

WEB COPY

Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 13 February 2019 in the Senate Room, Main Building

Present:

Mr Dave Anderson Employee Representative, Mr Graeme Bissett Co-opted Member, Ms Heather Cousins Co-opted Member, Professor Lindsay Farmer Senate Assessor, Mr David Finlayson Co-opted Member, Professor Carl Goodyear Senate Assessor, Professor Nick Hill Senate Assessor, Dr Simon Kennedy Senate Assessor, Dr Morag Macdonald Simpson General Council Assessor, Ms Margaret Anne McParland Employee Representative, Mr Ronnie Mercer Co-opted Member, Dr June Milligan Co-opted Member, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Professor Sir Anton Muscatelli Principal, Mr Elliot Napier SRC Assessor, Ms Elspeth Orcharton Co-opted Member, Ms Elizabeth Passey Co-opted Member (Convener of Court), Ms Lauren McDougall SRC President, Mr Gavin Stewart Co-opted Member, Ms Lesley Sutherland General Council Assessor, Dr Bethan Wood Senate Assessor

Attending:

Dr David Duncan (Chief Operating Officer [COO] & University Secretary), Mr Robert Fraser (Director of Finance), Professor Neal Juster (Senior Vice-Principal and Deputy Vice-Chancellor), Ms Deborah Maddern (Administrative Officer), Professor Jill Morrison (Vice-Principal & Clerk of Senate), Ms Ann Allen (Director of Estates) (for items 7 & 8), Professor Jill Pell (Director of the Institute of Health & Wellbeing) (for item 8)

Observing:

Mr Iain Stewart (lay member Finance Committee)

Apologies:

Members: Cllr Susan Aitken Glasgow City Council Assessor, Mr Aamer Anwar Rector, Professor Kirsteen McCue Senate Assessor, Dr Ken Sutherland Co-opted Member

CRT/2018/25 Announcements

Mr Iain Stewart, a lay member on the Finance Committee, was welcomed as an observer.

There was the following declaration of interest in relation to business to be conducted at the meeting: Professor Sir Anton Muscatelli as a Trustee of USS, as an ongoing declaration, given the updates on the triennial valuation of the scheme. Dr Duncan had also declared an interest in his written report, under the Pay Dispute update, as an employer-nominated representative on the JNCHES pay negotiating committee.

It was recorded that Ms Lauren McDougall had briefed Court at the pre-lunch session, covering the work of the SRC including its annual report. Ms McDougall was thanked for the briefing.

Court was reminded that papers and business were confidential.

CRT/2018/26. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 12 December 2018

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2018/27. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2018/28. Report from the Principal

CRT/2018/28.1 Higher Education Developments

Scottish Budget 2019-20

In mid-December the Scottish Government had published its draft budget for 2019-20. The overall draft budget for Higher Education was as follows:

	2018-19 Budget £m	2019-20 Draft Budget £m
HE Resource (SFC)	1024.9	1025.3
HE Capital (SFC) Funding	41.3	37.5
HE Capital (SFC) Financial Transactions	40.0	55.5

This was, in effect, a flat-cash settlement for HE in revenue terms. The capital budget had seen a 9% cash terms cut. The sector had been advised that the funding available would be sufficient to sustain the current level of capital maintenance grant in cash terms, along with a capacity to match fund the BEIS Science Capital funding in full. The budget had also announced an increase in Financial Transactions for the sector, aimed at ‘estates projects to improve the learner experience and reduce the sector’s carbon footprint’. These would be loans rather than grants.

Post-18 Funding Review in England

In December it had been announced that there would be a change in the way student loans were recorded in public finances: the amount expected not to be repaid would be reclassified as public spending. This would be factored into the tuition fees review, due to report early in 2019. The Office for Budget Responsibility had estimated that Public Sector Net Borrowing (PSNB) in 2018-19 would rise by approximately £12 billion as a result of changing from the current approach to the new approach. This might have implications for the 2020 spending review, but it also had potential implications if the rise in government spending had an impact on the block grant to devolved governments under the ‘Barnett’ formula.

There were ongoing discussions with Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, DfE and Treasury, through the Russell Group, on the implications of the post-18 review.

