (paper 5.1.2)

Finance Committee received eight capital expenditure requests, summarised in the table below:

Project	Purpose	Total projected cost	Other funding source	Value of funding sought under this application
Kelvin Data Annexe	Proceed to construction		none	
Pearce Lodge	Commence refurbishment		none	
Adam Smith Business School & PGT accommodation	Request for fees to progress to Full Business Case		none	
New MIMUMED (equipment)	Purchase and install new equipment		ERC grant	
New Edge Wave Laser & Microwave system	Purchase and install new equipment		ERC-ADV grant	
New inkjet printers	Purchase and install new equipment		EPSRC grant	
Jarrett Building	Construction of new insectary		Fully grant funded	

Finance Committee approved the Capex applications, noting that the four applications for equipment spend would only proceed if the external grant applications were successful.

FC/2017/08. Research Hub Full Business Case (paper 5.1.3)

Finance Committee received a paper and Dr Neil Bowering delivered a presentation outlining the full business case for the proposed Research Hub.

Committee members were supportive of the project concept and accepted the central aim of creating a hub for interdisciplinary research, to ensure that the University is maximising and increasing research income and is aligned with the changing nature of research and research funding - characterised by a move towards challenge led funding and collaborative, interdisciplinary projects. The Committee noted the strategic benefits in areas such as increased competitiveness in income growth and research quality, enhanced research reputation (particularly international), increasing Glasgow's attractiveness as a destination for PGR students, and enhanced collaborations with industry.

The Committee noted the current estimated capital cost was £106.7m, with an additional £9.4m estimated for the fit out of level 5, or £7.6m if completed during the main build. The decision on the timing of level 5 fit out was still to be finalised but the current position was that Court had agreed that it would take place in phase 1b, i.e. at a slightly later stage in the overall campus development.

Members received an update on the ongoing process of developing the final target price. This was in the process of being clarified with the delivery partner and Court would be updated on the outcome.

In considering the articulation of the measurable benefits of the project, Committee members noted that this section of the paper had been revised and strengthened since the full business case was considered at Estates Committee. Members requested more detail on the measures of success and what the incremental financial impact of each one would be over the 10 year period following completion of the project. Members agreed it would be useful to see a view of the financial picture if the Hub was not built, versus a view of the incremental benefits if the project was to go ahead. It was agreed that the following columns be added to the table of benefits:

- Basepoint or starting position for each measurable benefit
- Outcome of do nothing or do minimum option
- Cautious upside
- Optimistic upside

The Committee requested that an updated version of the measurable benefits section be circulated to members. It was also agreed that the current version of the full business case be sent to Estates Committee members for their information.

Finance Committee was asked to approve capital expenditure of £106.7m plus £9.4m for the fit out of level 5, and to recommend the project to Court on that basis. The Committee was minded to support the project, but deferred its approval and recommendation to Court pending receipt of the updated paper.

FC/2017/09. Finance Committee Annual Plan and Remit (paper 5.2)

The Convenor shared a draft Annual Programme setting out Committee business for the forthcoming year. Finance Committee approved the Annual Programme, noting that it would be adapted as needed throughout the year.

The Committee noted that each Committee of Court was required formally to review and approve its remit on an annual basis. The Finance Committee remit was approved with no amendments.

FC/2017/11. Insurance Renewal 2017/18 (paper 6.1)

The Committee received a report on insurance activity including a note of the premium costs for the coming year. It was noted that most of the University's main insurance policies were subject to competitive tender in 2015, subsequently entering into Long Term Agreements (LTAs) with the insurers. Therefore the 2017/18 renewal was primarily concerned with providing the insurers with up-to-date information and premiums being calculated accordingly using the agreed rates.

The total premium costs for 2017/18 were £1.46m, an increase of £60k (4.3%) on the previous year. This reflected increases in cover and an increase in the level of business activity.

The estimated cost for the year would be within the insurance budget for 2017/18, which was £1.7m.

Finance Committee noted the insurance renewal report.

FC/2017/12. Investment Performance (paper 6.2.1 and 6.2.2)

Finance Committee noted the endowments investment report and a report on cash investments. The Committee noted that UBS had taken over the Smart Beta portion of the portfolio. As this was a relatively recent development, and as the cash investments were also recent, trends would be more apparent in reports to future meetings.

The Committee noted the aim of the new style of reports was to provide more consistent and succinct feedback on investment performance.

FC/2017/13. Minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee held on 19 May 2017 (paper 6.2.3)

Finance Committee noted the minutes of the Investment Advisory Committee from 19 May 2017.

FC/2017/14. Corporate Structure (paper 6.3)

The Director of Finance presented a paper describing the various entities which are consolidated into the University's annual accounts as well as a number of other entities which are dormant or for which the University has responsibility as a guarantor. The Committee noted that there had been no significant changes from the prior year.

The Committee noted the paper.

FC/2017/15. Update on Campus Development (paper 7.1.1)

Finance Committee noted that given the importance and value being invested in the campus redevelopment and associated capital spend, a number of reports would be shared at Finance Committee going forward to provide a status and overview of the key projects.

Committee members welcomed the reports, noting an update on the campus redevelopment main projects with RAG status, key risks and direction.

The Committee noted a report summarising governance arrangements. Members endorsed the governance structure, noting that the arrangements were working well in practice, as evidenced by the example of the development of the business case for the Research Hub.

FC/2017/16. Overview of Campus Development Spend (paper 7.1.2)

Finance Committee noted a report outlining a financial overview of the campus redevelopment programme and highlighting forecast over/under budget and use of contingency. Committee members made some comments on the colour coding of the document which would be addressed for the next meeting in order to clarify project status.

FC/2017/17. Overview of Capex versus Annual Plan (paper 7.1.3)

Finance Committee noted a report providing a financial overview of the capital plan for the year, showing budget, actual and forecast, and highlighting significant variances.

FC/2017/18. Overview of Performance as at 31 July 2017 (paper 7.2)

The Director of Finance provided a report on the overview of performance to 31 July 2017. The Committee noted that the University achieved an operating surplus of £12.9m which was £11.9m ahead of budget. The movements which contributed to the improved surplus included tuition fees at £2m higher than budget, salary savings of £7.8m, other general income £4.6m higher than budget, and commercial contribution £2.2m lower than budget.

Under FRS 102, the surplus was £46.3m which was £17.6m ahead of budget.

The Committee noted a strong cash performance, with a net cash inflow of £209.9m. This was £222.9m above budget primarily due to borrowing ahead of schedule (£175m)

to take advantage of low interest rates, strong operational performance (£12.6m), deferral of capital spend (£32.7m) and payment in advance of deficit reduction plan obligations to the UGPS scheme (£17m) to take advantage of an agreed discount.

The University generated cash from operations of £40.4m.

The Committee noted reports on short term and long term cashflow. These two reports would be prepared for each meeting of the Committee going forward. It was agreed that SMG should review progress of the overall capital programme ahead of January Finance Committee, in the light of the new long term cashflow forecast document.

The Committee endorsed the updated format of reporting, which had been streamlined to simplify and allow focus on key items.

FC/2017/19. Debtors Report as at 31 August 2017 (paper 7.3)

Finance Committee received an update on overall debt levels as at 31 August 2017. The Group Financial Controller reported that total debt stood at £165.61m, representing an increase year on year relative to August 2016 (£144.67).

The level of student and sponsor debt was higher in August 2017 (£133.29m) than August 2016 (£119.6m). The Committee noted that the increase was driven by increased billing and aged debt was less than £2m.

The Committee noted an increase year-on-year in overall commercial debt (£25.69m as compared to £22.12m in 2016).

The Committee supported the updated format of the report.

FC/2017/20. Update on Accounting and Audit Matters: Accounting Policy Updates (paper 7.4)

Finance Committee received a paper setting out updates to accounting policies relating to cash and cash equivalents, and taxation.

The Committee approved the updates.

FC/2017/21. Date of next meeting

Monday 20 November 2017, 2pm.

Finance Committee

Remit:

- To monitor the income and expenditure of the University.

- To consider financial policies and issues and to make recommendations to Court on:
 - the annual revenue and capital budget;
 - banking, borrowing and lending
 - the investment of endowment funds; and
 - other financial matters, always having regard to the importance of financial sustainability.

- To advise Court on the financial implications of policy decisions being considered by Court.

- To consider the financial statements of the University and make recommendations to Court thereon.

- Having received a report from the Capex Committee:
 - to make recommendations to Court on the budget for capital projects;
 - to decide on all capex proposals involving expenditure of between £500,000 and £25M, subject to these proposals being included in the Court approved capital plan and, where appropriate, having been approved by the Estates Committee;
 - to make recommendations to Court on all capex proposals involving expenditure above £25M, subject to these proposals being included in the Court approved capital plan and, where appropriate, having been approved by Estates Committee; and
 - to decide on all requests for capital budget variances of £500,000 or above.

- To authorise individual items of revenue expenditure costing £1M or more.

- To ensure that the Committee's membership includes the skills and experience necessary to address its remit effectively. To this end, the Committee may request that the University Court appoint one or more additional co-opted members to the Committee. The Chair of Finance Committee will participate in the selection process for a new co-opted member.

