



Court

Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 12 December 2018 in the Senate Room, Main Building

Present:

Cllr Susan Aitken Glasgow City Council Assessor, 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, 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

In attendance:

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 Christine Barr (Director of HR) (from item 18)

Apologies:

Members: Mr Aamer Anwar Rector, Professor Kirsteen McCue Senate Assessor, Mr David Milloy Co-opted Member, Dr Ken Sutherland Co-opted Member

CRT/2018/13 Announcements

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; and the Convener of Court in relation to the Remuneration Committee item (Convener Remuneration section).

It was recorded that Ms Fran Shepherd and Ms Emily Howie had briefed Court at the pre-lunch briefing session, covering alumni relations.

Court was reminded that papers and business were confidential.

CRT/2018/14. Minutes of the meetings held on Wednesday 10 October 2018

The minutes were approved.

CRT/2018/15. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CRT/2018/16. Finance Committee

CRT/2018/16.1 Financial Statements 2017/18

Graeme Bissett introduced the item, advising that the Finance Committee had made some minor suggestions for changes to the narrative in the statements, and overall had been content to recommend the financial statements to Court. He also advised Court that the capital plan and how this interacted with the cash flow had been the subject of discussion at the Committee's meeting, at which an update paper had been requested; this paper appeared in the Estates Committee report and would be presented and discussed later in the meeting.

The Director of Finance, Robert Fraser, gave a presentation on the University's financial statements for the year to 31 July 2018, Court having received the statements for that year.

Revenue had increased to £631m (from £608m), primarily due to international student growth and an increase in underlying research income (£11m) offset by a corresponding reduction in capital grants. The surplus after tax had reduced to £31.8m from £56.6m due to FRS102 movements (£14.5m, largely reduced capital grants and donation income); demolition costs (£10.9m); and reduced gains on sale (£3.4m).

Total comprehensive income for the year had increased to £66.1m from £31.8m due to actuarial gains in 2018 in the UGPS scheme. Capital expenditure in the year was £41.9m, which was an increase of £3.9m compared to 2017, but £73m below budget. Cash and deposit balance as at 31 July 2018 was £207.4m, which was a decrease of £24.4m in the year.

In discussion, it was noted that staff costs for University Services included the World Changing Glasgow (WCG)/Transformation Project Office costs, which accounted for an increase of £2.7M. In terms of identifiable cost savings arising from the various projects being undertaken by WCG, it was noted that there would be many fractional savings on posts but an exact cost:benefit analysis was more difficult.

Court approved the University Financial Statements for the year to 31 July 2018. Robert Fraser and his team, and the Finance Committee, were thanked for their work.

CRT/2018/16.2 Universities Subsidiaries and Trust Financial Statements as at 31 July 2018

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

CRT/2018/16.3 Capital Projects

Court noted an update on capital projects. Court noted that the Finance Committee had approved 2 capex applications at its last meeting: Gilmorehill/Kelvin Building / Essential Works £3.279m; and Gilmorehill/Davidson/West Medical Refurbishment Supplementary Fees £283k.

CRT/2018/16.4 Financial reports

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

CRT/2018/16.4 Long term cash flow

Court noted details of long term cash flow.

The report was noted.

CRT/2018/17. Report from the Principal

CRT/2018/17.1 Higher Education Developments

Brexit

In October, Court had heard that EU staff affected by Brexit were being assisted as much as possible by services in the University, for example with regard to residency.

The UK government had very recently agreed a draft Political Declaration (PD) on the future relationship with the EU, alongside the negotiated Withdrawal Agreement (WA) which set out the terms of the UK departure from the EU. In the PD, the parties had confirmed that they would discuss participation by Britain in the EU programmes including a potential science and innovation pact, education, and space, subject to “a fair and appropriate financial contribution” from the UK. There would also be discussion on the UK’s participation in the EU-funded research facilities (European Research Infrastructure Consortia, or ERICs). The document recorded the UK’s intention to stop free movement of EU citizens into the country, but said that the parties would “consider conditions for entry and stay for purposes such as research, study, training and youth exchanges”. It was not yet clear what this meant, in terms of researchers and students potentially having special migration rules when moving between the EU and the UK.

On 22 November, the University had hosted a Scottish Government Brexit Summit for Further and Higher Education. This had coincided with the announcement of a joint statement signed by colleges, universities, trade unions and the Scottish Government, agreeing a united approach to protect Scottish tertiary education from the worst effects of Brexit. The statement had set out how all the parties would press the UK Government to reintroduce a Post-Study Work Visa in Scotland, continue research collaboration and safeguard education relationships within Europe.

In discussion, it was noted that student and staff travel in the EU would be kept under review during the early part of 2019. Plans were already required to be put in place within Schools, to cover travel related matters in the event of a no-deal Brexit. In terms of Court being kept informed about this and other areas connected to Brexit, and to allow Court to discuss any related matters, it was agreed that a paper would be provided to the February 2019 meeting, covering the University’s activities that might be affected by Brexit. The February meeting was at an appropriate time in terms of the Brexit timetable.

Post-18 Funding Review in England

At the October meeting, in the context of the funding review in England, Court had heard that the Department for Education had confirmed it would not report back until a ruling from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) has been issued on how student loans should be treated in the national figures on deficit and debt. ONS was expected to publish in December. Treatment of unpaid loans as public spending could result in a reduction in the headline tuition fee, following the review.

Post meeting note: On 17 December it was announced that a change in how student loans were recorded in the public finances would occur, following an Office for National Statistics ruling: the amount expected not to be repaid, which could be 45% of lending, would be reclassified as public spending and could amount to £12bn. The government indicated that the change would be taken into account by the tuition fees review, due to report early in 2019.

CRT/2018/17.2 Universities Superannuation Scheme USS/Pensions update

The Joint Expert Panel (JEP) report issued in September had led to a series of consultations with both UUK members and within UCU. Court members had been provided with a copy of the University’s response to the UUK-initiated consultation with USS’s participating employers on the JEP recommendations. UUK had subsequently announced that employers were willing to support these,

subject to USS providing more information on the additional financial risks involved – and if and how they could be managed and mitigated.

There had also been a statutory employer consultation by USS on proposed changes to employee and employer contributions on the conclusion of the 2017 valuation by the Trustee under rule 76.4, inviting input from members on the proposed cost sharing provisions, the proposed schedule of phasing in of higher contributions and the removal of the employer match from 1 April 2019. USS had recently issued the outcome of its consideration of members' responses to the statutory employer consultation. It had advised that USS did not propose to make any changes to the cost-sharing arrangements and would now consult with UUK (on behalf of the employers) before the arrangements were finalised. A summary of the consultation responses would be shared by USS with the scheme's formal stakeholders, through the Joint Negotiating Committee. This would conclude the 2017 valuation.

USS was now carrying out a new valuation of the scheme's funding position, as at 31 March 2018, in order to respond to the JEP's report and the UUK announcement of its support of the JEP conclusions. Areas such as market data, forecasted investment returns and life expectancy would be updated, and use would be made of actual investment experience since the date of the last valuation (31 March 2017). There would be formal consultation with UUK (on behalf of employers) on the updated funding assumptions during December and January. After this, USS would assess the proposals put forward by the stakeholders' panel and consider the scale of the additional financial risks involved, and the ways and means by which employers were willing and able to fund the risks that the Trustee could contemplate taking.

USS planned to finalise the updated contribution rates based on this new valuation in early February 2019 and the Joint Negotiating Committee would then consider how to address the outcome.

As member and employer representatives on the Joint Negotiating Committee could not agree on an alternative outcome to the 2017 valuation, default cost-sharing rules were triggered and member and employer contributions into the scheme would be increasing from 1 April 2019, with further increases planned in October 2019 and April 2020. Given the timescales, the April 2019 contribution increase could not be avoided, but USS had indicated that it hoped an alternative way forward would be agreed before the significantly higher cost-sharing increases were planned to come into effect from October 2019.

CRT/2018/17.3 Research Hub / Themes

In October 2017, Court had approved the Full Business Case for the Research Hub. In mid-October of 2018, planning consent had been received from Glasgow City Council to begin construction on the Hub. Work had now started on the £113 million project, with completion expected in 2021.

It had also been announced by the University that research in the Hub would be initially focused around five thematic areas: Creative Economies and Cultural Transformation; Digital Chemistry; International Development; Quantum and Nanotechnology; and Technology Touching Life. The decision about the thematic areas had followed a review of research across the four Colleges to identify large-scale research themes to form the initial occupancy for the Hub. The aim had been to identify broad, large-scale themes that would enable showcasing of Glasgow's research strengths at scale, with a critical mass of researchers around themes which would open up new opportunities to compete for funding. In response to a question about the methodology of the review, it was noted that this had involved discussion with the Heads of Colleges, Research Deans/RPSC and those identified by them as being in areas of critical mass that would be a good fit for the Hub. There was strong correlation with the Research Beacons. Comments were noted that processes in connection with the decision making had not been fully communicated across some Colleges. It was noted that, organisationally, the Hub would not be a new budgetary unit that would affect School budgets. It was also noted that there would be flexibility for movement in and out of the Hub.

CRT/2018/17.4 Institute of Health and Wellbeing

The University had been delighted to receive a donation of £5 million from the Pears Foundation for the construction of a new building to house the Institute of Health and Wellbeing. It would be named after Clarice Pears.

CRT/2018/17.5 Grant Capture

Court heard that in a recent THE survey reviewing UK HEI's performance in 2017-18 in terms of total cash awarded for open-call grants, the University had performed extremely well, moving from 14th to 9th in the UK and the top University in Scotland with over £41m secured from 57 successful applications.

CRT/2018/17.6 Transnational Education TNE

In October, the University of Glasgow Singapore (UGS) had celebrated its largest ever graduation ceremony, with 368 graduates receiving degrees in a range of programmes delivered in partnership with the Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT).

A new collaboration agreement had also been signed with SIT, merging all previous collaboration agreements with SIT to deliver five joint undergraduate degree programmes, leading to a jointly awarded degree from the academic year 2019/20 onwards.

CRT 2018/17.7 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/2018/18. Report from the University Secretary

CRT/2018/18.1 HE Governance (Scotland) Act 2016

A Court-Senate working group had been set up in late 2016 to look at options for the various staff memberships of Court, including members from Senate, the Trade Unions and the wider staff body. The intention as expressed by Court had been to keep as close to current arrangements as possible, retaining 11 'internal' members and a total of 25 members, while at the same time ensuring compliance with the HE Governance (Scotland) Act 2016.

A paper was now provided, containing recommendations which Court was invited to approve.

Dr Duncan summarised the proposed changes, which were that the current six Senate Assessors would reduce to five elected academic members, with one academic staff member to be nominated by the Trade Unions in future; and that instead of two Employee Representatives there would be one elected support staff member and one support staff member (on grades 1 to 6) nominated by the Trade Unions.

The paper noted that an alternative proposal, increasing the number of elected professional services staff (specifically on grades 1 to 6) had been suggested by Margaret-Anne McParland on behalf of the trades unions. The proposal had been to replace one lay member by a member of support staff from these grades. The Working Group had considered this proposal as well as a further alternative, which was to add a 3rd member of professional services staff without reducing the number of lay members. The Working Group's view had been that neither of these proposals was appropriate, as the first would have meant counting the Rector as a lay member in order to achieve a lay majority, and the second would have involved increasing the size of Court to keep a clear lay majority.

Ms McParland was invited to speak, explaining that she had an issue with the proposals since at present her position on Court was that she was an elected member taken from grades 1 to 6, as opposed to a union nominated member, and that the Working Group had chosen to take her role out. She questioned why academic staff on Court should outnumber her so significantly and considered that too many semantics had been introduced into the discussions to ensure that 'academic staff' were defined as 'academic teaching staff' rather than the traditional definition of 'academic and academic related staff' being used. Ms McParland advised Court that many other staff felt the same way as her, adding that the proposals in this regard had not been agreed by the unions. She referred to the report mentioning that diversity would be increased; however, she considered that as she currently represented about 3,500 people, it would be preferable for Court to include more people from lower paid jobs in any revised membership, since such staff should have more say. Ms McParland referred to the unions needing to be consulted further and to the SFC being likely to have a problem with the proposals, since she considered that the Code would not be adhered to, given its reference to non-academic staff. Responding to a question about what consultation had occurred with the unions, Ms McParland advised that in 2017 the unions had suggested increasing the membership to 26, which the Group had not accepted; and a paper from the unions relating to accommodating grades 1 to 6 had been sent, but the Group had not changed its position. Ms McParland advised that in 2016 she had requested that there should be union membership on the Group, but this requested had only been noted and not actioned.

As he was unable to attend the meeting, the Rector had provided a written submission. Dr Duncan advised Court of the Rector's views. The Rector's submission supported both the position outlined by Ms McParland and the unions' alternative proposal that had been provided as part of the papers for Court. He was requesting that the matter be deferred.

In discussion, the following points were made by individuals:

- that at present Court was covering 26 roles with 25 people, and that if Court was to maintain its position that it should be a body of 25, then it would effectively need to cut one position and consider the implications;
- that one of the current Employee Representative positions was an academic or academic-related position, and while the current incumbent was an academic-related member of staff, the post could equally have been filled by an academic member of staff;
- that it was important that staff at grades 1 to 6 had a voice;
- that previous discussions on the definition of a clear lay majority had concluded that 14-11 and not 13-12 was such a majority; a further comment was added that current requirement was only for a 'majority';
- that the spirit of the 2016 legislation was to expand employee representation and that adoption of a solution that did not do this would be outwith the spirit;
- that clear principles on diversity were required; on this point it was agreed that a broader engagement on diversity matters in general for Court was needed;
- that consideration should be given to increasing the number on Court to 26 if this was permitted;
- that wider methods of Court engagement with staff were needed, including with the unions, that went beyond discussions about membership of Court;
- that the proposal made sure that there would be two non-academic staff members on Court in future, which was not the position currently;
- that if the matter were referred back to the Group then Senate would also need to be involved in any amended proposals;
- that the Working Group had considered the options carefully and at length, with the final recommendations being an agreed best compromise; and that while the recommendations would not meet everyone's wishes, they fitted with the good governance requirements of the Act.

Dr Duncan observed that given the Rector's role and the electorate for this position being the student body, any reduction in lay member numbers within a 25-strong Court could effectively mean no lay majority. Increasing the number on Court to 26 would be contrary to Court's previously expressed view and would also result in a larger membership than other HEIs. With regard to the lack of clarity between relevant provisions in the Code and the Act, the Act took precedence and the definition of 'academic staff' as teaching and research staff only – and not academic-related – was a reasonable one. Dr Duncan noted that the Group's proposals were an improvement on the current position with regard to non-academic staff, given that there would be two support staff in future, if the recommendations were accepted, albeit that one would be a union nominee and not elected. The current membership provisions could in practice result in only one member of support staff being on Court at certain points.

Following the discussions, a vote was taken, with 12/21 Court members present voting to approve the recommendations in the paper, with the following effect in respect of future Court membership:

- i) election of five academic staff, rather than the current six Senate Assessors;
- ii) two nominations from the Trade Unions to be introduced, one nominee to be a member of academic staff and one nominee to be a member of support staff;
- iii) maintaining two professional services members of staff on Court, of whom at least one to be on grade 6 or below. One of these two professional service members ('support staff' in the parlance of the 2016 Act) to be the Trade Union-nominated member of support staff referred to in ii) above.

Specific recommendations in the report were approved as follows:

a) *Identifying the professional services member of staff who is not a Trade Union nominee*

This member of staff to come from one of the Management, Professional and Administrative (MPA); Technical and Specialist; or Operational job families, with no constraints on grade.

b) *Election of academic staff members*

For election of the five academic staff members, representation of all four Colleges to be maintained; at least one academic staff member to be professorial and one non-professorial; and the electorate to be confined to academic staff.

c) *Election of professional services or support staff*

The electorate for the professional services member to be the body of professional services staff on the monthly payroll (MPA, Technical and Specialist, and Operational job families).

d) *Union Nominees*

The academic member to be from the Research and Teaching job family, with no grading constraints; the 'support staff' member to be from one of the remaining three job families (MPA, Technical and Specialist, or Operational) and restricted to grades 1 to 6; and the nomination process to continue the practice of asking the Glasgow University Joint Union Liaison Committee (JULC) to provide the names of the nominees.

e) *Terms of office*

The terms of office for all elected staff members and the Trade Union nominees to be 4 years, and no more than two contiguous terms of 4 years to be served by the same individual.