CRT/2018/28.2 Universities Superannuation Scheme USS/Pensions update

At its previous meeting Court had heard that since member and employer representatives on the Joint Negotiating Committee had not agreed on an alternative outcome to the 2017 valuation, default cost-sharing rules had been triggered and member and employer contributions into the scheme would be increasing from 1 April 2019, in three phases.

In November the Trustees had announced that a new valuation of the scheme would start, to consider feedback from USS employers following the stakeholder joint expert panel (JEP)'s recent review of the 2017 valuation. In early January, a consultation had started with Universities UK (UUK) on the proposed Technical Provisions for a new valuation of USS as at 31 March 2018. The Trustee had issued its initial consultation document on the technical provisions and the statement of funding principles for the 2018 valuation. The consultation with employers via UUK would run from 2 January to the middle of March. The Trustee had not adopted all of the proposed recommendations of the JEP, but had adopted some which it felt were within its risk appetite. The approach by the Trustee

set out two 'bookends' for total contributions, ranging from 33.7% to 29.7%, to be shared between employers and employee contributions. This was on the basis of unchanged levels of benefits in the scheme. The consultation noted that the lower level of contribution could be reached provided that employers could agree to contingent contributions which could be triggered during the valuation cycle.

Given his role as a USS Director, the Principal had delegated the role of developing the University's response to this consultation to the Chief Operating Officer, Director of Finance, Senior Vice-Principal and Executive Director of HR on behalf of the Senior Management Group.

It was hoped that the 2018 valuation process could be finished by June 2019. The Trustee body could conclude the valuation by imposing the higher bookend level of contributions following the consultation. However, any proposed change in benefits or adoption of contingent contributions would require agreement by the employers and the Joint Negotiating Committee of USS.

The Director of Finance stated that the 2017 valuation had been reflected in a deficit contribution of 5% for 14 years on the University's balance sheet; this increased the provision on the balance sheet significantly and the figure would remain at that rate unless the national position changed before the end of the University's financial year. Additional employer contributions, which amounted to an additional £8-9M p.a., had been factored into the papers provided under item 7 for the present meeting.

Court would be kept updated at future meetings.

CRT/2018/28.3 2019 New Year's Honours

Court recorded congratulations to University colleagues and one former member of staff who had been recognised in the 2019 New Year's Honours list.

CRT 2018/28.4 Key Activities

Court noted a summary 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/2018/29. Report from the University Secretary

CRT/2018/29.1 Brexit

A paper had been provided, summarising steps that the University was taking to mitigate the impact of Brexit on the University. Areas covered in the update included the Settlement scheme for EU citizens; outward student mobility; European students studying at Glasgow; travel advice; Research funding; relations with universities in the European Union; dialogue with UK and Scottish governments; financial issues; stocks and supplies; and construction issues.

The situation was being kept under constant review. Regular updates were being issued to staff and students as new information became available.

CRT/2018/29.2 Mental Health

At previous meetings, Court had received updates on developments in the University's provision in the area of mental health. The Mental Health Group had met in January, its business having included reviewing progress against the action plan, a copy of which was noted by Court. The meeting had received a presentation on an online tool, the Big White Wall, which was now available to all students and staff. The tool provided a range of intermediate level support for individuals in a very accessible format; it also put those suffering from mental health difficulties in touch with professional assistance within a maximum of 30 minutes. One-on-one counselling was also available via the Big White Wall through a referral system run by the University's Counselling & Psychological Services (CAPS).

CRT/2018/29.3 Pay dispute

Dr Duncan declared an interest as an employer-nominated representative on the JNCHES pay negotiating committee.

Court noted that although the 2018 pay award had already been paid, the dispute over the settlement remained live, with UCU conducting a ballot over further industrial action. In February UCEA (the Employers' Association) would begin consulting members on the 2019 pay offer.

CRT/2018/29.4 Sexual Violence and Harassment

Court had heard previously about work to combat and raise awareness of sexual violence and harassment. Court noted a recent message from the Principal and SRC President to the University community, emphasising that sexual violence and harassment would not be tolerated and drawing attention to sources of support.

CRT/2018/29.5 Annual Court Self-Assessment and Convener appraisal

A questionnaire for Court self-assessment/feedback on performance would be circulated ahead of the next meeting. The Court Governance Working Group would consider the outcomes of this and would also refer to the Code, to ensure that the University was addressing all its responsibilities in terms of good governance. A report would be made to the April meeting of Court.