Approved by Court
October 2016

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

FINANCE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL PROGRAMME 2017-18

TOPICS	SEPTEMBER 2017	NOVEMBER 2017	JANUARY 2018	MARCH 2018	MAY 2018
Preliminary matters	Apologies Declarations of interest Minutes of last meeting Matters arising	Apologies Declarations of interest Minutes of last meeting Matters arising	Apologies Declarations of interest Minutes of last meeting Matters arising	Apologies Declarations of interest Minutes of last meeting Matters arising	Apologies Declarations of interest Minutes of last meeting Matters arising
Capital Plan : <i>For approval - >£0.5m < £25.0m and in-Plan For recommendation >£25.0m For approval – budget variances > £0.5m</i>	Update on Campus Development Specific capex and Business Case approvals Overview of capex versus annual plan	Update on Campus Development Specific capex and Business Case approvals Overview of capex versus annual plan	Update on Campus Development Specific capex and Business Case approvals Overview of capex versus annual plan	Update on Campus Development Specific capex and Business Case approvals Overview of capex versus annual plan	Update on Campus Development Specific capex and Business Case approvals Overview of capex versus annual plan
Investment performance	Endowment portfolio Surplus cash portfolio Annual review	Endowment portfolio Surplus cash portfolio	Endowment portfolio Surplus cash portfolio	Endowment portfolio Surplus cash portfolio	Endowment portfolio Surplus cash portfolio
Financial performance update <i>For approval – revenue spend items >£1.0m</i>	YTD report v Plan Full year outturn f/c Forward rolling cash flow	YTD report v Plan Full year outturn f/c Forward rolling cash flow	YTD report v Plan Full year outturn f/c Forward rolling cash flow	YTD report v Plan Full year outturn f/c Forward rolling cash flow	YTD report v Plan Full year outturn f/c Forward rolling cash flow
Financial planning			Outline prospects for FY19	Update on Plan for FY19 Review of capital structure	Plan FY19 for review and approval

TOPICS	SEPTEMBER 2017	NOVEMBER 2017	JANUARY 2018	MARCH 2018	MAY 2018
Annual Report & Accounts	Accounting / audit / reporting issues, if any	Accounting / audit / reporting issues, if any Draft Annual Financial Statements – University Group and Subsidiaries, US GAAP Accounts Going Concern review	Accounting / audit /reporting issues, if any	Accounting / audit /reporting issues, if any	Accounting / audit /reporting issues, if any
Committee matters	Annual review of remit Confirm annual programme Format of papers			Interaction with other Court committees	Annual self-evaluation [to include review of remit, annual programme and papers]
Other matters	Annual insurance review			TRAC Return	Student Finance Committee Report
Reporting	Matters for draft Report to Court	Matters for draft Report to Court	Matters for draft Report to Court	Matters for draft Report to Court	Matters for draft Report to Court
AOB					
Attending :	Committee members including : Robert Fraser Prof Sir Anton Muscatelli Convenors of Estates and Audit & Risk Committees Gregor Caldwell Prof Neal Juster Ann Allen David Duncan Fiona Quinn Convenor Investment Advisory Committee	Committee members including : Robert Fraser Prof Sir Anton Muscatelli Convenors of Estates and Audit & Risk Committees Gregor Caldwell Prof Neal Juster Ann Allen David Duncan Fiona Quinn	Committee members including : Robert Fraser Prof Sir Anton Muscatelli Convenors of Estates and Audit & Risk Committees Gregor Caldwell Prof Neal Juster Ann Allen David Duncan Fiona Quinn	Committee members including : Robert Fraser Prof Sir Anton Muscatelli Convenors of Estates and Audit & Risk Committees Gregor Caldwell Prof Neal Juster Ann Allen David Duncan Fiona Quinn	Committee members including : Robert Fraser Prof Sir Anton Muscatelli Convenors of Estates and Audit & Risk Committees Gregor Caldwell Prof Neal Juster Ann Allen David Duncan Fiona Quinn

Court Context Card - 11 October 2017 - Report from Estates Committee

Speaker	Mr Ronnie Mercer
Speaker role	Estates Committee Convenor
Paper Description	Report from Estates Committee (5 September 2017)
Topic last discussed at Court	Jun-17
Topic discussed at Committee	Various
Committee members present	Mrs A Allen, Dr D Duncan, Professor L Farmer, Mr R Fraser, Professor N Juster, Mr R Mercer (Convenor), Mr D Milloy, Professor A Muscatelli (Principal), Ms K Powell, Mr A Seabourne, Dr B Wood
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 Research Hub Full Business Case
Topics to be discussed	Research Hub paper under separate item 5 on Court agenda; items in Estates Committee report to discuss if Court wishes. Court is asked to NOTE the following:
Action from Court	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Estates Committee reviewed and approved the Research Hub (full business case) (EC/2017/4.1 refers);2. Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications: Western/New Build/Adam Smith Business School (Fees) in the sum of £2.42m (EC/2017/6.1 refers); Kelvin Data Annexe in the sum of £8.55m (EC/2017/6.2 refers); Garscube/Jarrett Building/Insectary Phase 2 in the sum of £545k (EC/2017/6.3 refers); Minimally Invasive Micro-ultrasound for Medical Guidance and Early Diagnosis (MIMUMED) in the sum of €565k (equipment) (EC/2017/6.4 refers); Edge Wave Laser and Microwave System in the sum of €261 (equipment) (EC/2017/6.6 refers); Neuromorphic Printed Tactile Skin (Super Inkjet Printer) in the sum of £225k (equipment) (EC/2017/6.7 refers); and Gilmorehill/Pearce Lodge Fabric Repairs and IT staff relocation in the sum of £2.575m (EC/2017/6.8 refers);
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 5 - Delivery of campus development programme
Risk register - college level	Not Applicable
Demographics	
% of University	100% staff and students
Campus	Entire University Estate (all campuses)
External bodies	Not Applicable
Conflict areas	Not Applicable
Other universities that have done something similar	Swansea
Other universities that will do something similar	
Relevant Legislation	Building and Planning legislation
Equality Impact Assessment	On a building by building basis/by CapEx, where applicable
Suggested next steps	
Any other observations	

UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW
Estates Committee

Minute of the meeting held in Committee Room 251, Gilbert Scott Building on Tuesday 5 September 2017

Present: Mrs A Allen, Dr D Duncan, Professor L Farmer, Mr R Fraser, Professor N Juster, Mr R Mercer (Convenor), Mr D Milloy, Professor A Muscatelli (Principal), Ms K Powell, Mr A Seabourne, Dr B Wood

In Attendance: Dr N Bowering, Mrs N Cameron, Mrs L Duncan, Mr P Haggarty, Ms B Massie, Mr M Munro, Mr R Smith

Apologies: Mr D Smith

EC/2017/1 Minute of the meeting held on 9 May 2017

The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2017/2 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

EC/2017/3 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

EC/2017/4 Capital Projects Governance Board Report

EC/2017/4.1 Research Hub Full Business Case

The Committee welcomed Dr Neil Bowering and thanked him for his presentation. It noted the project Vision and its primary objectives: Transformational Research; Industrial Engagement; Shaping UK and International Research; and Changing the face of Glasgow.

The proposed development would deliver capacity for 600 academic and student researchers from across the University's four Colleges and would create a collaborative environment for the whole University community, attracting, stimulating and enabling interdisciplinary research, building on the University's reputation and acting as a catalyst for the recruitment of world-leading professorial research talent.

The building would comprise five levels with a gross internal floor area of 16,835m².

The Committee noted the expected strategic, reputational and operational benefits of the project. It requested that ahead of Finance Committee on 18 September 2017, the benefits statement be developed to provide further detail and clarity and capture potential for links to spin-out opportunities. A series of projected 2025 position statements would also be developed to include position in global rankings.

The Committee noted the statement of risk and requested that it be further developed to provide additional detail, specifically in relation to the inflation risk to be carried by the University. It noted potential for further risk below ground when works commenced and that financial provision had been made for this.

As agreed by Court in December 2016, development of the Research Hub was split into phase 1a (build levels 1-5/fit-out levels 1-4) with an estimated financial envelope of £106.724m and phase 1b (fit-out level 5) had been costed in the sum of £9.42m. The business case was seeking approval of Phase 1a in the sum of £106.724m which included a costed contingency sum of £4m. The Committee noted that the £106.724m was a target price from the Programme Delivery Partner and would be finalised prior to Finance Committee on 18 September 2017. The Committee noted that there was no inflationary risk to the University on the primary construction cost (target price) until 2020 and that the project had been costed to reflect the ambition to achieve BREEAM excellent status.

Operational expenditure (OPEX) had been estimated in the sum of £2.9m per annum to include staffing, utilities, maintenance, repair and replacement.

The Committee agreed that the project wholly represented the University's ambitions and, subject to the amendments and additions it had recommended, approved the project in the sum of £106.724m. It agreed that a slimmer document, together with a revised Executive Summary would be presented to Finance Committee and that all appendices would be excluded.

EC/2017/4.2 Major Capital Project Reports

The Committee noted the updated suite of reports and their current RAG status.

It noted the current Amber status of the Learning and Teaching Hub project, primarily due to the tight time schedule for associated enabling works. It noted that the programme of works had been scheduled to ensure minimal disruption and noise to the University community and its commercial and residential neighbours. Construction works would commence in October 2017, to be undertaken Monday – Saturday (mid-day), and normal requirements during Examination times would be fully observed.

EC/2017/5 Capital Programme Governance Board Report

EC/2017/5.1 Update Report

The Committee noted the Capital Programme Governance Board and Workstream updates:

Workstream 1a Masterplanning (Green)

Workstream 1b Infrastructure (Amber)

Graham Construction had taken full possession of the site and was progressing asbestos removal works. A delay in the contract award would result in a three-month delay to the infrastructure delivery programme, now scheduled to commence in April 2018. Whilst the delay would not adversely impact the overall Capital Plan budget or delivery, it would affect the timing for delivery of the Research Hub.

Workstream 2 Design and Construction (Amber)

The Committee noted the movement of the Adam Smith Business School Project to Plot E.

Workstream 8 - Strategic Investment and Disposal (Amber)

Workstream 9 – Strategic Travel and Transport Plan (Green)

EC/2017/5.1.1 Cost Plan

The Committee noted the current Cost Plan (Capital Plan Phases 1a and 1b). It agreed that future reports should reflect the financial position at the end of the month prior to the date of the report.

EC/2017/5.2 Terms of Reference

The Committee noted and approved the proposal to revise the Terms of Reference for the Capital Programme Governance Board. Revisions would result in appropriate governance of business critical or technically challenging small projects alongside major capital projects.

EC/2017/6 CapEx Committee Report

EC/2017/6.1 Western/New Build/Adam Smith Business School (Fees)

The Committee noted and approved the CapEx application in the sum of £2.42m.

EC/2017/6.2 Kelvin Data Annexe

The Committee noted and approved the CapEx application in the sum of £8.55m subject to final confirmation of the target price by 18 September 2017.

EC/2017/6.3 Garscube/Jarrett Building/Insectary Phase 2

The Committee noted and approved the CapEx application in the sum of £545k.

EC/2017/6.4 Minimally Invasive Micro-ultrasound for Medical Guidance and Early Diagnosis (MIMUMED)

The Committee noted and approved the CapEx application in the sum of €65k (equipment).

EC/2017/6.6 Edge Wave Laser and Microwave System

The Committee noted and approved the CapEx application in the sum of €61 (equipment).

EC/2017/6.7 Neuromorphic Printed Tactile Skin (Super Inkjet Printer)

The Committee noted the additional item to the agenda and that the application had been approved at Capex on 4 September 2017. The Committee approved the CapEx application in the sum of £225k, subject to any further analysis and comment by Friday 8 September 2017.

EC/2017/6.8 Gilmorehill/Pearce Lodge Fabric Repairs and IT staff relocation

The Committee noted and approved the CapEx application in the sum of £2.575m.

EC/2017/7 Control and Monitor Reports

EC/2017/7.1 RAG Report

The Committee noted the status of the projects with a value in excess of £100k.

Two projects had completed since its last meeting on 9 May 2017:

Gilmorehill/Hillhead Street/Psychology project; and
Gilmorehill/Campus/Door Access System.