Court approved a related draft Ordinance amending the composition of Court, to align with the recommendations. Court further approved a draft Ordinance setting out the composition of the University's academic body (Senate) to comply with the 2016 legislation. Discussions with the Scottish Government would now occur ahead of the formal consultation period on the drafts.

CRT/2018/18.2 Brexit – EU Staff and Students

The University and the sector had been informing the UK and Scottish governments of the University's views on the importance of HE in the Brexit negotiations and in particular on the rights of non-UK EU colleagues. This had included seeking clarity on the Settlement Scheme process proposed for EU citizens in the UK, including how this would operate in the event of a no-deal.

HR and Student Services colleagues had been providing guidance and support to staff and students since the time of the EU referendum. In November, affected staff had been advised that the Home Office had confirmed they could now register to take part in the EU Settlement Scheme pilot, to make an early application for new UK immigration status so they could continue to live and work in the UK after the end of the planned implementation period on 31 December 2020. The University would reimburse the cost of making such an application.

There were also dedicated sources of information for current students and prospective students/applicants from the EU, and students who were planning an Erasmus+ exchange to or from Glasgow.

CRT/2018/18.3 Safeguarding Policy

The University had long-standing arrangements relating to the protection of vulnerable groups to ensure that, where relevant, applicants, employees and students were members of the Protection of Vulnerable Groups Scheme, which had been introduced by the Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Act 2007.

In the light of Court discussion about wider safeguarding matters, including the possibility of guidance and/or regulations for members of the University who might be engaged in activities with vulnerable individuals overseas, a more wide-ranging policy had been developed to provide guidance on the University's responsibilities in relation to safeguarding children, young people and vulnerable adults.

The draft policy had been approved by the Equality & Diversity Strategy Committee in the late spring, a fact reported to Court in June 2018, with the document annexed at that time. Since then, there had been extensive consultation, with feedback received from areas including: Student Experience Committee, Education, Policy & Strategy Committee, Chief Advisers of Studies Committee, the Gender Based Violence Workstream 3 and the University's Crisis Team. There had also been an internal audit of Safeguarding which had found the draft policy fit for purpose. Some minor changes had been made in response to requirements set by external funding bodies.

Court now approved the final version of the policy. It was agreed that the annual review of the policy, including any amendments, could be dealt with at executive and/or EDSC level and did not require to come to Court.

CRT/2018/18.4 IPSC visibility for Court

At the last meeting, Dr Duncan had been asked to review how Court was sighted on the work of the Information Policy & Strategy Committee (IPSC), given the increasing importance of IT/information to all aspects of University life

The matter had been discussed with the chair of the IPSC, Vice-Principal Professor Frank Coton, and subsequently with the Convener of Court. It had been agreed that the work of the Committee should be given greater prominence. Prof Coton and senior colleagues would give an annual presentation to Court members. The minutes of IPSC meetings would also be shared with SMG and key items highlighted as appropriate.

CRT/2018/18.5 Court Strategy Day 28 September – Summary report

Headline outputs from the Strategy Day were provided to Court.

CRT/2018/18.6 Student Experience Committee – awayday

The SEC had held an awayday in November, with sessions around an overarching theme of exploring initiatives that could have a transformative impact on the student experience. A set of questions about student wellbeing, communicating with students, the physical environment and residences had been used to capture views from members. A summary of the main points discussed was noted.

CRT/2018/18.7 Correspondence addressed to Court members

Court agreed a protocol for dealing with correspondence where a member of the University community or the public asked the Court Office to forward their correspondence to the entire governing body; or where an individual member of, or members of, Court received correspondence directly.

On receipt of any such correspondence, an initial discussion would take place between the University Secretary, Convener of Court and the Vice-Convener of Court, to agree the most appropriate course of action. Where the subject matter of the correspondence related to matters for which University procedures already existed, the correspondence would be forwarded to be dealt with under the appropriate University procedure e.g. complaints or relevant HR procedure(s); or forwarded to the Audit & Risk Committee where the subject matter came within areas covered by its remit. A report would be provided to Court on a regular basis, advising on any action taken under the protocol.

CRT/2018/18.8 Media Report

Court noted a digest of recent media coverage and summary details of social media interaction with the University.

CRT/2018/18.9 Summary of Convener's Business

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

CRT/2018/18.10 Nominations Committee business

Investment Advisory Committee IAC

Court approved a recommendation from the Nominations Committee that Ms Susan Anderson be appointed to the Investment Advisory Committee, to serve for 4 years with immediate effect.

Human Resources Committee HRC

Following recommendations from the Nominations Committee to Court, approved between meetings, Mr Martin Glover and Mr Shan Saba had been appointed to the HRC for 4 years from 15 November 2018.

CRT/2018/18.11 Student Experience Committee – remit

At the last meeting, it had been clarified that the remit of the Committee already covered access matters for students who lived at home, under the reference to the 'at risk' category, but it had been agreed that this would be made more explicit.

Court now approved an amendment to point 3 in the remit as follows:

Ensure that the University's provision for the student experience reflects the diversity of needs within the student population (e.g. overseas, part-time, mature, visiting and disabled students, BAME students, care leavers, students with children or caring responsibilities *and students who live at home*).

Dr Duncan and Ms McDougall agreed to discuss the representation arrangements for the Dumfries campus student cohort on the Committee.

CRT/2018/18.12 Energy Strategy

At the end of October, the University's new Energy Strategy had been launched. Its aim was to reduce energy consumption and carbon emissions across the estate. The intention was to deliver at least 6,000 tonnes of the target CO2 savings across the term of the five-year strategy, which formed a key part of the University's sustainability strategy. Additional carbon emissions savings were expected to come from effective implementation of both the Strategic Travel and Transport Plan and the Waste Management Action Plan

The target was seen as ambitious but achievable, while also ensuring that the University continued to provide a reliable and resilient energy supply to the estate.

Dr Duncan advised that a group called Extinction Rebellion Scotland (ERS) had asked Court to make a declaration relating to climate emergency, including noting a number of statistics provided by the group, relating to climate change and global warming. The group had also requested that Court call on the Principal to take a number of actions including: a pledge to make the University carbon-neutral by 2030 (amended to 2025 at a meeting of the Sustainability Working Group attended by representatives of the ERS group); calling on the City Council, Holyrood and Westminster to provide the powers and resources to make the target possible; working with other governments and institutions to determine and implement best practice to limit global warming; and to report to University bodies within six months with details of the actions being taken. Court had noted in the context of the Strategy update that although progress was being made and efficiencies being introduced, the group's target in relation to carbon-neutrality was not possible.

Dr Duncan was asked for a report on the environmental strategy, to be provided at a future meeting.

CRT/2018/19. Report from the Rector

The Rector had given apologies therefore there was no report. Dr Duncan had advised Court of comments from the Rector, relating to item 18.1.

CRT/2018/20. Reports of Court Committees

CRT/2018/20.1 Audit & Risk Committee

CRT/2018/20.1.1 Audit & Risk Committee Annual Report to Court 2017/18

Heather Cousins, chair of the Committee, presented the annual report, which included the Committee's assessment of the adequacy of the University's systems of internal control. Particular points of note were: the Committee's requirement for robust management responses to recommendations in audit reports; the annual report from the internal auditors; that the Committee regularly reviewed actions against recommendations, and related statistics, in internal audit reports; that the Committee had received summary details of whistleblowing cases under the terms of the University's policy and had been satisfied with the action taken; and that the Committee had reviewed the 2017/18 financial statements. On the basis of the internal audit work undertaken in the course of the year, and of the comments of the external auditors on the University's financial statements, the Audit & Risk Committee believed that the University generally had an adequate framework of internal control.

Court noted the Committee's annual report.

CRT/2018/20.1.2 Other Audit Committee business

At its recent meeting, the Committee had received the University's financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2018, noting the operating surplus. The Committee had also noted a summary of the position relating to cash and cash equivalents, and to capital expenditure during the year. The Committee had heard that on the basis of the work performed, the external auditors anticipated issuing unqualified audit opinions on the Group and University's financial statements, and on the University's subsidiary financial statements. The Committee had noted the accounts for subsidiary companies and the University Trust. The Committee had received the USGAAP restated financial statements.

The Committee had received internal audit reports on reviews of: School of Interdisciplinary Studies/Crichton Campus; and Safeguarding. The internal auditors had provided the Committee with an annual report, which had concluded that for 2017/18, governance, risk management and control and value for money arrangements in relation to business-critical areas were generally satisfactory. However, there were some areas of weakness or non-compliance with processes in the framework of governance, risk management and control and value for money arrangements, that potentially put the achievement of objectives at risk.

The report was noted.

CRT/2018/20.2 Human Resources Committee

CRT/2018/20.2.1 HR Committee business

At its recent meeting, the Committee had discussed strategic academic alignment, recruitment and talent attraction; and the high-level results from the 2018 staff survey. The Strategic Report from the Executive Director of HR had included the latest developments on the USS pension scheme, pay negotiations and Brexit as well as information regarding the positive outcome of the recent UKVI audit. The Committee had discussed proposed revised wording to the remit/policy of the Organisational Change Governance Group (OCGG) following earlier discussions at both Court and the Committee. Members of the OCGG and the trade unions had also been consulted. The Committee had supported the rewording and had recommended that it be presented to Court for approval prior to wider communication.

With regard to the reference to the staff survey, it was noted that Court would receive a briefing in 2019.

CRT/2018/20.2.2 Occupational Change Governance Group

The chair of HRC, Dr June Milligan, introduced the proposed changes, explaining that the OCGG was represented at HRC, the implications of the changes had been discussed and that the changes included an expectation that the group would normally meet in person rather than virtually.

Subject to a minor addition to the proforma to include a reference to equality implications being considered, Court approved changes to the remit/policy of the OCGG.

CRT/2018/20.2.3 HR Data Analytics

Data analytics were noted by Court; these included information on staff turnover, recruitment activity, absence rates, EU and international staff numbers, staff age profiles and gender balance and the gender pay gap review.

CRT/2018/20.2.4 JCCN annual report

The JCCN annual report was noted.

CRT/2018/20.3 Remuneration Committee

Court noted from the Convener of Court that the chairs of Remuneration Committees would be holding a meeting in the new year, with the University hosting.

Dr June Milligan, the chair of the Committee, summarised the report. The Committee had met in November, its delegated business having covered the Principal's report on SMG P&DR and remuneration; Professorial and senior administrative (grade 10) reward; the Principal's performance; Convener of Court remuneration; and Voluntary Severance and salary augmentation approvals since the last meeting. The approach to the annual review of senior management pay had been agreed by Court at its October meeting and Court's agreed approach applied to awards that had been made. Dr Milligan advised Court that as discussed in 2017, the Principal was now an attender not a member of the Committee and that he had been absent from the Committee's meeting other than for his own report on SMG P&DR and remuneration. Dr Milligan also advised Court that the Convener had left the Committee meeting for the discussion about Convener remuneration. Dr Milligan reminded Court that the Committee's membership now included a staff representative and a student representative; and advised Court that a new lay member had recently joined the Committee.

The Convener left the Court meeting for the next part of the discussion, relating to Convener remuneration. Dr Milligan advised that the Committee had been asked if the Convener fee that had previously been agreed (in October 2017) should be uplifted in line with the 2% uplift on staff salaries. The Committee had agreed that it would recommend to Court that the rate previously agreed by Court should apply for the current term of appointment, which ran to July 2020, and that it was not appropriate for the annual salary uplift paid to employees of the University to be applied to this daily fee. Parameters for remuneration of the Convener of Court from August 2020 would be agreed at a future date. Court approved this recommendation.

The Convener of Court returned to the meeting.

Court noted the report. A correction would be made to a list of terms of office, to clarify that the term of office for one of the functional VPs was 4 years, and was not commensurate with the underlying open-ended staff appointment that the individual held at the University.

CRT/2018/20.4 Estates Committee

The Committee had approved Capex applications relating to: Gilmorehill/Kelvin Building/Essential Works in the sum of £3.369m to support Disability Discrimination Act and fire compliance improvements; and Gilmorehill/Davidson Building/West Medical Refurbishment in the additional sum of £283,573.

The Estates Committee report also included an update from the Executive Director of Estates and Commercial Services on the delivery of the campus development programme, including some current issues and opportunities connected to it. SVP Professor Neal Juster summarised the paper, highlighting: the requirement for enhanced fire protection measures in the Learning & Teaching Hub, which would delay the opening of the building; that enhanced fire protection measures would also be included in the Research Hub; that there were some inflationary increases to building costs that would impact on future elements of the capital plan, which would be reviewed accordingly; that larger buildings would be considered to accommodate potential future growth in student and staff numbers; and that plans for an innovation district and innovation zone were gaining momentum.

The report advised that all of the matters would be developed in further detail and brought to Court for discussion. In particular, it was proposed that when Court considered the full business case for the Institute of Health and Wellbeing, a statement on affordability and impact on the full capital plan would be included; as part of the annual capital plan review, the impact of inflation and additional demands would be modelled and proposals brought forward as part of the budgetary process; and

opportunities to accelerate the programme to minimise the impact of inflation would be considered and brought back to Court.

Court noted from the chair of the Finance Committee, Graeme Bissett, that the Finance Committee had considered how the capital costs associated with the changes outlined linked to the University's cash flow. The Committee had noted concerns about all indicators pointing to increased costs and to the long term cashflow showing low points during 2022/23, leaving relatively little in reserve at that time. The long-term cashflow also depended on operating cashflow, which might be affected by major factors such as Brexit at the USS position. An update on capital costs as soon as possible would be welcomed, albeit that there were some variables that were not, and could not, be known.

Court heard and noted that in terms of governance of the capital programme, regular reports to the Estates and Finance Committees indicated where any there were any overruns or potential additional costs and that if figures became out of date, they were updated as soon as possible. Each time a project under the campus development plan was brought to Court, the cash position was covered. Court was reminded that with regard to commitments made against the capital plan, Court had only committed to two projects to date, and that any future requested commitments would come via the normal route of scrutiny by the Estates and Finance Committees.

Court noted a comment that any sensitivities analysis being undertaken should also look at the long term position, at possible re-use and at levers/opportunities to recover costs. If new variables were introduced, then the knock-on effect of these should also be analysed. A comment was noted that communication to staff about progress on the campus development was important and that staff and students should be kept up to date about any delays and contingencies arising from these; Court noted in this regard that contingency planning in relation to the Learning and Teaching Hub's delayed opening had been undertaken.

It was agreed that by way of further update and given the discussions at the present meeting, the February meeting of Court would receive an overview of the revised costs and potential issues affecting the capital programme, the costs to represent the best estimate available, given that there were some factors that were difficult to quantify.

CRT/2018/21. Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate 6 December

Council of Senate had received: updates on progress in bringing Senate into line with the Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act 2016 and on the campus development; confirmation that the ELIR Reflective Analysis had been submitted; a report on the Student Experience Committee awayday; and an overview of the general principles underpinning the revisions to academic promotions criteria. With regard to the proposed future composition of Senate, it was commented that it provided for only one non-academic member; the Senate Office would be advised of the comment.

The communications from the Council of Senate were noted.

CRT/2018/22. Annual report on the University's Complaints Procedure 2017/18

Court noted the annual report on complaints activity during academic session 2017-18. Thanks were recorded to those who were involved in investigating and resolving complaints and to those who had authored the report. With regard to the variance in numbers of complaints from different Colleges, Dr Duncan agreed that examples of any best practice, or lessons learned, would be looked at.

CRT/2018/23. Any Other Business

There was no other formal business. Court members were thanked for all their work in 2018 and wished a happy Christmas and New Year. The Rector's good wishes for the festive season were

Court Wednesday 12 December 2018

passed on to Court.

CRT/2018/24. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of Court will be held on Wednesday 13 February 2019 at 1.45pm in the Senate Room.