The Convener and the Chancellor's Assessor left the meeting for the next item of business, during which Court agreed that the annual appraisal of the Convener's performance would be undertaken by the Chancellor's Assessor, Ronnie Mercer.

CRT/2018/29.6 Conflicts and Declarations of Interest

Court members and senior management were required to complete a Declaration of Interest form on an annual basis. Court members and attenders were also expected to declare any interests in an item or items of business at individual Court or other University meetings, if there was an actual or potential conflict of interest.

Court noted a summary of a report compiled by the SFC and an HEI, on a recent governance matter, noting the 'lessons learned' and recommendations for the sector to consider. The University's Whistleblowing procedure in part covered the recommendations. Any amendments to the Code of Good HE governance, which might result from the report, and any other requirements from the Committee of Chairs, would be observed. There were also existing local processes relating to appointments and deputising/vice-convening of committees, which would address other recommendations.

CRT/2018/29.7 HE Governance (Scotland) Act – Ordinances on Court and Senate Composition

Following approval of draft Ordinances at the last meeting, copies had been provided to the Scottish Government, as part of the usual process, seeking any input ahead of the formal consultation. A response

was awaited. It was noted that the formal two-month consultation would commence thereafter. If there were significant delays, this would hold up the changes to the Court membership which were currently scheduled for 1 August 2019.

Court noted that a paper relating to the Convener's appointment would be included for the April meeting.

CRT/2018/29.8 Appointment of Employee Representatives on Court

At the previous meeting, approval had been given to the Court/Senate working group's recommendations relating to the future composition of Court.

The related Ordinance had not been through the necessary consultation yet, given that comments were awaited from the Scottish Government, but given that timescales would be relatively tight and the current Employee Representatives' terms ended 31 July 2019, an election would need to be held in the run up to 1 August, if the Ordinance were granted. A proposed process for future appointments had been drafted to provide guidance for those running the elections and for candidates. Court approved its use as the basis for future elections.

The document referred also to the new Trade Union nominated positions. As agreed at the previous meeting, it would be for the Unions to make the nominations. The process required to be approved by Court, under the terms of the 2016 Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act. The nominations process for the two student representatives on Court would also need to be submitted for Court approval.

CRT/2018/29.9 Summary of Convener's Business

Court noted a summary of activities undertaken by the Convener since the last meeting.

CRT/2018/29.10 Delegated signatory authority

University Ordinances and Court regulations about delegated authority provided for financial and other delegated authorities. In his capacity as University Secretary, Dr Duncan was authorised to sign documents in a number of areas, committing the University to contracts and other agreements across a range of the University's activities. Court approved delegation of signatory authority to the Deputy Secretary in the Secretary's absence from the University; this would be either as sole or joint signatory depending on the requirements of the document/process in question.

CRT/2018/29.11 Director of Research Institute / Head of School Appointments

College of MVLS

Institute of Health and Wellbeing

Professor Jill Pell had been re-appointed as Director of the Institute of Health and Wellbeing, for 5 years from 1 March 2019.

College of Social Sciences

School of Education

Professor Margery McMahon had been appointed as Head of the School of Education for 4 years from 1 August 2019, succeeding Professor Trevor Gale.

School of Law

Professor Jane Mair had been appointed as Head of the School of Law for 4 years from 1 August 2019, succeeding Professor Iain MacNeil.

CRT/2018/29.11 Draft Resolutions relating to Degree Regulations

On Court's behalf the University Secretary had approved a large number of draft Resolutions relating to degree regulations. The text of the regulations had already had the benefit of Senate Office and General Council input, but a formal consultation would also take place, as was required for documents of this kind.

CRT/2018/30. Report from the Rector

In the Rector's absence, there was no report.

CRT/2018/31. Capital Programme – Financial and Related Considerations

Ann Allen, Director of Estates, was welcomed to the meeting for this and the next agenda item.

Following discussion at the December Court meeting, Court now received an update paper outlining the current status of the capital plan and the proposed process for reviewing the plan and presenting an updated version to Court in June 2019. Court also received the most recent long-term cash flow, including a summary which listed the considerations factored into the cash flow, highlighted the main scenarios and analysis, and also referred to assumptions made, including assumptions relating to future USS contributions and to Phase 1a and 1b of the capital plan being completed.