EC/2017/7.2 Risk Register - The Committee noted the current Risk Register.

EC/2017/7.3 Programme - The Committee noted the current Master Programme.

EC/2017/7.4 Health and Safety Dashboard - The Committee noted the workstream status as Green.

EC/2017/8 Estates Reports

No items to consider.

EC/2017/9 Any Other Business

The Committee noted that two Gateway reviews were due to commence: Research Hub (25 – 27 September 2017) and Infrastructure (9 – 11 October 2017).

EC/2017/10 Schedule of Meetings for 2017/18

The schedule of dates was noted:

31 October 2017
15 January 2018
13 March 2018
15 May 2018

Court Context Card 11 October 2017 - Audit & Risk Committee

Speaker	Ms Heather Cousins	
Speaker role	Audit & Risk Committee Chair	
Paper Description	Minute of Committee meeting 20 September 2017	
<i>Topic last discussed at Court</i>	Last Audit & Risk Committee report June 2017	
<i>Topic discussed at Committee</i>	See paper summary section.	
<i>Committee members present</i>	Heather Cousins, Lindsay Farmer	
<i>Cost of proposed plan</i>		
<i>Major benefit of proposed plan</i>		
<i>Revenue from proposed plan</i>		
<i>Urgency</i>	Low	
<i>Timing</i>	NA	
<i>Red-Amber-Green Rating</i>	Green	
<i>Paper Type</i>	Information; discussion on Risk Register if Court wishes	
<i>Paper Summary</i>	<p>The Committee received internal audit reports on reviews of: Information security – General Data Protection Regulation GDPR; IT Structure and Governance - IT Strategy; Allocation of Bursaries and Scholarships (Scholarships & Discounting); Risk management - Q4 spend review (Procurement Data Analytics); and Research Grants Management. The Committee received the updated University Risk Register. The Committee received an update on Implementation of Outstanding Recommendations from prior internal audits; details of the University's corporate structure; and a report on cases of research misconduct from the recent academic session.</p> <p>The current University Risk Register. The register will normally be provided at each June meeting of Court, as previously agreed during the review of Court's involvement in Risk Management arrangements. NOTE: as indicated in the minutes, the Committee has requested that additional information be provided in the Register in future. This is being addressed during October and the revised format (updated also for 2018) will be provided to Court in June 2018</p>	
<i>Topics to be discussed</i>	As Court wishes	
<i>Action from Court</i>	To note and discuss if desired.	
<i>Recommendation to Court</i>	To note.	
Relevant Strategic Plan workstream		
Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve		
Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve		
Risk register - university level		
Risk register - college level		
Demographics		
<i>% of University</i>	100% Cross University application on several items	
Operating stats		
<i>% of</i>		
Campus	All	
External bodies		
Conflict areas	None Highlighted	
Other universities that have done something similar		
Other universities that will do something similar		
Relevant Legislation	Accounting regulations/Statements of Recommended Practice (for audits)	
Equality Impact Assessment		
Suggested next steps	N/A	
Any other observations		

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Audit & Risk Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 20 September 2017
in the Melville Room, Main Building

Present:

Mr Simon Bishop (SB), Ms Heather Cousins (HC) (chair), Professor Lindsay Farmer (LF), Mr Vincent Jeannin (VJ), Mr David Watt (DJW)

In attendance:

Mr Ken Baldwin (Ernst & Young) (KB), Dr David Duncan, COO & University Secretary (DD), Mr Gregor Caldwell, Group Financial Controller (GC), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance) (RF), Ms Denise Gallagher (PWC) (DG), Ms Deborah Maddern (Clerk) (DM), Ms Lindsey Paterson (PWC) (LP), Mr Stephen Reid (Ernst & Young) (SR), Dr Dorothy Welch (Deputy Secretary) (DAW)

Apologies: Ms Lesley Sutherland (LS), Professor Anton Muscatelli (Principal) (AM)

AUDIT/2017/1 Announcements

Mr Vincent Jeannin and Professor Lindsay Farmer were welcomed to their first meeting.

AUDIT/2017/2 Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2017

The minutes were approved.

AUDIT/2017/3. Matters Arising

Both sets of auditors left the room for items 3.1 and 3.2, PWC having declared an interest in item 3.2

.1 Scottish Code of Good HE Governance

The University had submitted a response to the consultation on the new Code. The code's publication was expected by the end of 2017. The Committee would be kept updated.

.2 Update on internal audit tender process

The closing date was 20 September, with the decision-making process scheduled for October and the contract to be awarded from 1 November.

.3 IT - update on patching systems

The IPSC would consider further the ability of the University to respond to ransomware and other IT attacks. Given the desktop management system in operation, files could be recovered, although the Committee noted that it was important that staff and students were appropriately trained to be aware of, and reminded regularly of, the risks. DD would ensure the matter was raised at the forthcoming IPSC meeting.

ACTION DD

.4 Emergencies Planning audit – follow up of high risk finding

A group existed for emergency planning and good progress had been made with regard to testing readiness.

.5 Treatment of historical action point from internal audits

A paper had been circulated from GC, outlining proposed journals controls and senior-level oversight that it was proposed would supersede a historical action point from an internal audit. PWC confirmed that the proposals had the internal auditor's support. The Committee agreed that it was content with the proposed levels of materiality and review, and approved the proposals, with the historical action point to be removed accordingly.

AUDIT/2017/4. Internal Audit Update

It was requested that management response to recommendations should routinely include a timescale for action, in the response section of the reports.

ACTION DD/DAW/GC

4.1 Information security – General Data Protection Regulation GDPR

The review had assessed the University's preparedness for the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which would cover every entity that held or used European personal data both inside and outside Europe, with increased compliance requirements backed by heavy financial penalties and a direct right of action for citizens in European courts.

Although the review had found that there was generally good awareness and some good practice across the University, relating to the requirements of the GDPR, the report classification was High risk. This assessment was based on the auditor's testing via methods such a questionnaire and workshops, and was made given the importance of moving towards GDPR compliance in what was now a relatively short time-frame. Decisive and swift action was needed to formulate a GDPR programme, and to devise a risk-based plan. It would be key to execute the programme with the appropriate governance, wider University support, senior level sponsorship, and ownership of key activities. Effective project management methodology should be used.

There had been 2 High findings and 2 Medium findings, the former relating to the need to collate related information into an overarching programme/project to take the University up to the 2018 implementation date; and to ensuring comprehensive awareness, including training and cultural awareness-raising, across the institution. Providing the necessary assurances in a devolved structure would be one of the challenges for the University. The Medium level findings related to a timeline of data mapping being needed, to understand the personal data elements being collected, held and processed across the University; and to the need to update and clarify some related policies. An action plan had been agreed.

The Committee agreed that there was pressure on the University, given the actions required within a relatively short timescale, and a need for awareness and buy-in at the most senior levels. It was also important for adequate resource to be made available for implementation of the requirements. It was agreed also that a risk assessment of the area should be undertaken in the short to medium term.

A more detailed timeline for action was requested. An update would be provided at the next meeting.

ACTION DAW

4.2 IT Structure and Governance - IT Strategy

Given the importance of how effectively the University used its resources to equip new facilities, the review had examined how the University's IT Strategy was being adopted by the campus redevelopment, and by the wider University within the Schools and Colleges.

The overall report classification was Medium risk, with three medium risk findings within that,

and no significant concerns. The findings related to some improved communication and collaboration being needed, given the number of different groups and projects connected to the IT strategy; to wider considerations being required around data security and data encryption in the context of the GDPR requirement for systems to be built 'secure by design'; and to the need for an impact assessment of data collection for the 'smart campus'.

The Committee noted that a new Information Services Director had been appointed, with both the Library and IT Services included in the area; and that a new Director of IT Services was being recruited. It was also noted that the Committee would be receiving a briefing on IT, including cyber security, ahead of the November 2017 meeting.

4.3 Allocation of Bursaries and Scholarships (Scholarships & Discounting)

As a commitment to supporting new students and rewarding academic excellence, the University offered a wide range of financial support, referred to as "discounting". Discounting was defined as University funding awarded to a student to reduce his or her overall fee liability. In 2014, a Discounting Working Group ("DWG") has been established to ensure that discounts being offered across the University were strategically awarded to maximise revenue. The group had produced a 'Pricing and Discounting Proposal 2016/17', containing recommendations to be implemented by the University. The audit review had assessed whether or not the recommendations from the Pricing and Discounting review had been implemented and the overall impact on the University as a result, from a value for money perspective.

The overall report classification was Medium risk. There was one High risk finding, relating to a lack of strategic oversight of PGR scholarships and discounts, with better understanding required about the level of expenditure and the effectiveness of investment. It was noted that the completion date for action was May 2018, the relatively long-term nature of this being required given the complicated nature of the business.

4.4 Risk management - Q4 spend review (Procurement Data Analytics)

The review had analysed the patterns of spend across the University over the financial years 2014/15 and 2015/16 in order to consider the value for money being achieved by the University. The review had used data analytics to baseline different Colleges, Schools, cost-centres and spend categories against one another to identify any unusual transactional behaviour, particularly towards the end of the year.

The overall report classification was Low, with two isolated accrual errors identified and one high value accrual, that was for a delayed planned spend.

4.5 Research Grants Management

The review had assessed the design and operating effectiveness of key controls relating to the Research Grant Management process and the Agresso Research Costing and Pricing System (ARCP) system in the period from 31 January 2017 to 30 June 2017.

The overall report classification was Low. The review identified a number of areas of good practice and benefits that the new system, processes and organisational structure have brought to the University. There was one Medium risk finding relating to periodic review of funder due diligence not being carried out in accordance with the defined frequency.

AUDIT/2017/5. Risk Management - Risk Register

The current University Risk Register was noted. It was also noted that there had been little movement since the last version.

It was agreed that additional information was required in the register, relating to timescales for mitigating actions, and further clarification of action owners.

ACTION RF

It was noted that the Risk Register would be provided to Court at its October meeting, as part of Court's agreed refinements to its level of involvement in the area of risk management.

It was agreed that a briefing on the Transformation Programme would be arranged for the February 2018 meeting date.

ACTION DM

AUDIT/2017/6. Implementation of Outstanding Recommendations

6.1 Departments other than the Finance Office

The update on implementation actions was noted. With regard to emergencies planning and the associated High risk finding relating to cross-University documentation of plans, DAW reported that an appointment had been made with the individual to engage with Schools and Institutes in this regard.

With respect to a High risk finding relating to data governance, DAW reported that there had been a review of access rights with an update made, and that this area would be kept under regular review.