Court Context Card 13 February 2019 - 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 December 2018
<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>	
Revenue from proposed plan	
<i>Urgency</i>	NA
<i>Timing</i>	Various
<i>Red-Amber-Green Rating</i>	Various
<i>Paper Type</i>	For information / discussion
Paper Summary	<p>Updates on areas listed in the paper as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Higher Education Developments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brexit Scottish Budget Post-18 Funding review in England Universities Superannuation Scheme USS/Pensions update 2019 New Year's Honours Key activities 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>	
Relevant Strategic Plan workstream	Empowering People, Agility, Focus
Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve	NA
Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve	NA
Risk register - university level	Item 1: Risks 1a Finance, 2a Government Policy (UK), Risk 9 Estates
Risk register - college level	Item 2: Risk 1a Finance
Demographics	
<i>% of University</i>	Items mainly relate to the University as a whole
Operating stats	
<i>% of</i>	
Campus	All locations
External bodies	UK Government; Scottish Government; SFC
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	

Court - Wednesday 13 February 2019

Principal's Report

Items A: For Discussion

1. Higher Education Developments

Brexit

Given the uncertainty and fluidity of the situation, I will update Court further at the meeting.

A more wide-ranging update on Brexit matters affecting the University, and the actions we are taking to mitigate the impacts of Brexit, is provided in the University Secretary's Report.

Scottish Budget 2019-20

In mid-December the Scottish Government published its draft budget for 2019-20.

The overall draft budget for Higher Education is 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 is, in effect, a flat-cash settlement for HE in revenue terms. Scottish Government officials have advised that the total funds for allocation will be the same as last year in cash terms, £1024.9m. The small cash uplift is an attribution of some of the costs of the civil service and will not be available for allocation.

The capital budget sees a 9% cash terms cut. The sector has been told that the funding available will 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 announces 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 are loans rather than grants.

The draft budget allocation is much as expected in our budget and financial forecasts. However, it is important to note that SFC may be under pressure to maintain a flat cash allocation given its needs to allocate sector funding over a different financial year for the sector which differs from that of the government, and as last year saw an increased cash allocation.

At the time of writing we know that the Scottish Government has received support from the Green Party for Stage 1 of the Budget, and hence the expectations are that it is likely to pass through Parliament.

Post-18 Funding Review in England

As the minutes of the last meeting note, in December it was announced that there will be a change in the way student loans are recorded in public finances: the amount expected not to be repaid, which could be 45% of lending, will be reclassified as public spending. This will be factored into the tuition fees review, due to report early in 2019.

ONS decided that student loans should be treated as in part government spending, and in part a financial transaction. A full account of the decision and the rationale behind it can be found at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/governmentpublicsectorandtaxes/publicsectorfinance/articles/newtreatmentofstudentloansinthepublicsectorfinancesandnationalaccounts/2018-12-17#implications-of-the-new-decision-for-fiscal-statistics>

In this note the ONS records that as a result of its decision, the Office for Budget Responsibility 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 partitioned loan-transfer approach. This may have implications for the 2020 spending review, but it also has potential implications if the rise in government spending has an impact on the block grant to devolved governments under the 'Barnett' formula.

There have been ongoing discussions with BEIS, DfE and Treasury through the Russell Group on the implications of the post-18 review and I will update Court on any latest information.

2. Universities Superannuation Scheme USS/Pensions update

At the last meeting, Court heard that since member and employer representatives on the Joint Negotiating Committee could not agree on an alternative outcome to the 2017 valuation, default cost-sharing rules were triggered and member and employer contributions into the scheme will be increasing from 1 April 2019, with further increases planned.

Under the 2017 valuation, the employer's contribution towards 'the match' (under which an additional optional 1% contribution by employees was matched by employers) will end, and total contributions will increase in three phases, between 1 April 2019 and 1 April 2020, from 26% today (8% members, 18% employers) to 36.6% (11.7% members, 24.9% employers).

In November, the Trustees 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 started with Universities UK (UUK), which acts on behalf of the employers, on the proposed Technical Provisions for the 2018 valuation. In January the Trustee 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 runs from 2 January to 28 February 2018. The Trustee did not adopt all of the proposed recommendations of the JEP but adopted some which it felt were within its risk appetite. The approach by the Trustee sets out two ‘bookends’ for total contributions, ranging from 33.7% to 29.7%, to be shared, as above, between employers and employee contributions. This is on the basis of unchanged levels of benefits in the scheme. The consultation notes that the lower level of contribution could be reached providing that employers could agree to contingent contributions during the valuation cycle.

Given my role as a USS Director, I have delegated the role of developing the University’s response to this consultation to the Chief Operating Officer, Director of Finance, Senior VP and Executive Director of HR on behalf of the Senior Management Group. They will be able to answer questions Court members have about our proposed response to the consultation.

It is hoped that the 2018 valuation process can be concluded by June 2019. It is important to note that the Trustee body can conclude the valuation by imposing the higher bookend level of contributions following the consultation (and this is lower than the proposed level of contributions in 2020 under rule 76.4 in the 2017 valuation: 33.7% would imply a 23% level of employer contributions). However, any proposed change in benefits or adoption of contingent contributions would require agreement by the employers and the Joint Negotiating Committee of USS.

Items B: For Information

2019 New Year’s Honours

The University of Glasgow was pleased to note that three present colleagues and one former were recognised in the 2019 New Year’s Honours list.

- Professor Iain McInnes, the Muirhead Professor of Medicine and Director of the Institute of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation, received a CBE for services to medicine.
- Ann Allen, Executive Director of Estates and Commercial Services was given an MBE for services to higher education.
- Cathy Bell, former Director of Development and Alumni, received an MBE for services to education and charity.
- In the military list, Major Iain MacDonald – a senior technician in the School of Computing Science – was one of only 13 military volunteers to receive a Queen’s Volunteer Reserves Medal across both the New Year’s Honours and the Queen’s Birthday Honours. The medal is presented only to members of the Volunteer Reserves of the British Armed Services for exemplary meritorious service in the conduct of their duties.

3. Key activities

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

Academic Development and Strategy

13 & 14 December: I met with candidates and then co-chaired interviews for the MRC Director of CVR.

19 December: I chaired interviews for the Assistant VP External Relations post.

18 January: I chaired interviews for the Head of School of Law.

18 January: Attended the Glasgow Health Sciences Partnership Oversight Board.

Internationalisation Activities

18 January: I hosted lunch for a delegation from McGill University, and then later in the day met with the Principal and President, Professor Suzanne Fortier.

31 January: I met a delegation from the University of Turin and signed an MoU.

1 February: I participated in a dial in GUILD board meeting.

11 February: I met with HM Ambassador to Hungary, Iain Lindsay, an alumnus of the University, who was visiting the University.

Lobbying/Policy Influencing and Promoting the University

17 December: I chaired a Standing Council Plenary Meeting with the First Minister.

18 December: I attended a meeting of the First Minister's Council of Economic Advisers and dinner thereafter.

8 January: I attended a David Hume Institute event which was focusing on Scotland's Evolving Fiscal Landscape. The speakers were Robert Chote from the Office for Budget Responsibility, and Susan Rice, Chair of Scottish Water, Business Stream, and the Scottish Fiscal Commission.

14 January: I led a delegation of Russell Group (RG) VCs, to Berlin, and in liaison with the British Embassy met with representatives of the German equivalent of the RG, the U15 group. We signed a joint statement. The meeting was then opened out to other delegates and we participated in an event which tackled the question: *Where next for UK-Germany science and research? The future of science and higher education cooperation.*

16 December: I attended a 30% Club Dinner in London which was co-hosted by our Convener of Court. It was arranged through a working group which is seeking to increase the representation of women in the senior ranks in Higher Education and the aim of the group is to provide practical support and ideas to help the governing bodies of academic institutions and individuals working in academia to address this challenge. The dinner was intended to encourage an exchange of ideas between representatives of business, regulators and academia.

17 January: I attended a USSL Investment Committee meeting.

17 January: Along with Tim Bradshaw, CEO Russell Group, I met with Chris Skidmore MP - New UK Universities Minister, and then with Robert Jenrick MP, Exchequer Secretary to the Treasury. It is hoped that Minister Chris Skidmore will visit the University soon to see some of our UKRI-funded projects.

21 January: I chaired a meeting of the Commission for Economic Growth for the Glasgow City Deal.

21 January: I welcomed the Deputy First Minister to the University who was officially launching the Education Scotland projects. These projects have been developed by research at the University of Glasgow in our College of Arts, in liaison with Education Scotland and offer a range of online teaching resources tailored to the needs of Scottish pupils. The collaboration, which started as a pilot in 2014, is run by Professor Dauvit Broun and Dr Joanna Tucker (University of Glasgow) and Lynne Robertson (Education Scotland).

22 January: I gave a presentation and talk to a meeting of the Heads of Independent Schools in Scotland. I covered the University's recent performance, issues around admissions, our approach to Learning & Teaching and the campus development.

23 January: I attended a USS Board training session and then a USSL Trustee Board meeting.

23 January: I attended a Goodenough College - Arts and Humanities Faculty Dinner. The Principal of the University of Glasgow is, ex-officio, a Governor of the College.

24 January: I was invited to give evidence at a Scottish Parliament Evidence Session to the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee on the Article 50 negotiations.

24 January: I took part in a TheCityUK FinTech Skills call and on 4 February a dial in to a TheCityUK Senior FinTech Steering Committee Meeting.

25 January: I attended, by teleconference, the AHRC Creative Industries Advisory Group Meeting then later, a Universities Scotland Main Committee. The same day I had the opportunity to meet with Karen Watt, the new CEO of SFC.

30 January: I attended an SFC Board Meeting.

31 January: I participated in a dial in SFC meeting of the Subject weights review group and later a dial in Additional board meeting of USS.

5 February: I gave an Interview on Brexit to Dario Maltese of TG5, Italy.

12 February: I met with Michael Arthur, President and Provost, UCL, in London, and Andrew Thompson, Executive Chair, Arts & Humanities Research Council. I then attended a dinner hosted by Margo James – Minister, Digital Culture Media and Sport.

Internal activities and Communications and Alumni events

13 December: I spoke to our Human Resources team at its Away Day.

17 December: I was given a tour of the University's New Exhibition William Hunter and the Anatomy of the Modern Museum.

17 December: I was a panelist in a public meeting held in the Bute Hall and organised by the Stevenson Trust for Citizenship on the topic *Whither Brexit?* Other panelists included Professor Sir John Curtice, University of Strathclyde, Dr Kirsty Hughes, Director, Scottish Centre on European Affairs, Professor Anand Menon, King's College London and Director, The UK in a Changing Europe.

21 December: I was filmed as part of a video promoting the Technician Commitment Initiative.

7 January: I filmed a New Year message.

8 January: I gave an interview to the Glasgow Guardian on Brexit.

8 January: I attended a Robertson Medal presentation in the University hosted by the Carnegie Trust. The medal is awarded by the trust to the Scholarship candidate judged to be the most outstanding for that year's competition. The 2018-19 winner was Ross Paterson, PhD student in Mathematics and Statistics at the University of Glasgow. Dame Anne Glover presented the medal.

11 January: I hosted our London Alumni Burns Supper in London.

15 January: I met with colleagues from the College of Social Sciences to discuss the recruitment process for the new Head of College.

21 January: I attended the Inaugural Lecture of Professor Beatrice Heuser, Professor of International Relations in the Politics. Her lecture was entitled: *Brexit In Historical Context: Sovereignty Vs European Union?*

22 January: I attended and introduced this year's Holocaust Memorial Lecture which was delivered by Professor Peter Davies from the University of Edinburgh. The title of his lecture was: *Whose words, whose voices? What thinking about translation can tell us about the Holocaust.*

24 January: I attended and spoke at the General Council Half Yearly Meeting.

25 January: I held my monthly meeting with the SRC Sabbatical Officers.

27 January: I hosted the annual visit of Archbishop Tartaglia who presided over Choral Mass which was followed by a Lodging dinner.

29 January: I hosted the annual visit of the Moderator of the Church of Scotland. The Moderator, the Rt Rev Susan Brown conducted a service in the chapel and presided over Communion. The service was followed by dinner in the Lodging.

30 January: I welcomed and introduced Professor Mary McAleese and Professor Robert Davis who were participating in the first of a series of 'Conversations' organised by the School of Education. The topic of the 'conversation' was: *'Concepts and Experiences of Childhood and Adolescence in 21st Century Scotland.'*

4 February: I spoke at Fellows of the British Academy Celebratory Event, which was organized by the College of Arts in recognition of the fact that Professor Lynn Abrams and Professor Alexandra Shepard were recently elected as Fellows of the British Academy.

5 February: I welcomed delegates to, and introduced, the Knowledge Exchange & Engagement Conference. Prior to the opening, I and Bonnie Dean, VP Corporate Engagement & Innovation met with the keynote speakers Will Hutton, journalist and Principal of Hertford College, Oxford, and Malcolm Skingle, Director, Academic Liaison, GlaxoSmithKline.

6 February: I attended a meeting with the Joint Committee for Consultation and Negotiation

8 February: I met with some student representatives of the Glasgow branch Our Future Our Choice campaign who had asked to meet me to share their concerns about the consequences of Brexit.

11 February: Hosted a Staff Student Officers Reception.

4. Senior Management Group business

In addition to standing (which now includes Brexit) and regular items, the following issues were discussed:

SMG Meeting of 10 December

- World-Changing Glasgow Transformation: update
- Research Culture Awards
- AOB & Members' Contributions: Biomedical & Life Science Fellowships – LKAS Readership Scheme

SMG Meeting of 19 December

- Professional Services – Accommodation & University strategy
- Expanding the Glasgow College UESTC
- University Services – requests for additional resource
- Scottish National Bank – update
- Professorial Recruitment Fund: Progress Update
- Radboud
- AOB & Members' Contributions: LKAS Readership Scheme: Review of Qualifying Fellowships

SMG Meeting of 7 January

- Staff Survey

SMG Meeting of 16 January

- GCRF and policy around advanced payments
- Universities Superannuation Scheme 2018 Actuarial Valuation: USS 2018 Consultation
- Proposed process to revise the capital plan
- SFC Research Pooling
- Strategic Alignment
- SMG Marketing & Public Affairs sub group – Minutes of previous meeting

SMG Meeting of 21 January

- Research Culture: Demonstrating Best Practice
- Funding PGR Development
- 2019-20 Planning Round update
- Graduations Review Interim Report
- University Innovation Fund update

SMG Meeting of 28 January

- Planning for REF 2021: Responsibilities and Governance
- Graduations Review: update
- Staff Survey Action Plan
- Interim Research Review – UoA 28A Modern Languages

Court Context Card 13 February 2019 - University Secretary's Report

Speaker	Dr David Duncan	
Speaker role	COO and University Secretary	
Paper Description	For information / some items for discussion/decision/approval	
Topic last discussed at Court	Last report was to December 2018 Court	
Topic discussed at Committee	NA	
Committee members present	NA	
Cost of proposed plan		
Major benefit of proposed plan		
Revenue from proposed plan		
Urgency	Low	
Timing	Immediate where relevant	
Red-Amber-Green Rating	Green	
Paper Type	Decision/Discussion/Information	
Paper Summary	<p>Report from Secretary on a number of items for Court's discussion/decision and/or information. A Items are:</p> <p>A1 A paper is attached summarising steps being taken to mitigate the impact of Brexit on the University. (Annex).</p> <p>A2 An update on mental health provision; and the updated mental health action plan</p> <p>A3 An update on pay dispute.</p>	
Topics to be discussed Action from Court	<p>As above plus any A or B items Court members may wish to discuss</p> <p>Listed under each item: specific decision requested under:</p> <p>B2 Court is invited to agree that the Chancellor's Assessor, Ronnie Mercer, undertake the appraisal of the Convener's performance.</p> <p>B5 Court is invited to approve the election scheme relating to election of employee representatives to Court in future; the scheme also refers to the TU nomination process.</p> <p>B7 Court is invited to approve delegation of signatory authority to the Deputy Secretary in the absence of the University Secretary.</p>	
Recommendation to Court		
Relevant Strategic Plan workstream	Empowering People, Agility, Focus	
Most relevant Primary KPI it will help the university to achieve	NA	
Most relevant Secondary KPI it will help the university to achieve	NA	
Risk register - university level		
Risk register - college level		
Demographics		
% of University	100% Cross University application on several items	
	Item A1 all non-UK EU staff (950, 13.2% workforce) and non-UK EU students (3300, 12% students)	
% of college	NA	
Operating stats		
% of		
Campus	All locations	
External bodies	Privy Council; UK and Scottish Governments; UCEA	
Conflict areas		
Other universities that have done something similar		
Other universities that will do something similar		
Relevant Legislation	HE governance legislation/Code of Good HE Governance	
Equality Impact Assessment		
Suggested next steps		
Any other observations		



Court – Wednesday 13 February 2019

Report from the University Secretary

SECTION A - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

A.1 Brexit

A short paper is attached (**Annex**) summarising steps we are taking to mitigate the impact of Brexit on the University. We are keeping the situation under constant review. Regular updates are being issued to staff and students as new information becomes available.

