A meeting of the University Court was held on 27 October 2014 in the boardroom of the Ninewells teaching hospital and was preceded by a tour of the new learning and teaching facilities and a visit to the TORT Centre.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (in the Chair), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Ms J Aitken, Professor L Bidaut, Dr WGC Boyd, Deputy Principal Professor SM Black, Ms SC Campbell, Mr R Duncan, Mr J Elliot, Mr IC Howie, Mr I MacKinnon, Professor GJ Mires, Ms CA Potter, Dr AD Reeves, Mr KA Richmond, Mr D Taylor, Mr RJ Van Mulders, and Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, Director of Strategic Planning (Minute 5) and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Mr R Bint, Mr RS Bowie, Ms S Krawczyk, and Ms B Malone.

The Chair welcomed Ms Janice Aitken to her first meeting following her election to the Court by the Senate.

1. MINUTES

The Court decided: (i) to approve the minutes of the meeting on 9 June 2014; and

(ii) to approve the minutes of the business meeting held as part of the Court Retreat on 11 and 12 September 2014.

2. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

The Chairman presented his regular report to the Court, outlining his activities since the last meeting. In doing so, he highlighted his visits to the Law and Dental Schools and progress in his individual meetings with members of the Court.

The Chairman also detailed his attendance at meetings of the Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) and the Committee of University Chairs (CUC), where in particular there had been discussion on gender diversity on governing bodies. The Court reiterated its commitment to improving diversity within its membership and while members noted that the balance on the Court was better than in many institutions the Court suggested that the Governance & Nominations be asked to develop a statement on diversity for inclusion within the annual financial statements and to consider how the recruitment process for new lay members might be enhanced in this respect. The Chairman went on to highlight the potential for legislation in
relation to the gender balance of governing bodies and members asked that the Chairman continue to update the Court on this matter at future meetings.

The Chairman went on to highlight discussions of the proposed new UK-wide Higher Education Code of Governance at the CUC meeting. Members noted concerns that, in the current draft, the UK Code would apply to Scottish HEIs in addition to the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance and that while compliance was unlikely to be problematic given the close alignment between the Codes, it had the potential to raise questions at audit and represent an additional bureaucratic burden.

The Chairman also informed the Court that he had been invited to a HEPI dinner with the Shadow Secretary for Education and would update members on discussions following that meeting.

Noting the summary of the Court Retreat activities elsewhere on the agenda, the Chairman invited comments from members on the format and location of the Retreat in September 2015. Members indicated support for holding the Retreat as a residential event and asked that officers consider potential venues for the future.

The Court also heard that Mr Donald Grant, a former Chancellor’s Assessor and Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee, had passed away at the end of September 2014. Members asked that the Chairman pass the Court’s sympathy to Mr Grant’s family.

The Court decided: to note the report.

3. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

The Court received a report from the Principal (Appendix 1). In his report the Principal focussed on the University’s financial position and the development of proposals to support the transformation agenda. The report also included an update on student matriculation figures for 2014/15, updates on the review of organisational and management structures and sectoral matters, and reference to the University’s performance in international league tables.

Members discussed the shortfall in teaching income reported in the Period 2 Accounts and noted that achieving the level of growth in this area required for the University to return to a surplus position by 2016/17 would be more challenging given that the forecast starting position had slipped by £2.2m. While the level of growth required (£9m over the next 2 years) was considered achievable based on competitor benchmarking, members noted that it was unlikely that it would be achieved within the timescale defined and as such agreed that the timetable for reducing costs and generating savings through the improvement of the efficiency and productivity of the University’s business processes and systems would need to be accelerated. The Principal confirmed that draft proposals would be developed in time for the next meeting of the Finance & Policy Committee, and that a breakdown of projects and initiatives to close the financial gap would be presented to the Court at its meeting on 15 December 2014. Through discussion members noted that the proposals to increase income net of costs would vary across the institution, with some areas looking to improve the balance of overhead bearing research grants,
others looking to drive unregulated student recruitment, and many looking to improve efficiency.