6.2 Finance Office

The update was noted, in particular that an additional contractor had been appointed for the delivery plan relating to TRM reports (Research Management Project); that a dowries policy had recently been approved by SMG, with the Committee noting that the policy contained provisions relating to value for money considerations such as the expected return connected to a dowry and that GC would pick up reporting matters relating to dowries, in the forthcoming budget round; and that it has been established that there were no unauthorised bank accounts in operation in Schools or services across the University.

It was noted that the auditors conducted follow-up testing on all audits, including checking completion of action points. It was agreed that reference would be made in the annual report.

ACTION PWC

AUDIT/2017/7. Corporate Structure

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

AUDIT/2017/8. Research Misconduct 2016/17/Related University Policies

A report had been provided to the Committee, as required by the Research Councils. Four formal investigations relating to research misconduct had been completed during the 2016/17 academic year (two in the previous year). The incidence of alleged misconduct, and the complexity of cases, had increased since 2015/16, as indeed it had across the sector. The Committee noted that it was difficult to establish with certainty whether the increases were as a result of increased misconduct or were arising because of better awareness and detection.

It was also noted that cases were included in the report at the allegation/informal stage as well as at the formal stage. A concern was expressed about the potential effect of this on individuals who were the subject of investigation, given the principle of assumption of innocence. The Committee noted that this concern had already been raised by the University in the response to a consultation on the reporting methodology.

AUDIT/2017/9. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

AUDIT/2017/10. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 7 November 2017 at 2pm in the Melville Room

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

Court Context Card - 11 October 2017 - HR Committee Report

Speaker	Ms June Milligan
Speaker role	HR Committee Chair
Paper Description	Draft minute of committee meeting held on 11 September 2017 & Draft Revised Committee Remit.
Topic last discussed at Court	Last HRC report June 2017
Topic discussed at Committee	See paper summary section.
Committee members present	See Attached.
Cost of proposed plan	
Major benefit of proposed plan	
Revenue from proposed plan	
Urgency	Medium
Timing	
Red-Amber-Green Rating	Green
Paper Type	Information
Paper Summary	Minutes of meeting held on 11 September 2017. The Committee discussed its remit, considering matters of membership and meeting format as well as the aims of the Committee. A final draft of the revised remit is attached (Annex 1). The Committee received a presentation from Prof. Neal Juster regarding the Strategic Transformation Agenda for the University. Mrs Christine Barr then provided a detailed update on progress made to deliver the People Strategy and to highlight the function's priorities for the coming Academic Session. The Committee then received an update on the strategic review of recruitment and discussed the pros and cons of the operating models under consideration. Finally Mrs Christine Barr spoke to the HR Director's strategic update including briefings on the ongoing Performance Development Review Process, Strategic Recruitment, the conclusion of the annual pay negotiations and the University's response to the ongoing developments regarding Brexit. She also noted that the function was supporting an increasing number of organisational change initiatives.
Topics to be discussed	
Action from Court	To approve revised remit; note rest of report and discuss if desired.
Recommendation to Court	To approve the revised Committee Remit and membership.
Relevant Strategic Plan workstream	Agility, Focus, Empowering People
Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve	Staff Engagement
Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve	Gender Equality/Service Delivery
Risk register - university level	1. Organisational Effectiveness 3. Immigration policy/EU staff & students - Staff Recruitment; 11. Organisational Culture; 10. Staff Development;
Risk register - college level	
Demographics	
% of University	100% staff
Operating stats	
% of	
Campus	All
External bodies	
Conflict areas	None Highlighted
Other universities that have done something similar	
Other universities that will do something similar	
Relevant Legislation	Employment legislation (UK & European)
Equality Impact Assessment	No specific points were noted within the papers for this agenda.
Suggested next steps	N/A
Any other observations	

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Human Resources Committee

Minute of meeting held in the Melville Room, Main Building
on Monday 11 September 2017

Present: Ms J Milligan (JM) (Chair), Dr D Duncan (DD), Mrs C Barr (CB), Ms S Ashworth (SA), Professor K McCue (KM), Professor C Goodyear (CG), Professor R O Maolalagh (ROM), Dr M Macdonald Simpson (MMS), Mr R Cloughton (RPC),

By Invitation: Professor N Juster (NJ) Item 3

Apologies: Professor A Muscatelli (AM), Mr R Goward (RG), Ms Susan Campbell (SC),

HR/17/01 **Opening Remarks & Apologies**

JM opened the meeting and noted apologies as above. JM welcomed KM and CG, Senate Assessors to their first meeting of the Committee and noted the gratitude of the Committee for the previous contributions of Professors N Hill and L Farmer.

The members of the committee introduced themselves setting out their role and interest in the people agenda and work of the Committee.

HR/17/02 **Minute of the Meeting held on 23 May 2017**

The minute of the previous meeting was agreed as drafted. RPC agreed to note any formal actions on future minutes as appropriate.

HR/17/03 **Update on the Strategic Transformation agenda from the Senior Vice-Principal & Deputy Vice Chancellor**

NJ joined the meeting and gave a presentation on the key strategic activities he is leading to establish the programme and support structures for the University's Strategic Transformation agenda. Three Boards have been established (Transformation Programme Board, Capital Projects Governance Board & Programme Governance Board), each reporting to the SMG and to Court via the Finance and Estates Committee. NJ indicated that he was keen to ensure HR Committee had opportunity to input on relevant aspects of the programme.

Alongside the Governance structure, a support structure is being created under the leadership of a Chief Transformation Officer (CTO). This position would shortly be advertised and the CTO would then manage a team of Project Managers and Analysts, recruitment of which has started. Each Project would have a Project Sponsor supported by a suitably resourced Project Team. There would also be additional Communications Resource to support the Transformation Programme. He noted that a conscious decision had been taken not to utilise consultants to run the programme but consultancy input would be considered to potentially supplement the internal teams where specialist skills were required.

The Transformation Programme Board (TPB) had been expanded to include "end-user" stakeholders from the Academic and student communities. NJ explained the remit of the TPB which includes ensuring the Programme aligns with the vision set out in the strategic plan and ensuring it delivers the efficiencies required to ensure finances are available to deliver the capital programme. NJ reported that a small central team of Business Improvement Specialists was being created and this would be supplemented with internal secondees trained in BPI techniques to support specific projects. Delivering process efficiencies to enable scalable growth formed a key part of the Transformation agenda.

JM welcomed the update and agreed with NJ that the Committee had a role to play given the central role that people would play in delivering and supporting the transformational change as well as the cultural and structural issues it would touch upon. It was agreed that a regular agenda item should be established to engage the Committee.

It was agreed that a strong communications plan was essential to ensure staff were informed and engaged. There was also discussion regarding the importance of resourcing the projects appropriately and inducting any new joiners to the University and the future cultural and strategic goals. Ensuring University Services were fully aligned to the future operating model was also essential focusing and organizing resources to deliver an excellent student experience and enhanced career opportunities for our staff. This would mean change for our existing staff and this again highlighted the importance of strong leadership and pro-active communications and staff engagement.

Actions: **RPC to consider frequency of future updates and schedule accordingly**
 RPC to invite CTO to attend a future meeting once appointed.

HR/17/04

People Strategy

CB gave a comprehensive presentation on progress made against the goals set out in the University People Strategy and the key priorities for the HR function over the coming year. CB reminded members of the Committee that the People Strategy, published in 2016, was developed to support the University's Inspiring People strategy, its key themes around People, Place and Purpose and key Strategic People strands of Leading Transformation, Attracting Talent and Supporting Development. A detailed plan was established to prioritise and track key deliverables in support of the strategy.

CB highlighted a number of areas where progress had been made during 2016/17, many of which the Committee had previously been involved in scrutinizing. These include the Gender Pay Strategy and plan, streamlined management policies and procedures and initiatives to support staff engagement and cultural transformation. Within Attracting Talent a number of significant recruitment campaigns had been successfully mounted with enhanced information and candidate experience. The function had also responded to the Brexit vote by delivering a number of bespoke interventions to support our non-UK EU employees. The year also saw step changes to the ECDP programme and further development of the Academic career tracks as well as ongoing leadership programmes, embedded in the Leadership Behavioural Framework and philosophy set out in the Glasgow Professional.

The function has a number of key priorities for 2017/18 in support of the three strategic strands. CB highlighted the direct links between the People strategy and the Transformation Programme, both in support of the University Strategy and made it clear that the Employee and Organisational Development team would play a key role in supporting the Transformation office. CB also noted the key role that both central and local HR teams are playing in supporting organisational change, an agenda that is only likely to increase in the future.

In terms of Attracting Talent, CB referred to the next item on the agenda but also stressed the focus on strategic appointments both within University Services and the senior professoriate. The HR service would continue to enhance the University profile as an employer of choice and the Committee noted the opportunity to further promote Glasgow City as well as the University as an attractive destination.

In relation to Supporting Development the HR function would continue to build our leadership and management capability and ensure the high performance culture is supported and the University values and reward structures embedded within these processes. Talent mapping and succession planning exercises would underpin our development agenda as would the work on the competency framework for the Glasgow Professional and further work to support Early Career Academics and Researchers. There was also discussion regarding the need to continue to support and develop professors to continue to motivate them to build their profiles and move through the zones.

Finally CB noted the various ways in which the impact of the People Strategy is tracked and monitored noting that the University would conduct a further staff survey in 2018 which provides information for one of the key university KPIs, namely staff engagement.

The Committee endorsed the priorities for the year and congratulated CB and the team on the progress made against the people strategy.

HR/17/05 Recruitment Review – Update

CB spoke to the paper, which provided an update on the drivers for the recruitment review and the process undertaken to conduct it. She outlined at a high level the work undertaken to map the current process, identifying the many hand-offs between staff and the potential to simplify and improve the process such as to deliver efficiencies and quality improvements. The Project Board had identified the dedicated resource required in the future and was currently considering two preferred operating models, which would be presented to the SMG for a final decision. Both models had a number of pros and cons but the consensus view of the Committee was that the greatest benefit could be derived from the more centralized approach with clear contacts in the colleges and university services. Realising immediate savings in terms of release of resources would be difficult given the large number of staff who currently spend a small amount of their time on recruitment activities. However, the review, once implemented, would immediately deliver efficiencies, reduce the time taken to recruit and create the opportunity to enhance the candidate and recruiting manager experience and increase the focus on genuine talent attraction.

HR/17/06 HR Committee Remit – Annual Review

JM thanked members of the Committee for the feedback provided on the draft remit previously considered at the Committee's May meeting. After a brief discussion the proposed revised remit was agreed as drafted. This includes an amendment to the membership of the committee and a reduction from five to four meetings per year. It was noted that some appointments to the Committee, including members of Court and from Senate, naturally change over time. It was agreed that it would be sensible to make the appointments of the Senior Managers from the Academic and University Services Leadership teams also of a fixed duration. These would hence forward be reviewed every three to four years.