A.2 Mental Health

At previous meetings, Court received updates on developments in the University's provision in this area. The Mental Health Group met on Thursday 17 January; it reviewed progress against the action plan and received reports from various external speakers. A highlight of the meeting was a presentation on the online tool, the Big White Wall, which is now available to all students and staff at Glasgow. The tool provides a range of intermediate level support for individuals in a highly accessible format; it also puts people suffering from mental health difficulties in touch with professional assistance within a maximum of 30 minutes. As an additional feature, one-on-one counselling is available via the Big White Wall through a referral system runs by the University's own Counselling & Psychological Services (CAPS).

A.3 Pay dispute

Although the 2018 pay award has already been paid (and backdated to 1 August 2018), the dispute over the 2018 pay settlement remains live, with UCU conducting an aggregated (i.e., UK-wide) ballot of members over further industrial action. The UCU ballot runs to 22 February. Despite this, UCEA (the Employers' Association) will begin consulting members on the pay offer for 2019 on 14 February; early signs are that there will be a gap between the expectations of the trade unions and the views of employers regarding what is affordable.

(Note: David Duncan declares an interest as an employer-nominated representative on of the New JNCHES pay negotiating committee).

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / ROUTINE ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

B.1 Sexual Violence and Harassment

Court has heard previously about our work to combat and raise awareness of these areas. The University community has recently been contacted by the Principal and the SRC President to emphasise that sexual violence and harassment will not be tolerated and to draw

attention to sources of support. They also outlined progress made – details of the statement are at **Annex**.

From 21-25 January, the University, SRC and Rape Crisis Scotland joined forces to support the ESHTE (Ending Sexual Harassment and Violence in Third-Level Education) 'It Stops Now' campaign against sexual violence and harassment in Universities. The University's team of trained First Responders were highlighted as a valuable point of contact for students wishing to disclose experiences of sexual violence and harassment. A new set of web resources was launched, and we took the opportunity to publicise the online reporting tool.

B.2 *Annual Court Self-Assessment and Convener appraisal*

As has been customary in other years, a questionnaire for Court self-assessment/feedback on performance will be circulated. The Court Governance Working Group will consider the outcomes of this and will also refer to the Code, to ensure that the University is addressing all its responsibilities in terms of good governance. There will be a report to Court in April.

With Court's agreement it is proposed that the Chancellor's Assessor, Ronnie Mercer, undertake the appraisal of the Convener's performance.

B.3 *Conflicts and Declarations of Interest*

Court members and senior management are required to complete a Declaration of Interest form on an annual basis. Court members and attenders are 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 members may be aware of a recent case at Robert Gordon University (RGU), which resulted in that institution's Principal leaving his post. Following this, RGU and the SFC worked together on a 'lessons learned' exercise. A report was published shortly before Christmas; it included some recommendations specific to RGU, but also some points for the sector to consider. The University's Whistleblowing procedure <https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/humanresources/mgrs-admin/employee/whistleblowing/> in part covers the relevant recommendations; any amendments to the Code of good HR governance, which may result from the report, and any other requirements emerging from the Committee of Chairs, will be observed.

In the meantime, the University Secretary and the Director of Human Resources are responsible for ensuring that we follow good practice in making senior appointments. With regard to a resilience plan, the University has in place clear measures to prevent conflicts of interest and thereby avoid the sort of events which occurred at RGU. A professional team led by the Director of Communications and Public Affairs is in place to anticipate and manage the reputational impact of any adverse development. In the event that the Principal left his post suddenly, there is ample experience and capacity within the senior management to ensure continuity of operations. Similarly, formal deputising arrangements are in place for the Convener of Court, chairs of Court sub-committees, the University Secretary and Directors of Finance and Human Resources. In summary, the University has the necessary policies, safeguards, professional support and deputising arrangements in place to prevent adverse events of the nature addressed in the report, and to manage unforeseen developments should they arise.

A summary of the report is at **Annex**.

B.4 *HE Governance (Scotland) Act – Ordinances on Court and Senate Composition*

Following approval of draft Ordinances at the last meeting, copies were provided to the Scottish Government, as part of the usual process, seeking any input ahead of the formal consultation process. At the time of writing this report, we are awaiting a response.

B.5 *Appointment of Employee Representatives on Court*

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

The related Ordinance has not been through the necessary consultation yet (see section B.4 above), but given that timescales will be relatively tight and the current Employee Representatives' terms end 31 July 2019, we would need to hold an election in the run up to 1 August, if the Ordinance were granted.

Court has previously agreed to Employee Representative elections being held electronically rather than by paper ballot. A proposed process for future appointments is to provide guidance for those running the elections and for candidates. For the sake of completeness, the document refers to the new Trade Union nominated positions, but as agreed at the previous meeting, it would be for the Unions to make the nominations, with the process required to be approved by Court, under the terms of the 2016 Higher Education Governance (Scotland) Act.

It is proposed that this document be used as the basis for the elections if the Ordinance is approved in due course.

B.6 *Summary of Convener's Business*

During the last session it was agreed that a summary of activities undertaken by the Convener would be provided to Court meetings. The details are at **Annex**.

B.7 *Delegated signatory authority*

University Ordinances and Court regulations about delegated authority provide for financial and other delegated authorities.

In my capacity as University Secretary I am authorised to sign documents in a number of areas, committing the University to contracts and other agreements across a range of our activities.

For occasions when I am away from the University on business or on annual leave, I would like to delegate signatory authority to Dr Dorothy Welch, Deputy Secretary, either as sole or joint signatory depending on the requirements of the document/process in question.

Court's approval for this is sought so that it can be formally recorded in minutes and provided to third parties if required.

B.8 *Director of Research Institute / Head of School Appointments*

College of MVLS

Institute of Health and Wellbeing

Professor Jill Pell has 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 has 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 has been appointed as Head of the School of Law for 4 years from 1 August 2019, succeeding Professor Iain MacNeil.

B.9 *Draft Resolutions relating to Degree Regulations*

On Court's behalf I have approved a large number of draft Resolutions relating to degree regulations. The text of the regulations has already had the benefit of Senate Office and General Council input, but a formal consultation will also take place as required for these documents.

Brexit – contingency planning

A great deal of contingency planning is taking place to prepare for whatever form of Brexit may eventually take, including a potential no-deal scenario. With the situation changing on an almost daily basis, we are keeping a constant watch on developments. We are also maintaining close contact with bodies such as Universities UK and UCEA (the employers' association), which provide us with up-to-date advice and support.

As far as the key risks facing the University are concerned, in the short-term we regard these as: (a) staff recruitment and retention issues arising from immigration issues and potential lack of access to European research grants; and (b) disruption to student mobility if we are unable to participate in Erasmus+. In the medium term, the key risks are (c) the possible diversion of Scottish Government funds currently used to support undergraduate students from EU countries; and (d) our potential exclusion from EU-led research programmes.

The paper covers:

1. Settlement scheme for EU citizens
2. Outward student mobility
3. European students studying at Glasgow
4. Travel advice
5. Research funding
6. Relations with universities in the European Union
7. Dialogue with UK and Scottish governments
8. Financial issues
9. Stocks and supplies
10. Construction issues

1. Settlement scheme

HR and Student Services colleagues have been providing guidance and support to staff and students since the EU referendum took place, including dedicated email addresses for affected staff and students to contact the University and a dedicated website that includes FAQs. In November, we advised affected staff that the Home Office had confirmed they can now register to take part in the EU Settlement Scheme pilot.

We have supplied colleagues with details on the new EU Settlement Scheme that will replace the current Treaty rights of EU citizens once the UK leaves the EU. The Scheme covers the right to live and work here, along with providing access to public services such as healthcare and benefits. Information was also issued on the transition phase that will extend until 30 June 2021.

The EU Settlement Scheme, which the University supports, is currently in a pilot phase with plans in place for the scheme to open in full on 30 March 2019, the day after Brexit. Non-UK EU staff affected by these proposed changes have been informed of the University's participation in the pilot.

On 30 January, the Government announced that if the UK leaves the EU without agreeing a deal, it will seek to end free movement as soon as possible. Time-limited transitional

arrangements will be put in place between the end of free movement and the introduction of a future border and immigration system. In the event of a no-deal scenario, for the period from 30 March 2019 until 31 December 2020, EEA citizens and their EEA family members, will still be able to come to the UK to work, study or visit without a visa for up to three months. However, if they wish to stay any longer, they will need to apply online for European Temporary Leave to Remain within three months of arriving.

The Guidance on European Temporary Leave to Remain confirms that if there is a no-deal Brexit:

- EEA citizens arriving in the UK who wish to stay longer than three months and apply for European Temporary Leave to Remain will be subject to identity, criminality and security checks before being granted permission to stay for three years (including permission to work and/or study).
- European Temporary Leave to Remain will be non-extendable and temporary. It will not give indefinite leave to remain (ILR), lead to EU settled status or make EEA citizens eligible to stay in the UK indefinitely. Those who wish to stay for longer will need to apply for an immigration status in due course under the future border and immigration system arrangements, which will come into effect from 1 January 2021.
- The initial three months' leave to enter for EEA citizens will be free of charge but there will be a fee for applications for European Temporary Leave to Remain. The fees have not yet been determined.
- Citizens of the Republic of Ireland will not need to apply for European Temporary Leave to Remain and will continue to have the right to enter and live in the UK under the Common Travel Area.

The 30 January announcement does not affect EEA citizens who are currently residing in the UK before the UK's exit from the EU – they will still be able to apply for settled or pre-settled status. In addition, EEA citizens who arrive in the UK after 29 March 2019 but were previously living in the UK before 29 March 2019, can also apply for EU settled status.

2. Outward student mobility

The UK Government has committed to allowing students from the EU who commence their studies in 2019 to access funding on the same basis as at present for the duration of their degree programmes.

Erasmus+ provides students in higher education with the opportunity to study abroad in Europe for three to 12 months as part of their degree. Eligible students receive an Erasmus+ grant provided by the European Commission – this is paid through the University. This grant contributes towards the extra costs they may encounter from studying abroad.

In a Technical Notice issued on 30 January 2019, the Government recommended that students continue to apply for Erasmus+ funding. If the UK leaves the EU with no agreement in place, the Government is committed to covering the payment of awards to all successful applicants – including those who are informed of their success after the date of the withdrawal. However, the EU has yet to confirm that UK organisations can continue to participate in Erasmus+ in the event of no-deal. If the EU refuses, the UK Government is committed to negotiating with individual countries to seek to ensure that UK participants can continue with their planned activity.

At this stage it is unclear whether a substitute programme will be put in place if the EU does not allow the UK to participate in Erasmus+ post-Brexit. Universities UK has launched a campaign aimed at persuading the Government to commit to funding study abroad opportunities in case of a no-deal Brexit.

3. European students studying at Glasgow

The UK Government has committed to allowing students from the EU who commence their studies in 2019 to access funding on the same basis as at present for the duration of their degree programmes. Applications for 2019 are strong, but it may be that this is the last cohort of UG students from EU countries who benefit from free tuition in Scotland. Together with other Scottish universities, we are in dialogue with the Scottish Government and the Scottish Funding Council about the use of funds currently deployed to support those students. Our interest is not only financial – we wish to maintain diversity in the student population and to ensure that Glasgow remains a destination of choice for students from across the world, regardless of background.

4. Travel Advice

The Clerk of Senate recently issued travel advice on what to do in the period up to and immediately after 29 March 2019.

On 19 December 2018, the EU Commission agreed that UK airlines would be able to operate flights into and over the EU for 12 months if there is a no-deal Brexit. Therefore, we do not advise cancelling trips to the EU. There may, however, be delays at airports due to additional passport and security checks. We have advised that:

- If it is possible to avoid travel in the period immediately after Brexit, it would be better to do so.
- Travellers should leave extra time for journeys in case of additional checks
- Where possible, travellers should book direct flights to destinations, as delays may compromise the time for transfer to internal flights.

At this stage, it is also unclear whether the EU will permit British carriers (or British-owned carriers) to travel between stops in the EU in the event of no deal.

We have also advised that University travel insurance including health insurance should be arranged, as it is not yet clear if UK citizens will be eligible for free EU healthcare for any period after Brexit.

The University of Glasgow webpages provide links to additional information and we will add more as it becomes available. We are also planning future events including a Facebook live webcast on what Brexit will mean for staff and students.

5. Research Funding

The UK Government has committed to replacing funding for any EU-funded project running at the date of UK exit. The University has in the region of 250 live EU projects, with awards

continuing to arrive. With the UK Government commitment, the University can be confident that EU-funded research projects will continue to completion.

We have reassured researchers at Glasgow that projects will be funded to completion and that if necessary, the University will cover any cash flow issues that may arise. Advice for holders of research grants under the Horizon 2020 programme has also been shared across the University.

UK Research & Innovation (the UK Government's main research body, which brings together the seven research councils, Innovate UK and Research England) will handle the UK payments and is reported to be making thorough preparations for all Brexit scenarios. UKRI has yet to issue guidance on when payments might be paid and whether they will be made in advance (like EU funding) or in arrears, as is standard for UK funding. However, we have advised staff that if there is a delay in finalising replacement awards from UKRI, the University will underwrite applicable projects, thus ensuring that research work can continue uninterrupted.

In order to make any transition to UK funding as smooth as possible, the University has submitted details of all existing Horizon 2020 grants held to a portal created by UKRI. The submission will be updated prior to 29th March for recent awards.

6. Relations with universities in the European Union

As a University with a global reputation, we greatly value the links we have with universities in Europe and around the globe. Our reputation as a world-leading institution is underpinned by the strong academic links we maintain with other universities; we recognise the importance of sustaining these following the UK's withdrawal from the EU. To this end, we remain a very active partner in the Guild of HE, which Glasgow was instrumental in establishing; we are forging deeper partnerships with specific institutions, such as Leuphana in Germany and Radboud in the Netherlands; and we maintain a high profile at conferences and events on the Continent.

7. Dialogue with UK and Scottish Governments

The University is working closely with the Russell Group, Universities UK and Universities Scotland on joint positions, and we are lobbying both Westminster and Holyrood on the most pressing issues of student and staff mobility, access to research funding and fees. The Principal and other senior colleagues have been very active in offering views on what Brexit will mean for Higher Education in general and the University of Glasgow in particular.

8. Financial issues

We are giving careful attention to the implications of Brexit for the University's overall financial position. This could be negatively impacted through, *inter alia*, the loss of SFC-funded EU students; the loss of EU-funded research grants; a decline in the value of the pound; currency fluctuations; inflationary pressures; a recession in the wider economy; and a potential decline in global standing, which in turn might affect international student recruitment. We will continue to scrutinise these and related risks at Senior Management Group, Finance Committee and Audit & Risk Committee, and consider their implications in the budget round for 2019/20 and beyond.

9. Stocks and supplies

On a more general level, colleagues in procurement are giving detailed consideration to logistical matters, including what stocks and supplies we currently hold and what we will need over the coming months. A number of purchase orders have been issued to try to secure supplies of materials and supplies which may be disrupted in the event of a no-deal Brexit. However, there remains an exposure on items with short shelf lives and/or storage issues. These items are predominantly reagents and gases mainly used in research; there are relatively few of these and we will manage them on an exception basis as required.