Professor Neal Juster introduced the item. In December 2016, had Court approved a major update of the capital plan that embraced the phased development of the Western Infirmary site. Alongside the capital plan, Court had also approved a funding strategy and an outline cashflow. The December 2016 capital plan had established the principle that the capital spend would be presented in terms of the development phases: Phase 1a, Phase 1b, and Phase 2. An additional £15m per annum capital budget had also been expected to be spent in support of other, yet to be identified, projects. Court had agreed in principle that the University should proceed to develop Phases 1a and 1b at costs of £433.5m and £98.5m respectively (total £532.0m). Court had also approved borrowing of £175m to support this development.

The capital plan was expected to be dynamic and able to change as new opportunities arose, income streams altered, and University priorities adapted to the external environment. In addition, in a capital development programme of the scale in question, risks and issues were expected to occur and to be managed. Taking these variables into account, the capital plan was formally updated and presented to Court each June alongside the annual planning and budgeting process. Updates had been presented in June 2017 and June 2018. In June 2018 the forecast outturn costs of Phases 1a and 1b had been £453.1m and £77.9 m respectively (total £531.4m).

Two years into the programme, it was clear that the scale of the current opportunities and cost pressures, coupled with cash generation being ahead of the December 2016 forecast, meant that it was appropriate to conduct a more thorough review of the capital plan. The intention was to present the review for approval to Court in June 2019, with an interim update in April.

Court noted key points, including the timetable for refreshing the plan, the current estimated outturn for Phases 1a and 1b, the list of major projects to be considered in the review, the process for prioritising major projects, and the minor projects to be included in the review and the process for prioritising these.

In discussion, it was confirmed that the emerging themes for inclusion in the University's new strategic plan would be available by the late spring of 2019, so that they would be available to inform the capital plan, albeit that the strategic plan would not be finalised until the following year. It was

also confirmed that the capital plan presented to Court in June 2019 would include specific recommendations and would incorporate details of any proposed accelerations of capital projects or proposals to delay some projects in favour of more strategically important developments. A commentary on resource would be included in the paper. It was agreed that options for additional car parking spaces, possibly off-campus, would be considered.

Court noted a paper on the long-term cash-flow, which was summarised by Robert Fraser. The paper took into consideration the following in the latest forecast: the latest capital plan; increased cash generation via an improved outlook and budget targets; expected USS increases; the removal of administrative savings relating to World Changing Glasgow/Transformation projects; additional running costs relating to the Institute of Health & Wellbeing; reprofiled salary costs beyond the current budget period; and updated SFC and Home tuition fee growth rates, with a future increase to match salary inflation. The following scenarios and analysis were included: the latest forecast; scenarios on capital repayment, limited international student growth, limited capital spend, lower USS contributions after 2025/26; a detailed 48-month forecast for the forecast low point in University cash balances; and an updated balance sheet forecast and debt covenant outlook.

Court noted the main contributors to the current forecast, and the headline figures.

Court heard from Graeme Bissett, chair of the Finance Committee, that the Committee's discussion of the cash-flow had revealed two main concerns. One related to the medium-term sustainability of the University, in the context particularly of Brexit, USS and the Augar review of tuition fees, all fluid situations, and of the upward movement in capital costs in the 2020s. The other related to the process for collective movement to an agreed position in June 2019, via senior management, Court Committees and Court, in the context of so many variables and a rapidly-moving landscape. The modelling and scenarios presented to Court for the current meeting were therefore valuable in helping understanding of the position. Ongoing collaboration between management and Committee representatives ahead of the April and June Court meetings, to assess key variables and test outcomes, would help to avoid problems when the budget and capital plan were provided to Court in June.

The Principal agreed that this interactive and co-operative approach would help inform the budget and capital plan, and key Court decisions relating to these in due course. Arrangements would be made between now and March to facilitate it.