Action: RPC to finalise draft and submit to the next meeting of Court.

HR/17/07 Strategic Update from the HR Director

CB spoke briefly to her paper that included commentary on the ongoing Performance Development Review process, the recent National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes and the strategic alignment of our academic workforce in preparation for the next REF. Further she welcomed the successful conclusion of the annual pay negotiations and spoke to the latest developments in the Brexit negotiations and our ongoing concerns about the potential impact on the Institution and our staff from the rest of the EU. The report also provided an update on work conducted to improve the processes associated with supporting our disabled staff, in part in response to concerns highlighted in the last staff survey. CB also highlighted the ongoing organisational change agenda and noted that the proposed restructure of University Sport which is currently subject to ongoing consultation, had attracted interest from the media and other external individuals.

A member of the Committee asked CB to comment on the recent annual valuation of the USS fund. CB noted the recent press coverage and the concerns this had inevitably raised, noting that the University would closely monitor the situation and engage accordingly in any potential consultation process regarding the implications of this.

HR/17/08 HR Analytics – Regular update

RPC spoke briefly to the paper. The information on the age profile prompted a brief discussion regarding whether different “generations” of staff had a different gender profile and whether this presented an encouraging picture of future change in terms of gender balance, especially in more senior roles. DD also took the opportunity to highlight the role he was assuming as Mental Health Champion, noting that mental health remained the cause of the highest number of lost days within the University. It was agreed that he should speak to the proposed action plan on mental health at a future meeting of the Committee. **Action: RPC for future agenda**

HR/17/09 Matters Arising from 23 May 2017

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

HR/17/10 Closing remarks

JM thanked members for their contributions to the discussions. There was no other business raised and the meeting closed.

HR/17/11 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled to take place on Wednesday 15 November 2017 at 10am in the Carnegie Room.

DRAFT

University of Glasgow
HR Committee – 11 September 2017
HR Committee – Review of Remit

Introduction

Following discussion at the May HR Committee, the following remit is presented for final discussion and agreement.

People Committee – Proposed Remit

To oversee, on behalf of Court, the ongoing development, implementation and delivery of the University's People Strategy and related plans and procedures, ensuring these are aligned with the key aims and objectives of University Strategy and its realisation.

To ensure appropriate monitoring and reporting arrangements are in place and that these are executed accordingly to demonstrate and deliver impact in the delivery of organisational goals to enhance institutional performance and success.

To provide corporate governance and oversight of key people initiatives and policies, monitoring compliance in accordance with the relevant and related legal and regulatory frameworks and promote the adoption of best practice in:

- Recruitment & Talent Attraction
- Performance Management,
- Reward & Recognition,
- People and Organisational Development (inc. Leadership Development),
- Talent Management & Succession Planning and
- Cultural & Organisational Change.

To 'add value' in terms of corporate governance and associated oversight in the delivery of the people strategy and provide a degree of challenge to the executive leadership in ensuring the University demonstrates its commitment in delivering in accordance with the best interests of its people, both staff and students.

Membership

4 (appropriately qualified/experienced) lay members of whom at least 2 will be Court members

2 Senate Assessors,

Director of Human Resources

COO & University Secretary

Deputy Vice Chancellor

1 Head of College/School/RI

1 Executive Director of Service

The Deputy Director of HR will act as Clerk to the Committee. Additionally other members of the Senior HR team will attend Committee meetings as agreed between the Chair and Director of HR. The Chair of the Committee will participate in the selection process for new co-opted members. Appointments to the Committee will typically be reviewed every three to four years.

Terms of Reference

The Committee shall

- ensure that the People Strategy is consistent and aligned with the University's mission, vision, values and strategic plan
- support the University's senior management to demonstrate the importance of strategic HR practice to the institution in providing support and leadership to all its staff
- act as a sounding board and where appropriate, provide a degree of challenge, to the executive leadership of the University with regards to the People Strategy and the human resources function, providing advice and support, from a breadth of perspectives on human resource issues
- champion the University's people agenda and ensure that the HR function is appropriately organised, resourced and aligned to support its successful delivery
- ensure the people issues arising from key University projects and strategic goals are identified and actively led
- ensure the University has adequate processes and procedures in place to drive transformational change & enhance employee engagement
- assess the University's talent pool and its capability now, and via succession & other relevant planning tools, in the future, to meet the University's strategic goals
- provide guidance and oversight of the University's performance management and reward practices
- monitor compliance in accordance with the relevant and related legal and regulatory frameworks and ensure the adoption of best practice, and approve key people policies on behalf of Court
- provide a forum for discussion of key trends in the external environment likely to impact on the University's people agenda and where appropriate, recommend associated actions
- support the work of senior management in terms of pro-actively advancing diversity and inclusion across the University
- monitor the employee relations culture and climate within the University, supporting the executive and HR in positive engagement/partnership with the Recognised Trade Unions
- monitor agreed performance indicators and people related MI to oversee key people metrics across the University
- monitor key people risks on behalf of Court, referring and or escalating matters as appropriate to relevant Court Committees, etc
- liaise with other Court Committees as necessary, to ensure the strategic people agenda is aligned and consistently considered on behalf of Court.

The committee receives and reviews minutes from various sub-committees including Equality and Diversity Strategy Committee (EDSC), the Joint Committee of Consultation and Negotiation (JCCN), which report to Court via the HR Committee.

Annual Meeting Schedule

Four times per year with at least one meeting per semester.

Current Remit

Human Resources Committee

Current Remit

On behalf of Court, to review the University's HR Strategy and, through agreed performance indicators, monitor its relevance, implementation and effectiveness.

Ensure that the strategy is consistent with and supports the University's mission, vision and values.

Monitor compliance with the legal and regulatory framework for HR and ensure the adoption of best practice.

Act as a sounding board for the University's executive officers and HR function, providing advice, from a breadth of perspectives, on human resource management issues.

Ensure that the University's senior management demonstrate the importance of HR to the institution by providing support and leadership to all its staff.

To ensure that the Committee's membership includes the skills and experience necessary to address its remit effectively. To this end, the Committee may request that the University Court appoint one or more additional co-opted members to the Committee. The Chair of the Committee will participate in the selection process for a new co-opted member.

Membership: 4 lay members, 2 Senate Assessors, Principal, Secretary of Court, Director of Human Resources, 2 Heads of College/School, Two non-academic service directors

Court Context Card 11 October 2017 - Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Speaker	Dr David Duncan
Speaker role	Convenor of HSWC
Minutes of last HS&W Committee meeting	Agenda, Draft Minute
Topic last discussed at Court	June 2017
Topic discussed at Committee	See paper summary section
Committee members present	None
Cost of proposed plan	
Major benefit of proposed plan	
Revenue from proposed plan	
Urgency	For Information only
Timing	Immediate
Red-Amber-Green Rating	Green
Paper Type	For Information only
Paper Summary	At its meeting on 21 September 2017, the Committee received an update on the pilot of central recording of overseas travel. The Committee covered its usual range of business in reviewing standard reports on Occupational Health activities, Audit updates, Accident reporting and Employee counselling.
Topics to be discussed	None highlighted
Action from Court	For information/discussion if desired
Recommendation to Court	None
Relevant Strategic Plan workstream	
Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve	
Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve	
Risk register - university level	
Risk register - college level	
Demographics	
% of University	100% All staff and students, relevant to all
Operating stats	
% of	
Campus	All locations
External bodies	HSE
Conflict areas	
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

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Thursday 21 September 2017 at 10:00 AM, Melville Room

Present: Dr Dorothy Welch (for David Duncan) (Chair), Richard Cloughton, Dr Craig Daly, David McLean, Peter Haggarty, Gillian Shaw, Aileen Stewart, Julie Summers, Graham Tobasnick, Selina Woolcott, Lauren McDougall, Paul Dragsnes (for George Hepburn), Janice Thomson (for James Gray)

In Attendance: Karen Christoforou (Clerk)

Apologies: Dr David Duncan, Paula McKerrow, Christopher Kennedy, Louise Bowden, James Gray, Deric Robinson, Kathleen Simmonds, David Somerville, Dr Jane Townson, George Hepburn

HSWC/2017/1 Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 23 May 2017

The Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 23 May 2017 were approved.

HSWC/2017/2 Matters arising

HSWC/2017/2.1 Safety for overseas workers (verbal update SW)

Selina Woolcott had received feedback from two of the Schools involved in the pilot of the new system on Core, relaying it awkward to use. A more integrated, robust system, especially from an insurance perspective, would be more user friendly. Currently Security colleagues have access to insurance databases, and can check these “out of normal office hours”, for colleagues locations abroad. Of the approved travel providers, Clarity authorised access to their database to the Head of Security, and Selective provide twice weekly updates to the University on who is travelling and to where. SW confirmed work was still ongoing, with a focus on better access and more integration.

A travel safety protocol had been drafted, outlining the required travel booking and insurance process and emphasizing the benefits that staff would gain from this. New software may improve the level of engagement but it was felt necessary to encourage colleagues to use approved suppliers prior to any expensive purchase of additional monitoring software.

HSWC/2017/2.2 Audit programme (Paper 1)

The Committee noted the circulated paper. David McLean summarised that all scheduled audit visits were now completed and draft reports prepared and issued for consultation. A new audit system, HASMAP, was due to be piloted this month, for the next round of internal safety audits. The intention was to trial this in a desktop exercise at University level for the auditing of the College of Social Sciences and subsequent audits next year. Over the autumn focus would turn to outstanding actions within CMVLS units. DMcL emphasised the need for College-level support to progress and prioritise these outstanding actions and a target for units to have all audit actions closed within 12 months of issue of final report.

HSWC/2017/2.3 Mental Health and Wellbeing Action Plan

Following the announcement of a new Mental Health Champion for the University, Dorothy Welch informed the Committee that a review had been completed in this area and a report

outlining actions to be taken submitted to SMG. This would be consulted on further and DAW agreed to circulate a copy to members of HSWC for information. Richard Cloughton noted that this item would be included on the agenda for the next JCCN Meeting.

HSWC/2017/3 Introduction to new EAP provider PAM

The Committee noted Kevan Leckie would attend the Committee's next meeting in December.

Selina Woolcott lead discussion on the EAP Report, and highlighted that the last quarter included the final two months of provision by Optum and the first month of the new provider, PAM Assist. In this respect, it was difficult to compare like for like, but going forward PAM Assist would provide a new format, clearer report.

A key point to note was the large surge in uptake of services, as well as increased hits on the website, thought to be most likely due to the launch of the new service. One complaint had been received in this transitional period and had been dealt with at local level and now resolved. SW highlighted the benefits of this new service provider, with counselling provided at an easily accessible location in the local Glasgow area. Kevan Leckie had already attended some events and was happy to support not only subsequent events at Gilmorehill, but also roadshows at other University sites.