10. Construction issues

We are maintaining close contact with our main construction partner, Multiplex and various other contractors, regarding the possible implications of Brexit for our campus development programme. Besides the issue of currency fluctuations, there is a risk of inflationary pressures in imported materials and of labour shortages in certain trades (some 30% of the workforce on our building sites is international). At present, the contractors are not reporting any major difficulties but we will continue to monitor the situation closely.

David Duncan
5 February 2019

Sexual harassment and gender-based violence (GBV)

Our aim is to ensure all students and staff have a safe, productive, inspiring and enjoyable time whilst at work or study. Sexual violence and harassment, of any form, has no place on our campus and will not be tolerated. We also recognise that there will be survivors of sexual violence and harassment within our community, and we want to ensure they are aware of support available to them.

For students: www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/students/safetyhealth/sexualviolence

For staff: www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/humanresources/equalitydiversity/dignityworkstudyover

In addition, we want to outline progress made in relation to this area of work.

In 2015, at the request of the Student Representative Council, the Gender Equality Champion (Prof. Anne Anderson, Vice-Principal and Head of College of Social Science) established the Gender Based Violence Strategy Group, a partnership group with Glasgow Caledonian University, Police Scotland and Rape Crisis Scotland.

The group draws on the views and experiences of students, harnesses the expertise of academics across both institutions, and is informed by the specialist knowledge of external agencies. The Joint Strategy Group has adopted an explicit gendered analysis in its approach, situating gender-based violence within unequal relationships between men and women, and recognising that gender-based violence is predominantly perpetrated by men against women. Some of the main outcomes of the strategy group to date include:

- **Let's Talk about Sexual Violence prevention training** – delivered to students in a train the trainer model and developed by Rape Crisis Scotland and the SRC:
www.glasgowstudent.net/campaigns/lets-talk-sexual-violence/.
- An **online reporting system** for students to report any form of harassment or bullying:
www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/students/safetyhealth/reportandsupport.
- The rollout of a **tiered training model for staff** on sexual harassment and violence, based on awareness raising and supporting survivors, this includes training specifically for '[First Responders](#)' and for front line staff.
- Alignment of the **University's misconduct codes** with the UUK on non-statutory guidelines on the handling of circumstances where a student's alleged misconduct may also constitute a criminal offence.
- **Comprehensive information being available on websites for staff and students:**
 - www.glasgowstudent.net/advice/health-and-safety/sexual-violence
 - www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/students/safetyhealth/sexualviolence
 - www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/staff/emergencyandcrisisissupport

We recognise that this is a long process, however we want to ensure that all staff and students are aware of the University's support provision and how we plan to address this issue as we move forward.

Lauren McDougall, President of the Student Representative Council
Professor Sir Anton Muscatelli, Principal University of Glasgow

Summary of SFC report

In May 2018 Robert Gordon University (RGU) received a package of papers, containing an anonymous letter listing allegations of impropriety, together with supporting information. A chain of events culminated in the resignation of the University's Principal and the appointment of his successor. Throughout these events there was much comment both in the media and from various stakeholders amidst concerns about the governance aspects of decisions being taken. The University and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) separately concluded that a "Lessons Learned" review was necessary; agreed that a joint exercise would be the most effective way to undertake this; and agreed that the exercise should identify: where internal processes might be improved at RGU; and where improvements might be made to the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance.

The aim of the Review was therefore to identify potential improvements in policies, procedures and processes both for the University and the university sector more generally.

Summary of recommendations

The recommendations contained in the report are summarised below. The Scottish Funding Council will now work with the University [RGU], the Committee of Chairs and other relevant stakeholders to take forward these recommendations.

1. Recommendations for Robert Gordon University

Recommendation to the University. We recommend that the University considers development of more tailored guidance which could make it easier to determine the best approach in the circumstance of anonymous allegations relating to senior personnel. It is, of course, impossible to circumscribe all circumstances within a policy framework. However, whilst the PID procedure provided a path to follow, it would have been helpful if there had been some further guidance on how to apply the procedure in the circumstance of an anonymous allegation.

Recommendation to the University (RGU). We recommend that, in future, the University should ensure that the option appraisal for decisions about terms of departure is recorded in writing. Because this issue concerns the correct use of funds in institutions funded by substantial public funding, it is essential that such decisions are both verifiable, by reference to written documentation, and defensible, in terms of reasoning that gives due importance to value for money.

2. Recommendations for the SFC, Committee of University Chairs and university sector

Recommendation to the university sector Committee of Chairs. We recommend that consideration is given to universities being required to publish the information that will be contained in their financial statements relating to principal-level settlement agreements, as soon as possible after the date of the settlement agreement. This could be achieved through either a revision to the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance or through creation of associated guidance. We note that the implementation period for this recommendation may need to take account of existing contractual arrangements.

Recommendation to the university sector Committee of Chairs. We recommend development of a sector-developed template for senior-level settlement agreements which would improve the transparency of such arrangements. Use of a publicly-available template, with assurance that the actual agreement was compliant with it, would improve transparency and confidence in relation to individual settlement agreements.

Recommendation to the university sector Committee of Chairs. Current guidance is predicated on a "comply or explain" basis. Universities are required to explain deviations from the Code in their annual financial statements and are expected to demonstrate how the relevant principle of good governance is met in some alternative way. In developing the next iteration of the Code, we recommend that the

Committee should consider what actions governing bodies can take in order to demonstrate, in a timely manner, their commitment to the principles of the Code even as, for reasons of circumstance or expeditiousness, a departure from full compliance has been necessary.

Recommendation to universities. We recommend that each university should consider the development of a Resilience Plan. This moves beyond the scope of a traditional Business Continuity Plan, which usually concerns how normal business activities can continue in the event of a significant external catastrophe. Rather, a Resilience Plan can be thought of as Business Continuity for the governing body, when there is a discontinuity at the very top of an organisation. The nature of an incident requiring such a plan to be put into operation is impossible to foresee, however the Plan would act as a guide to senior decision makers as to the areas which may need to be addressed in response to events such as those experienced by the University.

3. Recommendation to the Committee of Chairs and the Scottish Funding Council. We recommend there should be developed a confidential mechanism whereby governing bodies can access experienced officer-level and governor support from other institutions in the absence of the availability of normal internal support.

Recommendation to the Committee of Chairs and the Scottish Funding Council. Throughout the events outlined in this report the issue of communications has persistently arisen. We accept that much of this has been informed by the considerable benefit of hindsight. But we believe that what is considered in [this and the above] paragraphs should include communications support and advice. We recommend the assistance of somebody able to step back from the immediate immersion in events and visualise issues in a wider context may be of considerable benefit.

Convener of Court

Summary of Business – 12 December 2018 to 13 February 2019

Date	Meeting	Location
10 January 2019	Phonecall with Principal/Head of HR re Senior Vice- Principal , DVC Reappointment	Conference Call
11 January 2019	Glasgow University Development and Alumni Relations Burns Supper	Dinner
14 January 2019	30% Club call up on Higher Education board governance / Corporate sector board experience & insights	Conference Call
15 January 2019	Update Meeting with Anton Muscatelli	Conference Call
16 January 2019	30% Club Higher Education Dinner with Advance HE, The FCA, Corporate leaders, Imperial College, Cardiff University, UCL, Athena Swann, Brunel University, Edinburgh University, Glasgow University, Perret Laver and Norma Jarboe (Women Count)	London
22 January 2019	Higher Education report back to 30% Club Heads of Initiatives	Conference Call
23 January 2019	Finance Committee	Conference Call
23 January 2019	Pre-Court Officer's call	Conference Call
30 January 2019	CUC Committee Meeting and New Chairs' Dinner	London
13 February 2019	Update Meeting with Anton Muscatelli	University of Glasgow
	Court Pre-Briefing Meeting	
	Court	
	Court Dinner	

Court Context Card - 13 February 2019 - Report from Estates Committee	
Speaker	Mr Ronnie Mercer
Speaker role	Estates Committee Convener
Paper Description	Report from Estates Committee (15 January 2019 meeting)
<i>Topic last discussed at Court</i>	Dec-18
<i>Topic discussed at Committee</i>	Various
<i>Committee members (on Court) who were present</i>	Mr R Mercer (Convener), Mr D Milloy, Dr B Wood
<i>Cost of proposed plan</i>	Various
<i>Major benefit of proposed plan</i>	
<i>Revenue from proposed plan</i>	
<i>Urgency</i>	Various
<i>Timing</i>	Short, Medium and Long Term
<i>Red-Amber-Green Rating</i>	Not Applicable
<i>Paper Type</i>	Information
<i>Paper Summary</i>	Minutes including update on Capital programme and Project progress/approval
<i>Topics to be discussed</i>	
<i>Action from Court</i>	
<p>EC/2018/22.5 Western/New Build/Institute of Health and Wellbeing (Clarice Pears Building) The Committee recognised the clear alignment between the proposal and the University's strategic priorities and the benefits which would arise from the physical adjacency of a number of multi-disciplinary teams, currently working in silos in dispersed premises. The Committee noted the maximum project costs in the sum of £49.6m, based on an interim target price provided in December 2018. It noted that a value engineering exercise was underway to reduce this sum and it was expected that a final target price would be available by March 2019. The Committee agreed in principle with the aims of the proposal and that whilst it would be preferable to move forward with more cost certainty, given the extremely tight programme window and critical approval dates, it should be shared in its current form at the forthcoming January Finance Committee and at Court in February 2019 where conditional approval would be requested, subject to a maximum cost of £49.6m. Full approvals would be sought during the remainder of the 2018/19 governance cycle. It was agreed that an additional explanatory note would be prepared to sit alongside 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. These would also be clearly referenced in the Executive Summary.</p> <p>Court is also asked to note Estates Committee's approval of CapEx applications as follows:</p> <p>Gilmorehill/Joseph Black Building/Skabara Lab in the sum of £265k (additional finding) (EC/2018/23.2.1 refers); Gilmorehill/Joseph Black Building/Phase 2 Roof Works up to a maximum sum of £144k (EC/2018/23.2.2 refers); Replacement and Upgrade of Laboratory Caging in the sum of £1.497m (EC/2018/28.3.1 refers); and Phase 2 Quantic - College Equipment in the sum of £787k (EC/2018/28.3.2 refers).</p>	
<i>Recommendation to Court</i>	
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 9 Estates: Failure to define and implement a coherent, holistic campus development programme which is transformational and offers value for money
Risk register - college level	Not Applicable
Demographics	
% of University	100% staff and students
Campus	Entire University Estate (all campuses)
External bodies	Glasgow City Council; external contractors
Conflict areas	Not Applicable
Other universities that have done something similar	
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 on Tuesday 15 January 2019

Present: Mrs A Allen, Dr D Duncan, Mr R Fraser, Professor N Juster, Ms L McDougall, Mr R Mercer (Convenor), Mr D Milloy, Mr D Smith, Dr B Wood

In Attendance: Mrs N Cameron, Mrs L Duncan (Clerk), Mr D Hall, Mr P Haggarty, Ms M Hipkin

For Item 8.1: Professor A Dominiczak, Professor J Pell, Ms C Clugston, Mr D Marchant, Mr M Munro

Apologies: Professor L Farmer, Professor A Muscatelli (Principal), Mr A Seabourne

Convenor's Announcement: The Convenor and the Committee offered their congratulations to the Director of Estates and Commercial Services on her achievement of the award of MBE for Services to Higher Education.

EC/2018/19 Minute of the meeting held on 6 November 2018

The minute was approved as an accurate record.

EC/2018/20 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

EC/2018/21 Capital Programme Update

EC/2018/21.1 Programme Governance Board

EC/2018/21.1.1 Convenor's Update

The Committee noted the Convenor's update in relation to the review of the Capital Plan which would include full analysis of costs, risks and affordability. This is against a background of financial challenges for the University including pension contributions and further strategic investment needs such as enhanced IT infrastructure.

Currently the overall net financial increase for delivery of Phases 1a and 1b was forecast as £58.2m when compared to the Capital Plan update in June 2018. The main reasons for the increase were construction inflation, design and specification development, new projects to support further opportunities to deliver increased University revenues and legislative changes related to fire suppression.

The Committee agreed that there was a need to consider whether this increase was affordable and delivered both value for money and fit for purpose buildings which would meet the University's ambitions. It requested that those costs over which the University had control be identified in the revised Plan.

Three major new build projects were under construction: James McCune Smith Learning Hub; Research Hub; and Infrastructure. Five new-build projects were at varying stages in the design and approval cycle: Clarice Pears Building (Institute of Health and Wellbeing); Adam Smith Business School; Arts; Engineering; and Centre for Chronic Diseases. In addition, a major refurbishment was underway within the Joseph Black Building.

The Committee noted that the review would involve an evaluation of each proposed project against a set of agreed criteria to include: strategic alignment; contribution to organisational change; opportunity to increase collaboration; deliverability; quality; and strategic impact of non-progression. The updated Plan would be presented to SMG in April 2019 and to Court in June 2019 to align with the annual planning and budgeting process.

A cashflow report for Phases 1a and Phase 1b would be provided to Finance Committee in January 2019 and to Court in February 2019. It was agreed that feedback from these committees would inform planning and refinement of the business case for the Clarice Pears Building (Institute of Health and Wellbeing).

EC/2018/21.1.2 Lay Members Update

The report was noted.

EC/2018/21.1.3 Summary Report

The Committee noted that there had been extensive discussion with the planning authority in relation to changes to the Masterplan, in particular the new lane between the sites for the Clarice Pears Building (Institute of Health and Wellbeing) and Chronic Diseases building. It also noted that a full review of the capital programme would be undertaken in line with the budget programme.

EC/2018/21.1.4 Major Project Dashboard Reports

The Committee noted the current **green** status of Workstreams 1a (Masterplanning), 3 (Construction Mobilisation), 8 (Strategic Investment and Disposal) and 9 (Strategic Travel and Transport) and the amber status of Workstream 1b (Infrastructure).

EC/2018/21.1.5 Cost Report (19)

The report was noted. Work was underway to achieve greater integration and consistency in reporting, to ensure no overlap in spend allocation and to minimise variances in reporting throughout the governance and committee cycle.

EC/2018/22 Capital Projects Governance Board

EC/2018/22.1 Convenor's Update

The Board had been advised of a number of challenges being experienced in respect of projects which included achievement of Building Warrants, fire suppression measures and matters related to the progression of projects within live buildings.

EC/2018/22.2 Lay Member's Update

The Committee noted that the last meeting of the Board had focused on two key topics: the Clarice Pears Building (Institute of Health and Wellbeing) and the RAG ratings of key projects which it had suggested be considered in more detail.

EC/2018/22.3 Summary Report

The report was noted.

EC/2018/22.4 James McCune Smith Learning Hub (Fire Suppression System)

The Committee noted the update report detailing project programme, cost status, risk profile, specific matters concerning the fire suppression measures required to secure a Building Warrant and delays resulting from the identification of an underground cable. The Estates team was working closely with the Contractor to minimise cost and programme implications and to maintain momentum and construction progress.

The Committee noted that design work on the fire suppression system had commenced and that the design and associated tanking support systems and related infrastructure would ensure compatibility with any later systems which might be installed within the Boyd Orr Building.

The Committee highlighted a number of matters that it requested be considered further, specifically relating to time and cost implications, potential implications for other projects within the Masterplan and considerations in respect of future asset values. It requested that the Estates Team revert to the Contractor with a view to achieving further progress and agreed that delegated authority would be provided to a sub-group, comprising the Secretary of Court, the Executive Director of Estates and Commercial Services, Mr R Mercer (Convenor) and Mr D Milloy to progress matters outwith the formal Estates Committee schedule.

The Executive Director of Estates and Commercial Services undertook to clarify teaching dates in future years to ensure that soft opening and testing can be programmed ahead of an agreed opening date. She also agreed to share professional advice obtained by the University in relation to the current position with Committee members.

EC/2018/22.5 Western/New Build/Institute of Health and Wellbeing (Clarice Pears Building)

The Committee welcomed the presentation given by Professor Dominiczak and Professor Pell outlining the Full Business Case seeking approval for project funding to create a new build facility which would support the work and the development of the Institute. The Committee recognised the clear alignment between the proposal and the University's strategic priorities and the benefits which would arise from the physical adjacency of a number of multi-disciplinary teams, currently working in silos in dispersed premises.