Comments were noted from Court members, as follows:

- That Court should record some concern in light of the update that had been provided;
- That sufficient time should be allocated to the Court agenda in June to enable proper discussion;
- That a single scenario might be worked up in discussion between SMG and the Finance Committee, rather than a multi-factorial approach being taken;
- That with regard to the World Changing Glasgow/Transformation programme, any efficiencies arising should be made in a planned way; in relation to this, Court heard that an update on the programme would be provided in June. Administrative savings arising from the programme's projects had been removed from the current forecast, but it was intended to restore them and Court would be involved in any key decisions;
- That the amount of financial resource available to the City Council might be a factor in the University's consideration of the Kelvinhall project;
- That reference to asset disposals should be included in the capital plan;
- That scenario planning where increased student numbers were envisaged should include numbers and an assessment of what the campus would look and feel like as a result;
- That the ability to accommodate additional student numbers must be considered;
- That the levers to deal with variations in outcomes vs. assumptions should be clear;
- The importance of maintaining global ranking;
- That commercial sustainability must be carefully considered where projects had both

- commercial and public components;
- That the update to Court in June must set out details of areas for cost saving, progress against the targets and a realistic assessment of achievability, as part of the overall setting for the affordability of the capital plan.

It was agreed that the SMG/Committee representatives discussion timetable would be added to the overall timetable for the revision of the capital plan.

CRT/2018/32. Institute of Health & Wellbeing Full Business Case

Professor Jill Pell, Director of the Institute of Health & Wellbeing (IHW), was welcomed to the meeting for this item, which she was presenting.

Professor Pell provided a recap on the main points of the business case, which had previously been outlined at the Court Strategy Day in September 2018. The business case had now received approval from the Estates and Finance Committees, subject to a financial limit on expenditure.

The societal benefits of activity that would take place in the building were highlighted. These included improving public health; reversal of worsening health indicators; reducing health inequalities; reducing the NHS and social care burden. Additionally, there would be benefits connected to ameliorating the wider economic impact that poor health had, such as lost productivity.

As the business case explained, the benefit of the building would also be to protect existing research and teaching income streams by ensuring the Institute remained competitive within a rapidly changing funding landscape, where funders increasingly preferred to support large-scale, multi-disciplinary research. There would also be opportunities for developing new teaching programmes, given the interface between disciplines through co-location in one building. The structure, layout, facilities and use of the building would facilitate both planned and opportunistic networking. There would be ideation space for co-production of research with external stakeholders; facilities for knowledge exchange; and facilities for public engagement.

Ann Allen, Director of Estates, explained that the engagement of the Institute in the development of the project had facilitated effective challenge of the rationales outlined; and that the building complied with the Campus Masterplan given its inclusivity and public access. There had been significant involvement of the relevant governance bodies in the project, including a gateway review and scrutiny of costs by both the Estates and Finance Committees. The movement in costs had arisen in the context of a larger building, with more facilities, being developed, but the reasons for this had been well explored. Ronnie Mercer, chair of the Estates Committee, concurred with the summary, noting that the Committee had approved the business case subject to the expenditure limit of £49.6m being adhered to. The contractor was expected to revert shortly with details of costs; the project would not proceed if the limit was exceeded. Graeme Bissett advised that the Finance Committee had similarly approved the case, noting that the Net Present Value NPV was negative but that this measure was not necessarily appropriate for the building. The Committee had nevertheless agreed that there was a positive case, in particular relating to the societal benefits arising from the building, as had been outlined to Court earlier in the meeting; the building was also a significant infrastructure asset for the University.

In discussion, a question was asked about the relatively low increase in research income that was predicted, particularly when compared to the Research Hub case, which had had some similarities to the IHW in other respects. A question was also asked about the reason for the difference in the initial and current capital costs. Court noted from the responses that the Research Hub's impact translated more readily into commercial and IP income, whereas the positive impacts on health that the IHW would achieve were not measurable in the same way, health equality not being the same as commercial gain. Court also noted that in order to be fit for purpose and have the external and reputational impacts that were aspired to, the building needed to be as it was currently designed, with a commensurate cost increase from the original estimate. The revision of the capital plan would take

the increase into account.

Court heard that other capital projects were also likely to increase in cost as a result of higher student numbers leading to additional space needs; this would similarly be factored into the revised plan, with details to be provided about income growth arising from the additional recruitment.

It was confirmed that the IHW building was futureproofed for growth, to accommodate additional staff and that it was a flexible space that could be repurposed.

Court approved the Full Business Case for the IHW subject to a maximum cost of £49.6M. The IHW would come into operation in Q3 of 2021.