HSWC/2017/4 Business Continuity Report (written report)

In his absence, Colin Montgomery had prepared a written report advising members on the status of the Implementation Plan for the University's Business Continuity Management System. Schools and University Services were currently identifying local business continuity teams and working with CM on plans. CM was also working on an overarching University BC plan addressing high-level issues such as utilities and IT failures as well as the management of teaching and research space.

HSWC/2017/5 OH Report (Paper 2)

The Committee noted the circulated paper. Aileen Stewart informed the Committee that:

- Management referrals were up slightly on the same period last year, but the number of review appointments was lower by comparison.
- Health Surveillance appointments had increased threefold compared to the same period last year. This seemed to relate to the increase in numbers of people being screened through the Beatson contract. There had also been better compliance within MVLS of notifying OH as to who required HS.
- The Beatson contract took up a huge amount of time and resourcing in particular with health surveillance although it was noted that these would no longer be provided by the University and instead be moved to an external health care provider, allowing OH to focus on increasing in-house health surveillance demand.
- Vaccinations were up compared to the same quarter last year. There had been an increase in demand for the Hepatitis B vaccination from research staff however, this had been put on hold recently due to a national shortage of this vaccination. It was hoped that these would resume into early next year.
- Student fitness to practice referrals had continued to increase substantially reflecting the overall increase in OH work with the Schools of Medicine, Nursing and Dentistry.

AS explained that a higher number of management referrals in University Services and Social Sciences related to musculoskeletal issues, followed by prolonged illness and then mental health reasons.

OH was addressing the delay in managers receiving reports with the introduction of a University file drop system, now in use. Following a successful pilot, the system has been rolled out across the University and has led to improved speed and turnaround of reports on management referrals, enabling a faster delivery and security.

HSWC/2017/6 SEPS Report (Paper 3)

The Committee noted this paper, which included the reportable incidents, welcoming the reduction in unwanted fire alarm activations.

HSWC/2017/7 Fire Safety Update (Paper 4)

Following recent events at Grenfell Tower, SEPS colleagues had taken steps to consider the cladding system used on University buildings, especially those of high-rise construction.

The focus was primarily on the Boyd Orr Building and the Library, although a survey of all University buildings, including Garscube Estate, was carried out. Few University buildings were of high-rise construction, and these did not involve sleeping risks. The review did identify some compartmentation issues for follow up action at both high-rise buildings: these were being addressed by Estates and Commercial Services and SEPS.

HSWC/2017/8 Posturite DSE software (Paper 5)

David McLean reported that SEPS had purchased an online training and assessment software package that would not only aid the ergonomic set-up and use of computers and assessment of computer workstations but also cover the University's legal requirement for training in this area. He now sought the Committee's support for promoting use of this system at local operational level. The system would be accessed through the University Business Systems webpage using staff GUID and password, and would benefit the whole University community. The Committee was very supportive of this system and Dorothy Welch suggested that an article be included in the next edition of MyGlasgow news. David McLean agreed to action this.

HSWC/2017/9 Managing Contractors (Paper 6)

Peter Haggarty reported that the 3rd annual contractor safety forum had taken place on Campus on 18 August. With an extremely busy period leading up to Fresher's Week, the forum had provided an opportunity to communicate to new contractors the traffic and security issues when on Campus as well as the Equality and Diversity policies that the University operates. PH went on to advise that, in addition to the annual conference, the Safety and Compliance Manager for Estates also chaired a quarterly safety meeting with the main contractors, as well as weekly contractor activity meetings.

PH advised the Committee that there had been two unannounced visits by HSE Inspectors recently, resulting in no issues needing addressed.

Janice Thompson raised a communication issue where colleagues in Radiation Protection Services were not always made aware in advance of scheduled work taking place involving Controlled Areas for radiation work, and suggested a need for earlier contact with staff to highlight the work. PH agreed to share a programme of activities with both herself and Jim Gray.

HSWC/2017/10 Any Other Business

- Aileen Stewart asked that the Committee join her in sending their best wishes following the retiral at the end of July of Steve Doherty, Occupational Health Physician.

- In relation to item 2.1 Paul Dragsnes conveyed to the Committee, the gratitude of colleagues in London at the time of the recent Parsons Green incident, to both George Hepburn and Gerry Moore in Central Services, and at the reassurance of the University's concern on their wellbeing.

HSWC/2017/11 Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 12 December 2017, 10am in the Melville Room.

University of Glasgow

University Court – Wednesday 11 October 2017

Communications to Court from the meeting of Senate held on 05 October 2017

Dr Jack Aitken, Director, Senate Office

(All matters are for noting)

1. National Student Survey

Ms Kirsty Scanlon, Deputy Director Planning and Performance, presented the results of the National Student Survey (NSS) 2017. It was reported that the survey had been running for ten years and that there had been a review of the questions used leading to some significant changes, including new questions regarding learning opportunities. One of the sections where the University of Glasgow had previously performed well had – Personal development had become an optional question set, rather than part of the core questions.

In terms of overall satisfaction, 88.7% of respondents indicated that they were satisfied overall, which meant that the University of Glasgow had performed above the sector, but below its own KPI of 90% satisfaction. The Colleges of Arts and MVLS had performed well, with overall satisfaction of 91%.

The University continued to perform poorly in the questions related to assessment and feedback – whereas, in terms of overall satisfaction the University was 17th out of 119, in terms of assessment and feedback it was 102nd. It was recognised that difficulties in this area tended to be encountered across the sector.

Due to the inclusion of NSS results in the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), which meant that institutions in England that performed well in the NSS and TEF would be permitted to increase their fees, the National Union of Students had encouraged a boycott of the NSS. This had been successful in twelve institutions, including eight from the Russell Group, where the completion rate was less than 50%, meaning that results were not publishable.

It was recognised that the NSS results were also instrumental in league tables, although it was not clear how the new data in the revised NSS questionnaire would be used, nor how the missing institutions would be dealt with.

Professor Coton, Vice Principal Academic & Educational Innovation, demonstrated Qlickview, which allowed interrogation of the data against comparators. Members were encouraged to explore the data at subject level.

Professor Coton highlighted that there were respondents who were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, particularly in relation to assessment and feedback and suggested that this in part could be addressed by clarifying students' expectations and understanding of what constituted feedback.

2. Statement on the Use of Quantitative Indicators in the Assessment of Research Quality

Professor Miles Padgett, Vice Principal for Research, reported that there has been extensive

debate in the HEI sector about the appropriate use of quantitative indicators, specifically to assess and manage research. The discussions had led to recommendations for the responsible use of metrics as published in independent reports such as *The Metric Tide* (2015; commissioned by HEFCE), and in international statements such as the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (2012; DORA) and the Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics (2015).

The University subscribed fully to applying the principles of responsible metrics and these principles were consciously adopted in the formulation of the Institutional KPI for Output Quality approved by SMG in May 2016.

Professor Padgett reported that assessment tools were key to monitoring progress towards the goals in the University's 2015–2020 strategy; however, it was essential that the tools were used in the appropriate manner, and that they were applied fairly and transparently. It was accepted that there was some anxiety amongst the academic community; however, the use of quantitative indicators was inevitable and metrics made a significant contribution to various international league tables. In order to present a clear and consistent policy around the use of quantitative indicators to the academic community — and to allay any concerns that the community had in this regard — a statement explaining how the University uses metrics to assess research activity in its different dimensions was proposed. This approach follows the recent example of other UK universities.

There was discussion about the potential for gender bias in the use of quantitative metrics. Professor Padgett reported that recruitment figures indicated that in terms of recruitment females were more likely to be successful with appointments at grades 7, 8 and 9. However, this was not the case for professorial appointments. However, the Convenor highlighted that it was difficult to draw causal links. Members of Council of Senate identified other areas of bias, including females being a third as likely to be invited as a keynote speaker as males and citation bias towards papers by men. It was acknowledged that careful monitoring of bias was required and the Convenor asked that any further information be passed on to the Equality and Diversity Unit, to ensure that monitoring was undertaken.

Council of Senate approved the proposed statement.

3. REF update

Professor Miles Padgett, provided an update of the recent publication of decisions following consultation exercises that had taken place in response to the 'Stern' committee recommendations.

It was reported that the REF2020 would involve a full return of all research active staff, rather than institutions selecting staff it would return. The number of outputs would be twice the number of individuals returned, however the number of outputs any one individual could return would be a minimum of one and a maximum of six.

It was reported that the portability issue had not been resolved, although it was anticipated that there would likely be some restrictions, and it was recognised that early career researchers should not be disadvantaged. It was anticipated that there would be some credit awarded to the institution at which the output was produced, in addition to the institution the individual moved to. The relative weighting might depend on the timing of the staff member's move vis a vis the timing of REF.

There was to be some adjustments to the weightings of outputs and of impact, with the removal of the impact templates and a greater focus on impact case studies, the number of which was not yet clear. This would mean that impact was significantly more important than in REF2016. It was clarified that the impact should be from within the current REF period. Additionally the environment template would be based on data to a greater extent than previously.

It was reported that there was further consultation taking place in relation to portability and eligibility and it was anticipated that decisions would be reached by Christmas.

In terms of the University of Glasgow's preparation, all Units of Assessment had been reviewed. It was clear that there were fewer 4* outputs than competitor institutions. The results of REF2016 had ranked the University 20th out of 24 Russell Group institutions, compared to a position of 5th or 6th based on grant income. It was noted that some UoAs had a performance tail and others a relatively weak research focus. This had been the driver for the establishment of Research Beacons.

Interim reviews were currently underway, and had been found to be extremely constructive and worthwhile.

Clarification was sought about the eligibility of staff, and it was noted that there would be variation across disciplines.

With respect to which categories of staff would be included, there was clarification that the driver for career pathways should be career aspirations and not the REF exercise. It was recognised that for some, their profile between research and teaching changed over time. It was noted that poor performance in research did not equate to an increase in teaching and to shift staff to a teaching-only contract on that basis would be to undervalue teaching.

Members raised concerns about the pressure for 4* outputs and the terminology around what constituted a 4* output. It was noted that there was a danger of staff morale being impacted if not achieving 4* was considered to be a failing, as a body of internationally excellent work, i.e., 3* illustrated good performance.

Professor Padgett highlighted that rigour, originality and significance were key and that it was advised that authors be very clear about the significance of their work in the abstract and introduction, not purely for the purposes of REF, as conveying the significance of work was good practice.