The Committee noted the maximum project costs in the sum of £49.6m, based on an interim target price provided in December 2018. It noted that a value engineering exercise was underway to reduce this sum and it was expected that a final target price would be available by March 2019.

The Committee agreed in principle with the aims of the proposal and that whilst it would be preferable to move forward with more cost certainty, given the extremely tight programme window and critical approval dates, it should be shared in its current form at the forthcoming January Finance Committee and at Court in February 2019 where conditional approval would be requested, subject to a maximum cost of £49.6m.

Full approvals would be sought during the remainder of the 2018/19 governance cycle.

It was agreed that an additional explanatory note would be prepared to sit alongside 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. These would also be clearly referenced in the Executive Summary.

EC/2018/22.6 Dashboard Reports
The Committee noted the current status of all major projects.

EC/2018/23 CapEx Committee Report

EC/2018/23.1 CapEx Application Summary
The summary was noted.

EC/2018/23.2 Estates Applications

EC/2018/23.2.1 Gilmorehill/Joseph Black Building/Skabara Lab

The Committee approved the application in the sum of £265k (additional finding) to facilitate completion of the project to provide permanent laboratory accommodation.

EC/2018/23.2.2 Gilmorehill/Joseph Black Building/Phase 2 Roof Works

The Committee approved the application for additional funding, up to a maximum of £144k, for roof survey investigations to support Stage 1 design and feasibility.

EC/2018/28.3.1 Equipment/Replacement and Upgrade of Laboratory Caging

The Committee approved the application in the sum of £1.497m to facilitate upgrading of laboratory caging.

EC/2018/28.3.2 Equipment/Phase 2 Quantic – College Equipment

The Committee approved the application in the sum of £787k.

EC/2018/24 Control and Monitor Reports

EC/2018/24.1 RAG Report

The report, containing details of sixty-one live projects over a value of £100k, was noted. The Committee noted that during the November reporting period four projects had been reported with a full or partial red status and thirteen with a full or partial amber status.

It also noted that since the last meeting of the Committee three projects had been completed: Gilbert Scott Building/ASBS Research Cluster; Western/Maths and Statistics Modular Unit; and Sir Alwyn Williams (Level 5 Reconfiguration).

EC/2018/24.2 Risk Register

The Committee noted that a new **red** risk had been added to the Register (NEC3 training for Governance Boards) and that mitigating action in the form of training would be provided to manage this.

It was agreed that a further review would be considered in approximately 4 weeks to assess potential risks to programme.

EC/2018/24.3 Programme

The Committee noted the current Master Programme.

EC/2018/24.4 Health and Safety Dashboard

The Committee noted the workstream status as **green**.

EC/2018/25 Estates Reports

No items to consider.

EC/2018/26 Any Other Business

The Committee agreed that the next scheduled meeting on 5 March 2019 would include a site tour.

EC/2018/27 Schedule of Meetings for 2018/19

The schedule of dates was noted:

Tuesday 5 March 2019

Wednesday 8 May 2019

Court Context Card - 13th February 2019 - Finance Committee Report

Speaker	Graeme Bissett
Speaker role	Finance Committee Convener
Paper Description	Finance Committee Report to Court
Topic last discussed at Court	Dec-18
Topic discussed at Committee	Jan-19
Committee members present	Court members present at last meeting: G Bissett, L McDougall, R Mercer, E Orcharton, E Passey (by telephone), G Stewart
Cost of proposed plan	
Major benefit of proposed plan	
Revenue from proposed plan	
Urgency	High
Timing	Immediate
Red-Amber-Green Rating	Green
Paper Type	Discussion
Paper Summary	
FC/2018/46 - Executive Summary	
FC/2018/47 - Full Business Case for the Institute of Health and Wellbeing - CONDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION TO COURT	
FC/2018/48 - Four Capex applications, summary included in minutes - APPROVED	
FC/2018/50 - Update on the Capital Programme	
FC/2018/61 - Overview of Performance as at 30 December 2018	
Topics to be discussed	Institute of Health and Wellbeing; Progress of Capital Projects ; Long term cash flow forecast ; Period 5 Overview of Performance Approval sought for Institute of Health and Wellbeing . Other Items for noting.
Action from Court	
Recommendation to Court	Institute of Health and Wellbeing - recommended to Court, conditional on final cost
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	
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
Finance Committee
Minute of Meeting held on Wednesday 23 January 2019
Kelvin Room, 11 The Square

Present:

Mr Graeme Bissett (Convener), Mr Robert Fraser, Prof Neal Juster, Ms Lauren McDougall, Ms Elspeth Orcharton, Ms Elizabeth Passey (via teleconference), Mr Gavin Stewart, Mr Iain Stewart

In attendance:

Mrs Ann Allen, Mr Gregor Caldwell, Dr David Duncan, Mr Ronnie Mercer, Ms Fiona Quinn

For Item 47: Mr Derek Marchant, Mr Martin Munro, Prof Jill Pell

Apologies:

Ms Heather Cousins, Prof Nick Hill, Dr Simon Kennedy, Prof Sir Anton Muscatelli

FC/2018/43. Summary of main points

- The Full Business Case for the Institute of Health and Wellbeing was considered, and the Committee agreed to recommend the project to Court, on condition that the final cost did not exceed £49.6m. While the project sponsor presented a convincing account of the benefits of the building, Committee members registered their concerns with the cost increases which had emerged in the course of the design process and stressed that the costs should not rise further.
- In addition to the Institute of Health and Wellbeing, four Capex applications were considered and approved, with aggregate capital spend of £2.69m.
- The Committee was advised that costs for Phase 1a and 1b were expected to rise from £531m to £590m. A number of factors had contributed and these were discussed in detail. It was acknowledged that the current estimate remained work in progress and that a planned major review of options and priorities around the University capital plan in the context of increased programme costs and consequent strain on available cash was underway. A revised Capital Plan would be presented to Finance Committee in May 2019.
- Finance Committee received a long term cash flow paper updated from November 2018 to reflect a number of significant changes including: updated capital spend forecast, removal of administrative savings until committed plans are produced, increased USS costs of £8.6m per annum reflecting latest valuation, and reprofiled salary costs. These changes have a significant impact on outlook position versus June 2018 budget. The long-term cash flow analysis will be updated for all material factors and presented to the Committee alongside the revised Capital Plan in May 2019 ahead of submission to Court in June 2019.
- Performance of the Money Market Funds was £1.5m behind benchmark and would continue to be monitored. Endowment Funds were outperforming against the FTSE.

- The Committee received a brief report on donations and philanthropic fundraising, noting that current forecast is broadly in line with original targets. Milestones have been set out in the process to wind up the University Trust.
- The Committee received an update on the planning round, noting that initial meetings had been held in November with all Colleges and University Services. Draft targets for Colleges have been increased for the next four years by £3.8m per year given historic delivery over and above budget. The Senior Vice Principal noted that there would be a more substantive update at the next meeting in March.
- The Committee noted the overview of performance. The results for Period 5 showed an underlying surplus outlook of £10.8m, £8m ahead of budget.

FC/2018/44. Declarations of Interest

There were no new declarations.

FC/2018/45. Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19 November 2018

The minutes of Finance Committee held on 19 November 2018 were approved.

FC/2018/46. Executive Summary (paper 5)

Finance Committee noted the Executive Summary, confirming that it was a helpful overview.

FC/2018/47. Institute of Health and Wellbeing (paper 6.1)

Finance Committee received a paper setting out the full business case for the new Institute of Health and Wellbeing. The Convener welcomed to the meeting the Director of the Institute of Health and Wellbeing (who was also the project sponsor); the Senior Project Development Manager for the IHW project; and the Head of Finance for the College of MVLS.

The Director of the IHW gave a brief presentation, making the case for the importance of multidisciplinary facilities in the emerging research funding landscape, and noting the societal benefits which can be achieved when medical scientists and social scientists collaborate in addressing health inequalities and outcomes.

The Convener of Estates Committee provided an overview of the discussion which had taken place at that meeting. Estates Committee members had been clear that the cost of the building should not be permitted to increase further, and should not exceed £49.6m. Estates Committee had been convinced of the case for the building (a case which was founded on reputation, quality of research and societal contribution, rather than commercial considerations) and had agreed to recommend to Court subject to receipt of final cost.

Responding to queries from the Committee on the design of the building and the increased cost, the Director of Estates noted that the design has evolved and been tested rigorously through the internal governance process. Discussions at Capital Projects Governance Board meetings resulted in substantial changes in the design, particularly around room size. The Director of IHW

emphasised that the space in the building has been optimised and will be utilised very efficiently. The Convener requested that details about the utilisation of space should be included in the full business case paper for Court.

The contribution of the new building in financial terms was discussed. Committee members noted that this would be managed in the context of the College of MVLS as a whole. Although the building would not directly generate income, there was a loss avoidance consideration – for example, not to proceed with the building could put some streams of research funding at risk.

Finance Committee agreed to recommend the project to Court, conditional on the final cost not exceeding £49.6m.

FC/2018/48. Capital Expenditure Application Summaries (paper 6.2)

Finance Committee received five capital expenditure applications, summarised in the table below:

Project	Purpose of funding application	Total Projected Cost	Provision in capital plan	Other Funding Source	Value of funding sought under application
Western / New Build / Institute of Health & Wellbeing	Full Business Case	£49.6m	Yes	Yes	£48.04m
Gilmorehill / JBB / Phase 2	Supplementary Fees	£14.4m	Yes	Nil	£144k
Replacement and upgrading of laboratory animal caging	Full Business Case	£1.497m	No	Nil	£1.497m
Gilmorehill / JBB / Skabara Lab	Supplementary Approval	£1.29m	Yes	Nil	£265k
EPSRC outline call for Quantum Technology Research Hubs (Phase 2 - QuantIC)	Full Business Case	£787k	No	Nil	£787k

As discussed under the previous item, Finance Committee agreed to recommend the Institute of Health and Wellbeing to Court, subject to final price. The Committee approved the remaining four Capex applications.

For the next meeting and going forward, the Committee requested updates on the amount and percentage of budget that is drawn down following approval of capital expenditure.

FC/2018/49. Capital Plan Review (paper 6.3)

The Committee received a paper for information, 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. The Committee were advised that costs for Phase 1a and 1b were expected to rise from £531m to £590m. A number of factors had contributed and these were discussed in detail. It was acknowledged that the current estimate remained work in progress and that a planned major review of options and priorities around the University capital plan in the context of increased programme costs and consequent strain on available cash was underway. A revised Capital Plan would be presented to Finance Committee in May 2019 along with budget and cash flow forecasts.

The paper focused on affordability, cash flow, and processes for evaluating projects for inclusion and prioritisation within the plan. The Committee noted that consideration had been given to the timing of approvals proceeding through the Committee process between now and June. It was noted that the only major spend seeking approval in this period was in relation to IHW. Looking further ahead, the committee discussed potential options for facilitating discussions and approvals in a flexible and timely way, for example, arranging interim discussions between formal meetings, and reviewing the spacing of Committee meetings relative to each other and to Court meetings.

The Committee welcomed the paper.

FC/2018/50. Capital Programme Update, Campus Redevelopment Spend and Contingency (papers 6.4 & 6.5)

Finance Committee noted an update on current capital projects and a summary of progress of the capital plan.

FC/2018/51. Status of Capital Grant Funding (paper 6.6)

Finance Committee noted the report on capital grant funding. As previously noted, equipment purchases would not go ahead unless grant applications were successful. There were two applications pending.

FC/2018/52. Pensions – Key Dates (paper 6.7)

The Committee noted the timeline of key dates, incorporating campus development milestones and key dates in terms of possible changes to pension costs. The Convener requested that Committee and Court meeting dates also be plotted on the timeline.

FC/2018/53. Long Term Cash Flow Update (paper 7.1)

Finance Committee received a cash flow paper updated from November 2018 to reflect a number of significant changes including: updated capital spend forecast, removal of administrative savings until committed plans are produced, increased USS costs of £8.6m per annum reflecting latest valuation, and reprofiled salary costs. These changes have a significant impact on outlook position versus June 2018 budget with the University expected to be in net debt at the end of each year from 2023/24, and with net debt in 2035/36 of (£72m) versus prior estimates of £195m positive holdings.

In discussing the paper, the Committee noted that the cash flow modelling was a work in progress and that many of the assumptions are cautious, particularly in terms of assumed salary costs and SFC funding. The targets for the next four years would be challenged through the budget process to maximise opportunities for additional cash generation, particularly given historic delivery over and above target. It was also noted that margins on international fees may be more favourable than is implied in the current cash flow projection.

There was a wide-ranging discussion which touched on the following points:

- The Committee agreed the operating model should be developed further to demonstrate how the cash shortfall can be addressed.
- In discussing debt, the Committee noted that SMG would make a judgement on acceptable levels of debt and optimum level of provision for repayments of the bond finance. The Senior Vice Principal stated that he would be interested to look at the stock of debt (and closing net cash balances) by the time the final tranche of debt is due to be repaid as a percentage of overall turnover.
- The Committee agreed the importance of demonstrating affordability of new capital projects in the outer years: cash flow modelling discussions should be linked with capital planning discussions. It was also agreed that UofG should consider whether there are more efficient ways of taking forward major capital projects, e.g. combining two projects into one.
- The Director of Finance raised the issue of administrative savings, explaining that these had been removed from the forecasts as there were as yet no firm plans on how the savings would be met.
- Committee members raised concerns regarding upward drift in the cost of major capital projects, seeking to understand how this issue is being managed. The Director of Estates noted that through the internal governance process there was appropriate and robust challenge of project design, and teams in Estates & Commercial Services were responsible for working with project sponsors, giving appropriate push back and ensuring projects were briefed properly.
- The Committee raised the matter of reliance on income from international students, and queried the balance to be struck in positioning Glasgow as both an international and a local university. For the next meeting, members requested information on the proportion of international students at Glasgow relative to the UK HE sector.
- It was noted that there was no assumed income from disposal of assets. In response to a query from the Committee, the Senior Vice Principal confirmed that there is still a potential upside here and work is ongoing on this.

Summing up the discussion, the Convener re-emphasised that the cash flow modelling was a work in progress. Capital spend projections and cash flow forecasts would be worked on side by side in preparation for presenting the Capital Plan and University budget to Court in June.

FC/2018/54. Investment Fund Performance (paper 7.2)

The Committee noted that performance continues to be behind benchmark by £1.5m, however total returns since inception remain higher than the best term deposit rates, with a total return of £2.2m mostly due to Insight performance.

FC/2018/55. Endowment Fund Performance (paper 7.3)

The Committee noted that both endowment funds continue to outperform the FTSE. Endowments have had significant gains in each of the last two years.

FC/2018/56. Donations and Philanthropic Fundraising (paper 7.4)

The Committee noted a brief report on donations, noting that the current forecast is broadly in line with original targets. A more detailed paper would be shared with the Committee at its next meeting.

FC/2018/57. Operation of the University Trust (paper 7.4.1)

Finance Committee received a paper setting out the process for winding up the University Trust. Milestones had been set out, with a target date of summer 2019 for completion. Feedback was awaited from HMRC, and colleagues from the Development and Alumni Office would brief the Trustees.

FC/2018/58. Current and future holding recommendations (paper 7.5)

The Committee noted that holding profiles had been reviewed in line with revised cash flow forecast. No additional fund investment is recommended at this time given current market volatility. For the next meeting, fund managers would be consulted on holding recommendations.

FC/2018/59. TRAC Return

The discussion of this item was deferred. The return would be circulated to members via email for comment.

FC/2018/60. Budget update (paper 9.1)

The Committee received an update on the planning round, noting that initial meetings had been held in November with all Colleges and University Services. Draft targets for Colleges have been increased for the next four years by £3.8m per year given historic delivery over and above budget. The Senior Vice Principal encouraged feedback from Committee members on the manner in which the budget process was reported to the Committee, noting that there would be a more substantive update at the next meeting in March.

Committee members welcomed the update.

FC/2018/61. Overview of Performance as at 31 December 2018 (paper 10.1)

The Group Financial Controller presented the overview of performance for Period 5.

The underlying surplus outlook was £10.8m, an increase of £2.7m from November and £8m higher than budget, primarily due to increased numbers of international students offset by increased depreciation. The Committee noted that cash from operations was forecast to be £41.1m, a £3.9m increase from November and £9m ahead of budget.