Members were pleased to note the University’s positive progress in relation to undergraduate student recruitment, particularly Rest of UK (RUK) students, with the improvement being due to improved conversion rates from offers to matriculations. The University Secretary confirmed that a number of initiatives, including the #testdrivedundee campaign, were targeted toward increasing application numbers which had fallen in the previous recruitment cycle. The Court noted that changes to recruitment caps in England would likely make recruitment in the coming cycle even more challenging, but stressed the importance of achieving year-on-year increases. Members also noted that although targets for taught postgraduate student recruitment had not been achieved, the maintenance of recruitment figures despite a decrease across the sector nevertheless represented a significant achievement by the admissions team.

Turning to the Review of Organisational and Management Structures, the Court noted that the Principal expected to receive a report from the group leading the review shortly and that he would report on this further at the next meeting of Court.

The Principal informed the Court that the University and College Union (UCU) had notified the University that it was in dispute in relation to proposed changes to the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS). Members noted that this was a sector-wide issue, and that a recent ballot of UCU members had supported both industrial action and action short of a strike.

The Principal went on to highlight progress in relation to the appointment of a new Director of External Relations and a new Head of Marketing. Members noted that an announcement would be made within a couple of weeks once the process was concluded, but that there had been a number of strong candidates for both positions.

On the issue of international league tables, members discussed factors which might have contributed to changes in the University’s position. While it was noted that there was no direct correlation between international league table position and overseas student income, the importance of maintaining a top 200 position was nevertheless acknowledged, and members noted that the annual report on league tables would be presented to the Court at its meeting on 15 December 2014.

The Court decided: to note the report.

4. GOVERNANCE MATTERS

(1) Governance & Nominations Committee

The Court received a report of the meeting of the Committee on 6 October 2014 (Appendix 2). The Convener of the Committee drew the Court’s attention to proposed revisions to the Statement of Primary Responsibilities, discussions relating to the development of a Skills Matrix for membership of Court (see Minute 4(3)), discussions of the Review of the Effectiveness of the Court (as discussed in minute 4(2) below) and a paper outlining the discussions of the
performance of the Chair of Court and his response to this feedback. In response to suggestions that reference to the internationalisation agenda be included in the Statement, the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs proposed to circulate a revised statement to the Court which reflected this perspective.

**The Court decided:**

(i) approve the revised Statement of Primary Responsibilities subject to minor revision outlined above; and

(ii) otherwise, to approve the report.

(2) **Quinquennial Review of the Effectiveness of the Court**

The Court received a report from the Governance & Nominations Committee detailing the Review of the Effectiveness of the Court and setting out a series of proposals for consideration by the Court. Members noted that the review had included: a review by an external facilitator, a Court members’ questionnaire and the review of the Statement of Primary Responsibilities. In introducing the report, the Convener of the Review Group highlighted the conclusions of the external facilitator who believed the University had effective governance arrangements, including many which he considered to be sector-leading. Members noted that the proposals therefore mainly related to the enhancement of existing arrangements rather than the need to amend procedures to comply with good practice.

The Court discussed each of the recommendations, in particular those relating to the Chancellor’s Assessor, the Lord Provost and the election of the Chair of Court, and the Convener explained the rationale behind the proposals. The Court’s decisions in relation to each recommendation are outlined in Appendix 3.

In discussing the recommendation relating to the proposed discontinuing of the role of Chancellor’s Assessor, members noted that the Chair of Court and Principal had spoken with the Chancellor. The Court highlighted the importance of the relationship between the Court and the Chancellor and following discussion members agreed that the recommendation should be accepted subject to inclusion within the remit for the Deputy Chair position, and as recommended elsewhere in the report, of a responsibility to communicate with the Chancellor when a matter arose at Court which required his/her attention.

In relation to the proposal that the Lord Provost should cease to be an *ex-officio* member of the Court and that lay membership should be reduced by one, members were keen to express the importance of the relationship between the city and the University, and in particular the symbolic importance of the role of the Lord Provost on the Court. Following discussion members decided that the Lord Provost should remain in membership of the Court.

Noting that the decision in relation to the Lord Provost maintained the number of lay members on Court, the Court decided that there was no requirement to consider further the number of elected staff members on Court and rejected the recommendation that the number elected by the Academic Council be reduced by one.
Turning to the recommendation relating to the mechanism for identification of the Chairman of Court, members noted that the proposal would bring the University’s governance practice in line with Principle 11 of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance. Members considered the likelihood of future legislation in this area and discussed at length the need to ensure that the process behind any change appropriately ensured the involvement of the Court. Some members indicated that the existing mechanism (election from within the Court) was preferable to the implementation of an advertisement and appointment process, however following a vote a clear majority of members were in favour of updating the process to ensure compliance with the Code.