4. Education and Policy Strategy Committee: Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy

Professor Coton reminded the Council of Senate that, at its last meeting, the Council had requested an opportunity to review and comment on the Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy that had been approved by EdPSC on 3 May 2017. The Policy had been circulated to Council of Senate for comment over the summer and had been amended in accordance with comments received. The Accessible and Inclusive Learning Policy 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. The matter had been referred to EdPSC by the Disability Equality Group. The working group had consulted widely across the academic community and student support services and had discussed earlier drafts with Learning and Teaching Committee. The main principle of the Policy was that the learning environment should be as inclusive as impossible so that individual interventions would be the exception. The Policy was supported

by links to a range of guidelines on the impacted areas of academic activity, such as course design. Council of Senate endorsed the policy.

5. Appointment of Clerk of Senate

Dr Jack Aitken, Director of Senate Office, reported that, as Professor Briggs was scheduled to demit office as Clerk of Senate on 31 July 2018, the selection procedure called for activity to commence in order to identify his successor.

Dr Aitken outlined the procedure, which would firstly involve the establishment of a finding committee to make recommendations on the appointment. The committee's first task was to review and update the role description, in this seeking advice as it wished. The role would then be advertised and nominations sought, with self-nomination permitted. The committee may consult as it wished on other potential appointees and may interview possible candidates. Having considered the nominations, the committee would submit its recommendations to the Council of Senate on who would be the best candidate or candidates for the position. In the event that more than one nominee is identified, a ballot would be held.

While any member of Senate may be nominated, the nature and seniority of the role meant the appointee was likely to be a senior member of staff with extensive experience of academic management and affairs.

Council of Senate was reminded that the period of office for the Clerk was four years; in exceptional circumstances, this may be extended by one or two years.

Membership of the Finding Committee was set out including two elected members of Senate and Council of Senate was content with the proposal that these should be drawn from the Professorial elected membership of the Council of Senate Business Committee.

The timetable for the process was set out with the appointment anticipated to have been made by the April meeting of Council of Senate to allow shadowing of the current Clerk of Senate during the ceremonial period.

6. Convenor's Business

6.1 Fee regime in England

The Principal reported that Parliament had frozen fees at £9250 and had changed the threshold for repayment. He highlighted that any change to the fee regime in England would impact on Scottish institutions. It was noted that here had been a proposal to reduce the cap and that, had that been introduced, it would have had a significant negative impact on income for a number of institutions. It was reported that a shift away from private funding would require the Government support to ensure the sustainability of the sector. The Principal also reported that consideration of value for money on the basis of teaching only was dangerous, particularly for the Russell Group.

6.2 TEF

There was discussion about the implications of the freezing of fees for the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). It was anticipated that TEF would continue, despite the decision to freeze fees. It was seen as a regulatory mechanism to measure quality; however, it was not yet known what final form it would take. To date, TEF had involved assessment of institutions' performance at institutional level. There was concern within the sector that the proposal to replace this with subject level assessment would constitute a disproportionately resource-intensive exercise. Professor Coton reported that piloting of two

possible models for subject-level assessment were due to commence shortly and that volunteer institutions and assessors were being sought.

6.3 Brexit

The Principal reported that he had been making representations and pressing for clarity on EU staff and student status and conditions post-Brexit. It was noted that open meetings had been held for staff, although not recently, as there was little new information to share. Seminars had also been held for those requiring legal advice and individual support. The Principal was keen to hear from members of the Council of Senate whether it was felt that more could be done to support staff at this stage.

7. Clerk of Senate's Business

7.1 Senate Guest Night Dinner

The next Senate Guest Night would be held on Thursday, 12 November 2017 at 7.00 for 7.30pm in the Senate Room. The guest speaker on this occasion would be John Beattie. BBC presenter and former Scotland and British Lions rugby international.

Members of Senate and Court were also encouraged to contact the Clerk of Senate with suggestions for speakers at subsequent Senate Guest Nights.

7.2 Remembrance Sunday

Remembrance Sunday falls on 12 November 2017. This year, the Service of Remembrance would be held in the Bute Hall at 10.45am.

Members of Senate who wish to join the academic procession are requested to assemble in the Hunterian Museum by 10.30am (dress: academic gown, hood and dark tie). Members wishing to attend are asked to advise Pete Murphy, ext 3292, e-mail: pete.murphy@glasgow.ac.uk by 12 noon on Monday 6 November.

7.3 Honorary Degrees 2018

Senate received the oral report from the Honorary Degrees Committee concerning recommendations for the conferment of honorary Degrees in 2018. The Clerk of Senate would provide a report to Court at its meeting on 11 October 2017.

8. Communication from Meeting of Court 21 June 2017.

8.1 Principal's Contract of Employment

Dr David Duncan, Chief Operating Officer and University Secretary, highlighted from the report of Court that Court had approved the recommendation of the Court group, convened to consider whether the Principal should be offered an extension to his current contract of employment. The recommendation was a five-year extension to his contract of employment as Principal and Vice Chancellor of the University, to run until 30 September 2024.

Court had also approved the proposed salary increase on the terms recommended by the Remuneration Committee.

Court Context Card - 11 October 2017 - Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council and Institution-led Review of Quality and Governing Body Statement of Assurance for AY 2016-17

Speaker	Professor John Briggs/Professor Frank Coton	
Speaker role	Clerk of Senate/Vice Principal (Academic and Educational Innovation)	
Paper Description	Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council and Institution-led Review of Quality and Governing Body Statement of Assurance for AY 2016-17	
Topic last discussed at Court	October 2016 (annual report and statement for the year 2015/16)	
Topic discussed at Committee	See paper's cover sheet	
Committee members present	NA	
Cost of proposed plan	N/A	
Major benefit of proposed plan		
Revenue from proposed plan	N/A	
Urgency	Medium - Court approval required for SFC	
Timing	Immediate	
Red-Amber-Green Rating	Green	
Paper Type	For approval/endorsement	
Paper Summary	The statement summarises review activity undertaken by the University of its provision for students, i.e. Periodic Subject Reviews (PSR), Graduate School Reviews and the University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP) carried out in respect of student-facing University services. Information concerning review activity carried out at the University by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies is also included.	
Topics to be discussed	The paper in general/and approval sought	
Action from Court	Court is requested to approve the draft report and endorse the statement of assurance in the cover sheet	
Recommendation to Court	Approval of report and endorsement of statement	
Relevant Strategic Plan workstream		
Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve	3. Student experience	
Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve	Student Mobility/Service delivery	
Risk register - university level	11 Student experience	
Risk register - college level		
Demographics		
% of University	12% of academic provision 6 Reviews of which 2 were Schools and 4 were Subject Areas (total number of Subject Areas being 50)	
% of college		
Operating stats		
% of	NA	
Campus	All: The PSR process is an integral part of the University's Academic Quality Framework	
External bodies	SFC	
Conflict areas		
Other universities that have done something similar	All Scottish HEIs	
Other universities that will do something similar		
Relevant Legislation	Since 2003, the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) has operated the national 'Quality Enhancement Framework'. This was devised collectively by the SFC, the HE sector (through Universities Scotland), the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for Higher Education, and representatives of the student body. The Quality Enhancement Framework in Scotland replaced the systems of quality audits and teaching quality assessments and subject reviews that had operated during the previous decade. It was judged that these earlier activities had 'demonstrated that, in general, Scottish Higher Education institutions had in place effective quality management systems relating to the experience of students and the standards of their awards, and that the subject provision experienced by students was highly satisfactory or better.' (<i>QAA Handbook for enhancement-led institutional review: Scotland, p. 1</i>).	
Equality Impact Assessment	No specific implications identified, although Schools should continue to embed consideration of equality and diversity in all its procedures and provision.	
Suggested next steps	For endorsement	
Any other observations		



Annual Report for the Scottish Funding Council

Progress of Institution-led Reviews conducted in 2016-17

1. Introduction

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

2. Periodic Subject Review (PSR)

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

The University's Academic Standards Committee (ASC) reviews and endorses the report and monitors the responses to the recommendations made. More detailed information on the PSR process is available at:

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/periodicsubjectreview/>

2.1 Subject Areas Reviewed in Session 2016-17

Six reviews were conducted during 2016-17, as follows:

Psychology	1 February 2016
HATII	7 February 2016
Central and East European Studies	22 February 2016
History of Art	22 February 2016
Life Sciences	2 and 3 March 2016
Accounting and Finance	3 March 2016

Details of the programmes covered by the reviews are included in Appendix 1. The University's confirmed PSR review reports are publically available and can be found at the web address stated above under item 2.

2.2 Update on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed in Session 2015-16

Six months following each Review, Progress Reports were considered by the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) for the following subject areas. The outcomes of which were as follows:

School/Subject	Outcome
Academic Development Unit (Learning and Teaching Centre ¹)	As the Learning and Teaching Centre was undergoing a period of reorganisation, ASC delayed an update on all recommendations until November 2017.
Archaeology	ASC was satisfied with the subject area's responses to all the recommendations and no further updates were required. The subject area was commended for providing responses which directly and comprehensively addressed the issues raised.
Dental School	Overall, the responses were considered adequate, but it was agreed that further updates were required in relation to 3 of the recommendations.
English Language	ASC was satisfied with the good progress made on all but one recommendation. This was in relation to the limitation of Moodle ² and the provision of feedback. This was part of a broader set of limitations currently being reviewed by the University's Visual Learning Environment (VLE) Board.
English Literature	ASC was satisfied with 11 responses but requested a further update on 2.
School of Interdisciplinary Studies (Dumfries campus)	Out of 12 recommendations, ASC requested a further update on 2.
Scottish Literature	ASC sought 4 further updates out of 11 recommendations.
School of Mathematics and Statistics	<p>ASC noted particular positive responses to 4 recommendations regarding peer review for staff, student engagement in tutorials, mentoring of GTAs and relationships with 'client' subjects.</p> <p>The response to a recommendation on embedding graduate attributes throughout the curriculum, indicated that a working group had been established to develop detailed proposals with implementation anticipated in 2018-19. Although consultation with some of the 20 other subjects which offered combined Honours degrees was required, ASC requested a further update in September 2017, on any progress made during the 2017-18 session.</p>

¹ Learning and Teaching Centre has been restructured as is now known as the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS)

² Moodle is the VLE used by the University

2.3 Further progress reports on Subject Areas and Programmes Reviewed prior to Session 2015-16

Further updates were requested by ASC on the following

School/Subject	Outcome
Classics	ASC with satisfied with progress made for all but one recommendation. This related to support for international exchange students and would be brought to the attention of the next PSR Panel.
Economics	ASC agreed that no further updates were required in relation to the responses. However, ASC agreed that at the next review of Economics the question of the operation of office hours should be highlighted to the PSR panel and raised with students.
History	A further update on four recommendations was considered with all responses considered adequate with no further update required.
Theatre, Film & TV studies	A further update was requested regarding 2 recommendations relating to career progression and development opportunities for University Teachers on temporary contracts. Responses were provided at a later date with ASC satisfied with the information provided and agreed no further updates were required.
Urban Studies	ASC received an update on one recommendation, concerning the development of a learning and teaching strategy. ASC was satisfied that good progress had been made and no further update was required.