FC/2018/62. Debtors Reports as at 31 October 2018 (paper 10.2)

Finance Committee received an update on debtors as at 31 December 2018. Members noted that overall debt stood £15m higher than prior year (at £107.62m in comparison to £92.83m) as a result of increased year on year sales within Student and Sponsor and Commercial areas. Overall debt had reduced by £30m from November.

The Small Animal Hospital continued to be monitored, and aged debt continues to rise in this area.

FC/2018/63. Table of Actions

Action	Date Due	Notes
Review TRAC return which will be circulated via email	31 January	All Committee members
For Court meeting, include information on space utilisation in IHW in the business case paper	February Court meeting	IHW project team
Report final cost of IHW to Finance Committee when available	March 2019	Director of Estates
Provide information on the amount and percentage of budget that is drawn down following approval of capital expenditure. This information to be added to the Capital Expenditure applications summary sheet.	March meeting and going forward	Director of Estates/Group Financial Controller

Committee and Court meeting dates to be plotted on the key dates timeline (paper 6.7)	March meeting	Group Financial Controller
Provide information on the proportion of international students studying at UofG relative to the UK HE sector	March meeting	Clerk/External Relations
Provide more detailed donations report	March meeting	Group Financial Controller
Consult fund managers on holding recommendations	March meeting	Group Financial Controller
Provide more substantive budget update	March meeting	Senior Vice Principal
Provide update on administrative savings to inform long term cash flow forecasts	May or September meeting	Group Financial Controller

FC/2018/64. Date of next meeting

27 March 2019, 10.00am, Melville Room

Prepared by: Fiona Quinn, Clerk to Committee, Fiona.Quinn@glasgow.ac.uk

Court Context Card 13 February 2019 - Student Experience Committee report

Speakers	Dr David Duncan and Lauren McDougall	
Speakers' roles	Joint Conveners of the Committee	
Paper Description	Report of the meeting of the Student Experience Committee (SEC) held on 17 January 2019	
<i>Topic last discussed at Court</i>	Dec-18	
<i>Topic discussed at Committee</i>	See paper summary section below.	
<i>Court members present</i>	Lauren McDougall	
<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	
<i>Paper Summary</i>	<p>Report of the second meeting of the Student Experience Committee (SEC) held on 17 January. The Committee's discussions included items for Court to note, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEC Remit • A revised title for the University Calendar • Discussion on the Student Services Review • Information on the new online platform to support mental health • The SEC Action Plan • The SEC Away Day 	
<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 4 Student: Failure to offer an attractive, high quality and fulfilling student experience to UG and PG students	
Risk register - university level		
Risk register - college level		
Demographics		
<i>% of University</i>	100% Students	
Operating stats		
<i>% of</i>		
Campus	All	
External bodies		
Conflict areas		
Other universities that have done something similar		
Other universities that will do something similar		
Relevant Legislation		
Equality Impact Assessment	There are equality implications in many areas covered by the Committee, the Head of Equality and Diversity attends meetings in an advisory capacity, and the Action Plan covers a number of areas where equality issues will be addressed. The online support for mental health will have a positive impact in increasing facilities available for mental health support.	
Suggested next steps	NA	
Any other observations		

University of Glasgow

Court – 13 February 2019

Student Experience Committee – Report of meeting held on 17 January 2019

Dr David Duncan & Ms Lauren McDougall (Co-conveners)

1 Student Experience Committee - Revised Remit [For Noting]

Members received and noted two changes to the Committee remit following amendments requested by University Court (Appendix 1). Item B3 relating to the diversity of students now included reference to students living at home. A final clause had been added to section C to specify the committee quorum of one third of members, plus the requirement for at least one external member to be present at each meeting. This latter provision had recently been added to the Standing Orders of Court for all Court committees. Members were advised that as neither of the external representatives had been available to attend the current meeting they would be consulted out of committee before any decisions taken by the Committee were formalised.

2 Update on Transitions Working Group activity [For Noting]

Moira Fischbacher-Smith advised that all Colleges had reported to the Transitions Working Group improvement in new students' understanding of registration and enrolment at the beginning of session 2018-19 following the enhanced communications for the 2018 intake.

Members were advised that funding had been approved for the Glasgow Essentials post and the recruitment process was under way. Moira Fischbacher-Smith noted that this post was part of a wider set of actions relating to improvement in the induction and welcome of new students, on which the SEC should also be kept updated.

3 Change of Title for University Calendar [For Noting]

Further to discussion at the previous meeting it was noted that that no suggestions were submitted for an alternative title for the University Calendar. Members agreed that a more transparent title should be adopted for the document which was a collection of regulations, policies and codes. It was agreed that a revised title of "University Regulations" should be introduced for the next publication which would be in August 2019.

4 Student Services Review: Consultant Report on Support for Student Services [For Noting]

External consultant, Andrew West, introduced his project report on the review of Student Services which had been commissioned by the University to allow an extensive review of Student Services within the recently formed Directorate of Student and Academic Services. Andrew West emphasised the need for balance in any such exercise which naturally focused on problems and challenges, and therefore acknowledged the very positive aspects of the University's current work in student support where staff demonstrated significant experience, professional expertise and strong commitment to effective support for students. The report was wide ranging with extensive findings and 15 key recommendations. It highlighted opportunities for significant change across the service in order to improve delivery of the student experience.

Andrew West provided a number of comments under key headings:

Governance: the introduction of SEC to take a strategic oversight of the non academic student experience was considered to be a positive development and it was expected that this Committee would take a central role in monitoring the response and actions arising from the consultation.

Leadership: a review of leadership was recommended, both at the level of Student Support as a whole and within individual specialist teams.

Organisation: a review of the current organisational structure was strongly recommended, as the focus on specialist support for student services left a gap in centralised generalist student support. Current structures did not provide any scope for service provision to be presented in terms of graduated levels based on need, which led to student issues being inappropriately escalated to specialist response units. A review of cross-institutional support between local academic areas and central services was also recommended.

Communications: the need for effective communications with stakeholders regarding support was highlighted. This highlighted the need for an overarching student communications strategy to facilitate more coherent, consistent and streamlined communications with students in this area.

IT: the report identified a good opportunity for improvements in IT to be made as part of the wider review and restructuring of Student Services. It recommended that new IT systems for student support be implemented as widely as possible across the institution to allow a single customer view for students and staff interacting with these systems.

Evaluation: the report identified numerous but un-coordinated evaluation activities at present, which would benefit from revision through a service evaluation plan. This would enable identification of key areas for evaluation, potentially reducing the amount of evaluation activity but improving on focus and analysis of data gathered. SEC was impressed by the report and welcomed its comprehensive findings and recommendations. It noted that staff and the SRC were already aware of many of the issues covered, but the overview and recommendations in the report provided an excellent opportunity to further improve the service for students. Members recognised the need to develop an action plan, and identified various challenges associated with the potential scale of change such as:

- ensuring strategic oversight and co-ordination of change;
- developing an appropriately prioritised action plan;
- ensuring business continuity during the period of transition; and
- developing a communications strategy for both staff and students.

In discussion, members agreed that the key issues arising from the report were leadership, the need for an increase in appropriate generalist support centrally, and resources. The need for an effective evaluation framework was also identified, and Andrew West advised on taking a selective approach by identifying a small number of key measures to monitor, rather than trying to tackle all areas at once and being overwhelmed with data.

SEC was also advised that current changes planned for the Fraser Building would also be factored into the plan arising from the Student Services review. These involved refurbishment and changes in the use and occupancy of the space, bringing about the co-location of specialist services such as CaPS and Disability Service. Robert Partridge agreed to provide SEC with further detail on the Fraser Building project at the next meeting.

Robert Partridge reported that he had begun the process of identifying the next steps for Student Services reform following the review report, and these would focus on the staged introduction of extensive reform, taking account of the priority areas identified by SEC. An outline paper on next steps would be submitted to the next meeting of SEC for discussion.

5 Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS) – New Online Platform to Support Mental Health [For Noting]

Sarah O'Donnell from Big White Wall gave a presentation on the mental health support offered through their online system which provided a facility to registered students and staff of the University.

Big White Wall offered an online service of mental health support which was accessible day and night to any registered student on an anonymous basis. SEC heard that 1 in 4 of the adult population suffered from a common mental health issue in any given year, but 75% did not seek help or support. Big White Wall sought to make mental health support more accessible by addressing some of the barriers to seeking help which had been identified, particularly in student populations, as: access, waiting times, engagement, stigma and choice.

The service provided an online community made up of clients from the various organisations which had joined Big White Wall such as educational institutions, local government, private companies and the military. Various facilities were available including online discussion forums (peer communication), interaction with trained clinicians (Wall Guides), self-assessment and training or guidance tools to encourage self-management in a supportive community. Online live therapy was also available, on a non-anonymous basis through referral from CaPS, and was offered via multiple communication methods such as messaging, audio, and live webcam.

Activity was carefully monitored by trained clinicians to ensure a positive experience for users and to identify any critical cases requiring intervention or escalation. Access to the system was immediate (on registration) and response rates were fast with approaches to Wall Guides being responded to within 30 minutes. Discussion forum posts were also responded to by trained staff if no peer responses were made in order to provide interactive dialogue to users. The maximum waiting time for live therapy was two days, and in most cases was much sooner, unless users had specific requirements regarding the timing of their live therapy.

SEC was advised that there had been a soft launch of Big White Wall in the University last year, and full roll-out was now taking place to increase use of the facility. Members welcomed the facility and saw great potential benefits, particularly in offering rapid support for large numbers of students with mild to moderate mental health issues. It was agreed that the facility was additional to, and would complement, the specialist support offered by CaPS.

6 Student Experience Committee – Action Plan Tracker [For Noting]

Further to discussion on the Student Experience Action Plan at the previous meeting, the co-conveners had drawn up a tracker to provide more detail on the actions to allow progress to be monitored.

Members agreed that this information was useful, although clarity was sought on how some of the actions noted would be monitored given they were being taken forward by other

committees. The need to distinguish between this action plan and other actions undertaken by the SEC was also highlighted. It was confirmed that this tracker was specific to the Student Experience Action Plan which had been devised following the discussion and presentations at the first meeting of SEC, and was designed to allow SEC to take an overview of activity in this area. It was recognised that some actions would be taken forward by other bodies, but the progress on these would be reported to SEC via the tracker. Separate actions of SEC which did not fall under the Action Plan would be progressed in the normal way, with reports under matters arising and through main committee items. It was agreed that the Action Plan Tracker should be submitted to every other meeting of SEC highlighting any updates since the last report.

7 Away Day – November 2018 [For Noting]

7.1 Report of Away Day

SEC received and noted the report of the Away Day held on 15 November 2018. Discussion had focused on four themes in order to generate ideas on how bring about a step-change in the student experience at Glasgow. This covered: student wellbeing; communications with students; the physical environment; and student residences.

The GUSA President noted that on the day there had been considerable discussion on physical activity and the culture of sport in some of the break-out sessions, and it was agreed that the report of the Away Day would benefit from some specific reference to this. The report would therefore be amended to include this information.

David Duncan reported that the Capital Plan for the University's Estates development had been discussed at Senior Management Group (SMG) and was expected to be finalised in June 2019. It was noted that discussion at SMG had acknowledged that criteria relating to the student experience would be built into the Plan, and therefore actions identified at the Away Day would be included in this process.

7.2 Student Wellbeing

Robert Partridge introduced his outline of a Framework for Student Wellbeing which had been drawn up following discussion at the Away Day. This was an initial working copy to stimulate discussion and provide feedback from SEC to allow fuller development of the proposed framework. The draft included an introduction with current data on levels of student wellbeing throughout the UK, the identification of six pillars around which the framework would be focused, identification of specific segments of the student community which might require more targeted support for wellbeing, three objectives for the University's approach to wellbeing, and some commentary on measurement and evaluation.

Given the perception of falling levels of wellbeing among students nationally, SEC agreed that a structured approach should be taken with further development of the proposed framework. It was noted that there was already activity under the six core areas identified in the report, but better promotion and co-ordination of this would be useful. Student organisations were also tackling many of these areas, and this work would benefit from support and further input from the University.

Members agreed that following on from discussion at the Away Day, some emphasis on empowering students to develop self-care, particularly in relation to mental wellbeing, should be included in the framework. There was some concern that identifying parts of the student community for targeted support could be problematic, for example in terms of the selection

and omission of potential groups. In the current targeted groups, it was suggested that PGR students should be amended to encompass all postgraduate students.

In terms of the three objectives included in the draft, it was suggested that there should be some reference to learning or education within these, and that the second point required re-working.

SEC agreed that evaluation should be included in the framework, and it was noted that there could be scope for using an off-the-shelf product for a wellbeing survey, if one was to be introduced. It was also suggested that once the framework had been developed, some interface with the Staff Wellbeing strategy should be explored, particularly around branding and core messages for the University, for example in terms of promotion of healthy lifestyles.

While the proposed framework document was marked as confidential, it was agreed that there could be further circulation to relevant colleagues across the University, and around student bodies, in order to generate further feedback to assist in taking this forward. Therefore, members were invited to discuss the draft with relevant groups out of committee and provide written comments on the document to allow a further re-working of the proposal for discussion at the next meeting of SEC.

7.3 Communicating with Students

Heather Corley provided a summary of actions arising from discussion at the Away Day. She reported that work was progressing on the formation of a Student Communications Network with identification of a potential membership of 75 for the Network from across University Services, Schools, Colleges and student bodies. While it was acknowledged that this number might be reduced, the need for a broad membership was recognised in order to effectively disseminate messages and provide guidance on student communications.

It was also reported that Heather Corley was working with the SRC on the redesign of the MyCampus student pages. This included a focus on the information relating to student wellbeing and further consideration of the introduction of an online student-led newsletter. It was noted that dissemination of the current University newsletter to undergraduate students had been withdrawn due to a low level of student engagement. The SRC Permanent Secretary reported that the SRC had not been consulted on this change which was problematic as the University newsletter had been a useful communication channel for the SRC. Heather Corley confirmed that any future recommendations relating to student communications would be discussed with the SRC before any changes were made.

SEC welcomed the actions that were being taken to improve communications with students. Members highlighted the need to keep the wide range of staff who communicated with students informed of the University's formal communication channels, and also to provide guidance for staff to facilitate consistent and effective communications with students.

7.4 Physical Environment and Residences

SEC noted the report from the Director of Estates on actions to bring about improvement in the physical estates, and also student residences, which had been drawn up following discussion at the Away Day. SEC welcomed the proposed actions which included quick wins in the form of changes which could be introduced within the next 12 months, and medium term issues which would be tackled over the next three years.

8 Joint Away Day with Learning and Teaching Committee – 31 May 2019

Members welcomed the planned joint away day between SEC and the Learning and Teaching Committee in May. The event would focus on the areas of overlap between the two committees in order to identify how to work on these most effectively. Lauren McDougall agreed to give further consideration to identifying any attendees beyond members of the committees, while ensuring that the event was of a manageable size.

University of Glasgow

Committee Remit and Membership

Student Experience Committee is invited to note the revised remit as highlighted in points B.3 and C.6.

The changes reflect amendments requested by Court. The Standing Orders for Court and Court Committees have been amended to include a reference to Committee meetings needing to have at least one lay (external) member present, as well as being quorate.