Ahead of consideration of the Estates Committee item, Court noted from Ann Allen that work would shortly begin on a larger pedestrian crossing area (a ‘super crossing’) at the main University gate; and that a crossing would also be constructed close to the Learning & Teaching Hub. Temporary traffic restrictions would occur but vehicle flow on University Avenue would be maintained throughout, given the importance of the route for local and other traffic. Discussions were being held with the City Council about traffic flow and safety on other local roads, including Kelvin Way and the ‘Western Infirmary’ campus. Court noted a comment that cycling safety was also an important factor.

CRT/2018/33. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2018/33.1 Estates Committee

CRT/2018/33.1.1 Institute of Health and Wellbeing (Clarice Pears Building)

The Committee had noted the maximum project costs of £49.6m, based on an interim target price, and that a final target price would be available by March 2019. The Committee had agreed in principle with the aims of the proposal and that it should be shared in its current form at the Finance Committee and at Court, where conditional approval would be requested, subject to a maximum cost of £49.6m. It had been agreed that an additional explanatory note would be prepared to accompany the Business Case and that this would provide a detailed synopsis of the anticipated societal and reputational benefits expected to be realised through delivery of the project.

CRT/2018/33.1.2 Other Capital Projects

The Committee had approved Capex applications relating to: Gilmorehill/Joseph Black Building/Skabara Lab £265k (additional finding); Gilmorehill/Joseph Black Building/Phase 2 Roof Works up to a maximum of £144k; Replacement and Upgrade of Laboratory Caging £1.497m; and Phase 2 Quantic - College Equipment £787k.

Arrangements to cover the costs of the fire suppression system in the Learning & Teaching Hub had been finalised.

The report was noted.

CRT/2018/33.2 Finance Committee

CRT/2018/33.2.1 Institute of Health & Wellbeing IH&W

The Full Business Case for the Institute of Health and Wellbeing had been considered. The Committee had agreed to recommend the project to Court on condition that the final cost did not exceed £49.6m.

CRT/2018/33.2.2 Other Capital Projects

Court noted an update on capital projects. Court noted that in addition to its approval of the IHW Full Business Case, the Finance Committee had approved 4 capex applications at its last meeting: Gilmorehill / JBB / Phase 2 £144k; Replacement and upgrading of laboratory animal caging £1.497m; Gilmorehill / JBB / Skabara Lab £265k; and EPSRC outline call for Quantum Technology Research Hubs (Phase 2 - QuantIC) £787k.

CRT/2018/33.2.3 Financial reports

Court noted an overview of performance as at 30 December 2018.

The report was noted, including the executive summary.

CRT/2018/33.3 Student Experience Committee

The Committee's recent discussions had included several items for Court to note, in particular: the committee's remit, which had been slightly amended following agreement by Court; a revised title for the University Calendar (to change to University Regulations); discussion on the Student Services Review; information on the new online platform to support mental health; the SEC Action Plan; and the SEC Away Day.

The co-chairs Lauren McDougall and David Duncan highlighted the good progress against the SEC action plan and the related work on mental health and wellbeing.

Although it was already open to Dumfries-based University students to stand for positions on the Committee, the co-chairs would discuss Dumfries representation on the SEC with the School of Interdisciplinary Studies.

The report was noted.

CRT/2018/33.4 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

The Committee had received: updates on insurance arrangements for overseas travel, on traffic changes on University Avenue arising from the Learning & Teaching Hub, and on identification of funding for Safe Zone (personal safety) software. 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 committee had discussed matters relating to lessons learned from adverse weather conditions and to the new parking permit system. The committee had reviewed the HSW Policy, with an addition made to document collaborative working with the SRC and Trade Unions.

It was noted that the Safe Zone software's primary use was local, and that other solutions might be required for students abroad, including support for individual needs and circumstances outside the UK.

The report was noted.

CRT/2018/34. Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate 7 February 2019

Council of Senate had received: reports from the Student Experience Committee and Education Policy and Strategy Committee; and details of acceptances received from nominees to receive Honorary Degrees in 2019.

The communications from the Council of Senate were noted.

CRT/2018/35. Any Other Business

There was no other formal business. Members were reminded that an invitation had been issued for the annual Cathedral service on 10 March, to which all were invited.

CRT/2018/36. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of Court will be held on Wednesday 10 April 2019 at 1.45pm at the Vet School.