2.4 Subject Reviews to be conducted in Session 2017-18

The following eight reviews are scheduled to take place in Session 2017-18

Management
Medical Undergraduate School ³
Music
Open Studies
School of Education
School of Law

³ Due to the Undergraduate Medical School being accredited this Session by the General Medical Council (GMC), the SFC has agreed to postpone this review until November 2018.

School of Modern Languages and Cultures
School of Physics and Astronomy

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

3.1 PSRB Reviews conducted in Session 2016-17

Please note that the reviews listed below are those reported to the SFC in Autumn 2016 as expected in 2016-17. The reviews shaded in grey have been postponed to 2017-18 and will be reported. Those marked in italics provide updates to reviews which took place in 2015-16.

Subject	PSRB	Outcome
Business School	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business	Report received. Programmes have been reaccredited.
	CIPD	Report received. Programme has been accredited.
Interdisciplinary Studies	Institution of Environmental Sciences	Report received. Programme has been reaccredited.
School of Education	Standards Council for Scotland	Report received. Programmes have been reaccredited
School of Geographical & Earth Sciences	Royal Geographical Society	Report received. Programmes have been reaccredited
School of Humanities	Archives & Records Association	Review on hold pending an internal review of processes by ARA.
<i>School of Mathematics & Statistics</i>	<i>Institute of Mathematics and its Applications</i>	<i>Review undertaken in March 2016. Report now received.</i>
School of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing	Association for Nutrition	Report received. Programme has been reaccredited
	Institution of Physics & Engineering in Medicine	Report received. Programme has been reaccredited

3.2 PSRB reviews to be conducted in Session 2017-18

The following PSRB reviews are anticipated in 2017-18. Subjects shaded in grey are those that will be carried over from the current session.

Subject	PSRB
Business School	Association of MBAs
	European Quality Improvement System
School of Engineering	Institution of Engineering Designers
	Institution of Mechanical Engineers
	Royal Aeronautical Society
School of Law	Law Society of Scotland
Review of the following subject is on hold pending an internal review by the Accrediting Body.	
School of Humanities	Archives & Records Association

4. Graduate School Reviews

The College of Science and Engineering Graduate School was reviewed in May 2017. The report will be approved by the Research Planning and Strategy Committee in October 2017. As one of the outcomes of the College of Science and Engineering Graduate School review, the Deans of Graduate Studies will discuss extending the range of material to be provided in advance of the review to be submitted with the Graduate School Review Self-Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ). This was based on feedback from the external panel member who recommended that statistical information regarding submission rates was provided.

PGR Annual Reporting was introduced for the first time in Session 2015-16. The Deans of Graduate Studies will review this during Session 2016-17 to ensure that the process is functioning effectively.

5. University Services Administrative Review Programme (ARP)

The Research Strategy and International Office (RSIO) was reviewed during Session 2015-16⁴. The recommendations included clarification of management arrangements including standardisation of governance for decision-making on research and Knowledge Exchange matters. The report also suggested improved focus on core services, aligned to College needs; and further articulation of the Knowledge Exchange agenda. Additional resources were suggested in the context of any expansion of the commercialisation agenda that required RSIO support. Additional or refined measures of success for the areas of operation were also recommended.

No reviews are planned for Session 2017-18.

6. The Outcomes of the Institution-led Review Processes

The outcome of a subject review at the University of Glasgow is a report produced by the Review Panel identifying the key strengths of the School or Subject Area along with conclusions and recommendations for improvement or change. There were no recommendations during the

⁴ The report had not been approved prior to submission of the 2015-16 report to the Funding Council

2016-17 PSR reviews that called into question the continuation of any programme for reasons relating to quality or standards.

The University makes the reports of its institution-led quality reviews available to the public through its website.

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

The University continues to work closely with the Students' Representative Council (SRC) to involve students in all quality management processes at the University of Glasgow. The University considers its relationship with the SRC to be strong and effective.

In the Periodic Subject Review process, the meeting with students is considered to be one of the most important aspects of the review. Ongoing efforts are made to increase the numbers and range of students attending. From Session 2017-18, the SRC will include PSR in class representative training, highlighting the importance of this process and the key role of student feedback within it. The class representatives of those Subjects or Schools being reviewed will be informed that they should expect to be consulted in relation to the Self Evaluation Report and will be actively involved with recruiting students to meet with the Panel. The SRC and Senate Office will liaise and support the class representatives in this.

8. Development Needs and the Identification of Good Practice

8.1 Development Needs

As in previous years, an examination of the recommendations made by PSR Panels during Session 2016-17 has been undertaken. In total, 73 recommendations were made from 6 reviews. As part of our standard practice, a report on the examination of the recommendations will be submitted to the 6 October 2017 meeting of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). ASC's attention will be drawn to the groupings with specific attention drawn to any recommendations that have potential for University-wide consideration.

Academic standards[7]	<i>Setting, maintaining and reviewing</i>	Appropriate quality processes	6
		Course/Programme approval	
		Annual monitoring	1
		External Examining	
		Student feedback	
		Benchmark statements	
		Accreditation and other external references	
		Academic governance	
		Sharing good practice	
Context and Strategy		Range of provision	2

	[8]	Staffing	1
		Changes since last review	
		Strategic approach	5
		Overall aims and linkage to University strategy	
Enhancing the Student Experience [23]	<i>Admissions, Retention, Success</i>	Student numbers and trends	
		Recruitment	1
		Retention and Progression	2
		Leavers destination data	
	<i>Equality and Diversity</i>		2
	<i>Supporting students</i>	Support mechanisms	8
		Transition and Induction	
		International students	
		Widening participation	
	<i>Student Engagement</i>	Graduate attributes	
		Employability	3
		Internationalisation	3
		Feedback mechanisms	4
Enhancement Learning & Teaching [35]	<i>Learning & Teaching</i> <i>[8]</i>	Curriculum design and development	5
		Approaches to ILOs	
		Work based learning and placement	2

		Technology enhanced L&T	1
	<i>Assessment & Feedback [9]</i>	Range of assessment methods	
		Engagement with Assessment policy	2
		What/how students receive feedback	7
	<i>Resources for L&T</i>	Staffing	
		Physical resources	
	<i>Engaging and supporting staff [18]</i>	Staff (in general)	6
		Probationer and early career development	4
		GTA support and training	8
Collaborative activity			

As in previous reports, the majority of recommendations fall under the categories Enhancement in Learning and Teaching and Enhancing the Student Experience. The following themes have been identified as having the most recommendations: Engaging and supporting staff (18) within which GTA support and training (8), Student support mechanisms (8) and quality and methods of feedback on assessment (7) were identified.

As a response, the University has established a number of working groups:

- 1) Assessment and Feedback Working Group
- 2) Recognition of Teaching Excellence Working Group
- 3) Transitions Working Group
- 4) Virtual Learning Environment Board (VLE)

The Assessment and Feedback Working Group has also established a sub-group to specifically review GTA training and support. The remits are attached for information, Appendix 2.

There were no concerns that were raised that required urgent attention. This is the third cycle of internal review and the lack of urgent action indicates that our processes are mature and addressing issues through the regular monitoring processes. The University is committed to continuing to review and develop its internal quality processes. During the forthcoming session, in depth consideration will be given to the Periodic Subject Review Process in advance of its fourth cycle due to commence from Session 2020-21.

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

8.2 Key Strengths and Good Practice

A total of 57 areas of good practice/key strengths were identified in the following areas:

Academic standards [3]	<i>Setting, maintaining and reviewing</i>	Appropriate quality processes	
		Course/Programme approval	
		Annual monitoring	
		External Examining	1
		Responsiveness to student feedback	2
		Benchmark statements	
		Accreditation and other external references	
		Academic governance	
		Sharing good practice	
Context and Strategy [10]		Range of provision	1
		Environment (strong sense of community/student focused)	3
		Changes since last review	
		Strategic approach	4
		Reflective and high quality Self Evaluation Report	1
		Overall aims and linkage to University strategy	1
Enhancing the Student Experience [21]	<i>Admissions, Retention, Success</i>	Student numbers and trends	
		Recruitment	
		Retention and Progression	1
		Leavers destination data	

	<i>Equality and Diversity</i>		
	<i>Supporting students</i>	Support mechanisms	8
		Transition and Induction	4
		International students	
		Widening participation	1
	<i>Student Engagement</i>	Graduate attributes	2
		Employability	4
		Internationalisation	
		Feedback mechanisms	1
Enhancement Learning & Teaching [23]	<i>Learning & Teaching</i>	Curriculum design and development	5
		Approaches to ILOs	
		Work based learning and placement	
		Technology enhanced L&T	3
		Innovative Teaching	1
	<i>Assessment & Feedback</i>	Range of/Innovative assessment methods	3
		Engagement with Assessment policy	2
		What/how students receive feedback	2
	<i>Identifying/extending good practice</i>		
	<i>Resources for L&T</i>	Staffing	
		Physical resources	
	<i>Engaging and supporting staff</i>	Supporting staff (including Equality and Diversity)	5
		GTA support and training	2

Collaborative activity			
-------------------------------	--	--	--

Good practice identified covered a wide range of activities with a number identified under Support mechanisms (8), Graduate Attributes/Employability (6), Supporting staff (5), Curriculum design and development (5), Strategic approach (4) and Transition and Induction (4).

Dissemination and tracking of good practice

The University is committed to disseminating good practice and has attempted to do so with practice arising from Periodic Subject Review. This has taken the form of identifying practice with potential for wider dissemination to be circulated to Heads of School and Learning and Teaching Advisers. Examples have also been presented at the annual Learning and Teaching Committee Away Day.

Last year, the Learning and Teaching Committee proposed that the Learning Enhancement and Academic Development Service (LEADS) should take an active role in reviewing and identifying good practice worthy of dissemination. Academic Standards Committee endorsed this proposal in October 2016. Since then, LEADS has appointed a Good Practice Adviser, who is working with the Senate Office in order to progress this.

In the first instance, the Good Practice Adviser will contact Schools where good practice has been identified, and will work with staff in these Schools to develop a range of electronic and online materials in a variety of media. These will be made widely available to the University of Glasgow community.

Staff engaged in good practice will be encouraged to:

- share their teaching tips by submitting them to 'Glasgow University's Teaching Tips Online' (GUSTTO), which is a bespoke resource designed for staff to share practice
- consider offering a presentation at the annual Learning and Teaching Conference
- contribute to regular CPD events run by LEADS

It is hoped that this will help build a community ethos of sharing and embedding good practice across the University.

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

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