Student Experience Committee: Remit and Membership 2018-19

Chief Operating Officer and University Secretary	David Duncan (Co-chair)
<i>8 representatives of the students:</i>	
President, Students' Representative Council	Lauren McDougall (Co-chair)
Vice President (Student Support), Students' Representative Council	Fatemah Nokhbatolfoghahai
Vice President (Student Activities), Students' Representative Council	Scott Kirby
Two additional representatives of the students, identified by the Students' Representative Council	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRC Mental Health Equality Officer • SRC General Representative 	Maria Teresa Banos Garcia Marco She
President, Glasgow University Sports Association	Paddy Everingham
President, Queen Margaret Union	Mata Durkin
President, Glasgow University Union	Ailsa Jones
<i>4 representatives of the academic staff:</i>	
Clerk of Senate	Jill Morrison
Assistant Vice Principal (Learning and Teaching)	Moira Fischbacher-Smith
A representative of the Chief Advisers	Joanne Ramsey
A Senate Assessor on Court	Lindsay Farmer
<i>4 representatives of the professional services:</i>	
Information Services	Susan Ashworth
Estates and Commercial Services	Karen Lee
External Relations	Jonathan Jones
Student and Academic Services	Robert Partridge
Permanent Secretary, Students' Representative Council	Bob Hay

Senior Advice & Policy Officer, SRC	Helen Speirs
Two lay members of Court	Morag Macdonald Simpson David Finlayson
Clerk (member of Senate Office)	Helen Butcher
Attending non-member	
Head of Equality and Diversity Unit	Mhairi Taylor
Representative from Communications and Public Affairs Office	Heather Corley

B. Terms of reference

1. Agree and oversee implementation of a common strategy, plans and policies for non-academic aspects of student life, to be jointly led by the University and the SRC.
2. Ensure that every student has the opportunity to enjoy and derive value from their university experience.
3. Ensure that the University's provision for the student experience reflects the diversity of needs within the student population (e.g. overseas, part-time, mature, visiting and disabled students, BAME students, care leavers, students with children or caring responsibilities **and students who live at home**).
4. Review and monitor the effectiveness of services and determine their priorities, in consultation with relevant senior managers.
5. Consider the activities and plans of the SRC, GUU, QMU and GUSA as they support the student experience.
6. Determine and monitor key measures of the student experience and oversee the development and implementation of plans to enhance student satisfaction
7. Consider key trends in the external environment, and consider their implications for the student experience.
8. Report to SMG, Senate and Court and make recommendations to other relevant bodies and committees, such as the Student Finance Committee, on matters relating to these terms of reference.

C. Ways of working

1. Members will participate in an annual away-day, which will consider aspects of the strategy and action plan, such as:
 - Diversity, inclusion and community cohesion
 - Health and wellbeing
 - Opportunity: volunteering, internships, enterprise, study abroad, clubs and societies
 - Estates and facilities
 - Student services

2. The Committee will receive reports from its sub-committee: Chief Advisers Sub-Committee. The Committee will also receive reports on non-academic aspects of the student experience from the Equality and Diversity Strategy Group (EDSC).
3. The Committee will consider periodic reports:
 - On the performance of the services, from the directors of Information Services, Student and Academic Services, Estates and Commercial Services, and External Relations
 - From the representatives of the student bodies on matters for celebration or concern.
4. The Committee will also receive periodic inputs from external speakers on key trends in the external environment.
5. The Committee will meet at least five times a year.
6. The quorum for the Committee will be at least one third of the membership, and attendance is also required from at least one external representative (lay member of Court).

Court Context Card - 13 February 2018 - report from Health, Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Speaker	Dr David Duncan
Speaker role	Convenor of HSWC
Paper Description	Draft Minute from 10 December 2018 HSWC meeting
Topic last discussed at Court	10-Oct-18
Topic discussed at Committee	For information only
Court members present at meeting	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	<p>At its meeting on 10 December 2018, the Committee 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 covered its usual range of business in reviewing standard reports on Occupational Health activities, Audit updates, Accident reporting and Employee counselling. The committee discussed matters relating to lessons learned from adverse weather conditions and to the new parking permit system. The committee reviewed the HSW Policy, with an addition made to document collaborative working with the SRC and TUs.</p>
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; Glasgow City Council
Conflict areas	
Other universities that have done something similar	
Other universities that will do something similar	
Relevant Legislation	Health and Safety legislation
Equality Impact Assessment	
Suggested next steps	
Any other observations	

University of Glasgow

Health Safety and Wellbeing Committee

Minute of Meeting held on Monday 10 December 2018 at 10:00 AM in the Melville Room

Present:

Dr David Duncan, Mr Paul Fairie, Mr James Gray, Mr William Howie, Mr Christopher Kennedy, Mr David McLean, Mr John Neil, Mr Deric Robinson, Ms Aileen Stewart, Ms Julie Summers, Mr Graham Tobasnick, Ms Selina Woolcott, Ms Fatemeh Nokhbatolfoghahai

In Attendance:

Ms Debbie Beales, Mr David Harty, Mr Gary Stephen

Apologies:

Ms Paula McKerrow, Ms Karen Morton, Mr Peter Haggarty, Mr Richard Claughton, Ms Gillian Shaw, Mr Thomas McFerran

HSWC/2018/12 Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 20 September 2018

The Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 20 September 2018 were approved.

HSWC/2018/13 Matters arising

HSWC/2018/13.1 Overseas workers (verbal update SW)

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that she and the University's Insurance and Risk Manager recently met with Selective Travel to discuss combining travel and insurance bookings for overseas workers. Once in place this will mean that anyone booking overseas travel will automatically book travel insurance at the same time. This insurance will not cover countries flagged by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office as a danger zone but this will be clearly explained in the insurance cover note.

HSWC/2018/13.2 Contractor activity (verbal update DH)

Mr Harty informed the Committee that, due to construction of the new L&T hub, there will be traffic changes on University Avenue/University Place until at least March 2019. Initial teething problems with safe crossing points for pedestrians have now been resolved as have issues with the loading and unloading of commercial vehicles. Contractors working in the Joseph Black and James Watt buildings were praised for reporting near misses which then generate alert notices to promote positive learning.

HSWC/2018/14 Safe Zone (verbal report GS)

Mr Stephen informed the Committee that the University is in the process of identifying funding to purchase Safe Zone software which includes functions such as sending mass notifications to selected groups, a help/alert button linked to the main gatehouse and a section for lone/remote staff and students. The app is installed on staff/student pc's and mobile phones

and they can use the red button if they require help. Activating the alarm will allow Security to track the user's location, both at home and abroad, which is especially useful for staff/students involved in an incident overseas or whilst working alone at any of the University's locations. There are currently 25 UK University's using this software and the Committee supports this initiative.

HSWC/2018/15 OH Report (Paper 1)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Stewart informed the Committee that management referrals were down slightly from the same period last year and Health Surveillance (HS) was much lower than for the same period last year as most of the HS was completed in the previous quarter. Vaccinations increased substantially due to vaccine that was unavailable last year being available again. OH ran additional vaccination and blood sample clinics for over 600 MVLS students from both 2017 and 2018 intakes.

HSWC/2018/16 SEPS Report (Paper 2)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that there were no significant trends to report. Slips, trips and falls continue to be the biggest cause of significant injuries with glass/sharps the biggest cause of minor injuries.

HSWC/2018/17 Audit update (Paper 3)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Mr McLean informed the Committee that within the College of Arts Portable Appliance Testing (PAT) remains an open action due to funding issues. The Committee agreed that the current method of PAT delivery isn't working (Schools/US currently pay for testing in their own areas which can be problematic in shared buildings). The Convenor agreed to take steps to centralise PAT.

SEPS are about to embark on the 2018-19 audit programme with remote areas such as Glasgow Royal Infirmary and the Queen Elizabeth University Hospital currently being scoped to determine the best way to structure the audits. The BAHCM's SCENE field station at Rowerdennan will also be audited once current staff changes at the unit are complete. SEPS have also agreed 3 audits with Estates & Commercial Services which will involve Cleaning Services, Transport Services and Hospitality Services.

The Committee raised the issue of how to provide safety support to the many GUSA clubs and the Convenor agreed to raise this with GUSA at their next meeting.

Mr McLean informed the Committee that SEPS had recently visited the Human Nutrition Unit at Glasgow Royal Infirmary for a detailed laboratory inspection. The Unit had not been notified in advance. Staff engagement at the Unit was very good. There were 50-60 issues raised, the majority of which were minor housekeeping issues, and SEPS will return on 13th December 2018 to undertake a scheduled safety management audit. Follow up on this will include looking at how the Unit has actioned the inspection issues.

HSWC/2018/18 EAP Report (Paper 4)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that there were no significant trends to report. Ms Woolcott will meet with the EAP provider in January 2019 to discuss speedier reporting from them, how feedback is collected and how to address the current gender bias of service usage. The Committee discussed the current method for PAM Assist to request additional counselling sessions for our employees (staff are

automatically entitled to 6 sessions) and agreed that a centralised budget should be made available for this to ensure that staff are able to access this without line manager approval. The Convenor agreed to discuss this with Court.

HSWC/2018/19 HSW Policy statement review (Paper 5)

The Committee noted the Paper that was circulated. Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that there had been no major changes to the Policy other than to make the document more concise. The Committee agreed that other than an addition documenting collaborative working with the SRC and TU's the document should be signed and published on the HSW web pages.

HSWC/2018/20 Adverse weather conditions (Paper 6)

The Committee noted the Papers that were circulated. Mr Kennedy provided a Paper from UNITE requesting updates on the outcome of the reviews of lessons learned from last year and Mr Harty provided a Paper summarising issues identified, actions required and progress to date. Many of the actions are now completed and the Convenor will share a summary on lessons learned once it has been shared with the trade unions.

HSWC/2018/21 Stress Policy review (verbal update SW)

Ms Woolcott informed the Committee that HR have linked their Organisational Change Policy to the Managing Stress Policy. The current Managing Stress Policy is being reformatted to make it more web friendly and it is hoped that this will be completed in the next few months.

HSWC/2018/22 Any Other Business

Parking permits: The Committee discussed the criteria used to award parking permits which included location, caring responsibilities, blue badge holders and travel times. Short term disabilities will be assessed by OHU. The Committee were concerned that staff with long term disabilities, who don't meet the criteria for holding a blue badge, are being disregarded and that the appeal process will not take this issue into consideration.

HSWC/2018/23 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the HSWC will take place on Monday 4 March 2019 at 10am in the Melville Room.

Created by: Miss Debbie Beales

University of Glasgow

University Court – Wednesday 13 February 2019

Communications to Court from the meeting of the Council of Senate held on 7 February 2019

Dr Jack Aitken, Director, Senate Office

(All matters are for noting)

1. Intimations

The Council of Senate stood in silence to mark its respect for former members of Senate whose deaths had been announced during the session:

Professor Gavin Arneil

Professor Gavin Arneil died on 21 January 2018 aged 94. Professor Arneil was a graduate of the University and was a Professor of Child Health from 1968 until his retirement in 1988. Professor Arneil played a leading role in the field of paediatric nephrology and was responsible for setting up the first regional referral unit for children with renal disease in the UK at the Royal Hospital for Sick Children in Glasgow in 1950. In recognition of his outstanding contributions to child health, Professor Arneil was awarded the St Mungo Prize (Glasgow's highest civic award) in 1987.

Professor David Donnison

Professor David Donnison died on 28 April 2018 at the age of 92. He was Professor of Town and Regional Planning at the University between 1980 and 1991 and was one of the most prominent figures in British social policy in the second half of the twentieth century. At Glasgow, he was the initial Co-Director of the Scottish Housing Research Group (1982) that evolved into the UK's national Centre for Housing Research and ultimately the Department of Urban Studies. Throughout his career, Professor Donnison received four honorary doctorates and was awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award by the Social Policy Association in 2008.

Professor Patrick Reilly

Professor Patrick Reilly, who died on 15 July 2018 at the age of 86, was a professor and former Head of the Department of English Literature at Glasgow University. Professor Reilly is remembered as a distinguished academic and enlightening educator who inspired generations of students with his knowledge and love of literature.

Professor Joe Thomson

Professor Joe Thomson died on 12 May 2018 at the age of 70. Professor Thomson joined the University in 1991 as Regius Chair of law and was one of the leading legal scholars of his generation. In 2000, he was appointed to the role of Scottish Law Commissioner and was director of the Scottish Universities' Law Institute from 2000 – 2009. In his retirement, he continued to make an active contribution to academia, serving as editor of the *Juridical Review* until 2017.

Professor Paul Younger

Professor Paul Younger, who held the University of Glasgow's Rankine Chair in the School of Engineering, died on 21 April 2018 at the age of 55. Professor Younger was an

internationally-renowned hydrogeologist and environmental engineer. Paul was a member of staff at the University of Glasgow from August 2012 to March 2017. As a Senate Assessor on the University Court, and a member of the Estates Committee, he made a significant contribution to the governance of the University. He became a Fellow of the Royal Academy of Engineering in 2007, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 2016.

2. Student Experience Committee: Report of the meeting held on 17 January 2019

The Council of Senate received a report from the Student Experience Committee (SEC) meeting held on 17 January 2019. The Council of Senate noted the following items from the Committee's report:

- Student Experience Committee – Revised Remit
- Update on Transitions Working Group activity
- Change of Title for University Calendar
- Student Services Review: Consultant Report on Support for Student Services
- Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS) – New Online Platform to Support Mental Health
- Student Experience Committee – Action Plan Tracker
- Away Day – November 2018
- Joint Away Day with Learning and Teaching Committee – 31 May 2019

3. Education Policy and Strategy Committee – Report of meeting held on 13 December 2018

The Council of Senate received the report from the Education Policy and Strategy Committee (EdPSC) meeting held on 13 December 2018. The following items have been highlighted for Court's attention:

3.1 Learning and Teaching Strategy Review

A paper was received from Professor Frank Coton (Vice-Principal, Academic and Educational Innovation) and Professor Moira Fischbacher-Smith (Assistant Vice-Principal, Learning and Teaching) which presented the outcomes of a mid-term review of the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy and specified the next steps required to ensure comprehensive delivery of the Strategy. Areas identified for particular attention included:

- Curriculum innovation (including internationalisation of the curriculum)
- Graduate attributes
- Redesign of some systems and processes

3.2 Working Group on Graduate Attributes

EdPSC established a new short-life working group to improve support for student engagement with graduate attribute development across the University. The Working Group would report to EdPSC.

3.3 ELIR4: Update on progress to date

The ELIR review team visited the University for a one-day planning visit on 23 January 2019, with the aim of assessing the decisions the University had taken around contextualising the

Reflective Analysis (RA), and to determine the focus for the main review visit which would take place from the 18th of March for five days. The full ELIR review team would visit the University and meet with key institutional contacts, a group of staff and a group of students.

4. Clerk of Senate's Business

4.1 Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee

The Clerk of Senate reported that the following acceptances had been received from nominees to receive Honorary Degrees in 2019:

DOCTOR OF ENGINEERING (DEng)

Craig CLARKE
Clyde Space Ltd

Karen DINARDO
DP Group

Professor Dame Ann DOWLING
University of Cambridge

Professor Anne NEVILLE
Professor of Tribology and Surface Engineering
University of Leeds

DOCTOR OF LAWS

Sir Iain MACLEOD
Legal Adviser to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office

Lady Rita RAE
Scottish Lawyer and Senator of the College of Justice

DOCTOR OF LETTERS (DLitt)

Mary BRENNAN
Arts Journalism and contemporary culture

Sarah DRUMMOND
Snook Design

Katharine VINER
Editor in Chief, Guardian

Jackie WYLIE
Artistic Director and Chief Executive
National Theatre of Scotland

DOCTOR OF SCIENCE (DSc)

Professor Gary FIRESTEIN
Dean and Associate Vice Chancellor of Translational Medicine
University of California

Professor James GARDEN
Director of Edinburgh Surgery Online
University of Edinburgh

Dr John Iain GLEN
Glen Pharma Limited

Mark LOGAN
Technologist and business leader

DOCTOR OF THE UNIVERSITY (DUniv)

Professor Dame Janet BEER
Vice Chancellor
University of Liverpool

Jayne-Anne GADHIA
CEO Virgin Money

Bernard HIGGINS
Chairman of the Board of the National Galleries of Scotland

Professor Sir David OMAND
Vice President of RUSI

Kevin SNEADER
Global Managing Partner, Hong Kong, McKinsey & Company

Sabir ZAZAI
CEO, Scottish Refugee Council

DOCTOR OF THE UNIVERSITY (DUniv) - Dumfries

Andrew WALLS FRCS
Convenor of the Crichton Foundation

The names noted above of those who had accepted the offer of an Honorary Degree were now in the public domain.

Further replies were awaited and would be reported to the next meeting of the Council of Senate.

5. University Court: Communications from the meeting held on 12 December 2018

The Council of Senate received and noted the report from the University Court meeting held on 12 December 2018. The following items were included for information:

- Report from the Principal
- Report from the University Secretary
- Communications from Meeting of Council of Senate on 6 December 2018