Members also made a number of suggestions for minor amendments to the proposals from the Governance & Nominations Committee.

The Court decided: to note the report and approve the proposals as set out in Appendix 3.

(3) Skills Matrix

Members considered a summary of members’ returns in relation to the skills matrix for membership of Court developed at the Court Retreat. Members recognised the opportunity to use the matrix to help target the recruitment of members in future rounds and proposed that the matrix be published once returns had been received from all members.

The Court decided: to approve the publishing of the Skills Matrix summary.

5. STRATEGIC MATTERS

(1) SFC Outcome Agreement 2013/14 and Key Issues for 2015/16

The Court received a copy of the self-evaluation report to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) in relation to the 2013/14 Outcome Agreement. The Court noted that the report used a red/amber/green approach to assess performance against the six agreed outcomes and would be submitted on 31 October 2014. Members considered each of the outcome areas listed, in particular the exploitation of research. The report also included a summary of key messages and issues emerging from discussions in relation to the development of the 2015/16 outcome agreement.

The Court decided: to approve the report

(2) University Strategy to 2017: Key Performance Indicators Report

The Court received a report from the Director of Strategic Planning, which set out the University’s performance across Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) covered by the University Strategy to 2017 in comparison with a number of other universities. The report highlighted performance over time, performance against
target and performance compared with benchmarking institutions and used a traffic light system to highlight those areas where progress was on target and those areas where remedial action was necessary.

Members noted the improvement in the University’s National Student Survey scores and the strong performance in the recruitment of MD40 students, but also noted that unregulated learning & teaching income was lower than in the comparator group despite the University’s strong student experience performance. Members also discussed graduate employment levels and initiatives to improve this aspect, the need to improve progression rates, and the percentage operating surplus and income per academic FTE which remained below target and behind benchmark. Members also noted that while research income had grown considerably, overhead recovery had not grown at the same rate.

Members asked that consideration be given to reducing the number of KPIs, and expressed a preference that KPIs be designed around measures which were relevant for more regular rather than annual monitoring if at all possible. Through discussion, members indicated that it would be useful to receive the management accounts, updates on unregulated learning & teaching income and updates on research income which were regularly considered by the Senior Management Team.

**The Court decided:**

(i) to suggest that the total number of KPIs be reviewed as outlined;

(ii) to ask that management accounts, updates on unregulated learning & teaching income and updates on research income be provided to the Court on a regular basis; and

(iii) otherwise, to note the report.

6. **FINANCE**

(1) Finance & Policy Committee

The Court received a report of the meetings of the Committee on 18 August (Appendix 4) and 6 October 2014 (Appendix 5). Members noted discussions in relation to the budget for the Remuneration Committee for 2014/15 and proposed amendments to the Treasury Management Policy.

**The Court decided:**

(i) to approve the approach and budget for the Remuneration Committee for 2014/15 as proposed;

(ii) to approve revisions to the Treasury Management Policy; and

(iii) otherwise, to approve the reports.
(2) Period 2 Management Accounts

The Court received copies of the Period 2 Management Accounts. Members noted variations between contributions for each College, and was reassured to hear that the Senior Management Team (SMT) was actively considering the strengths and weaknesses of all Colleges and Schools in relation to teaching, research, overhead, and efficiency.

In response to questions, the Director of Finance confirmed the assumptions and risks within the budget, and members noted that adjustments would be made in the Period 3 budget once the final recruitment and scholarship figures were processed. He also confirmed that despite the shortfall in unregulated teaching income, the University was working to meet budgetary projections through realisation of provisions within the budget and cost reductions.

The Court decided: to note the accounts.

7. AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Court received a report of the meeting of the Committee on 23 September 2014 (Appendix 6). The Convener of the Committee highlighted the annual audit report from the internal auditors, recent internal audits (Data Returns: Analysis & Verification and Health & Safety) and the annual review of the remit and terms of reference for the Committee. The Court discussed the internal audit report into Health & Safety and, noting that the Human Resources Committee had also discussed the findings at length, noted that the Senior Management Team (SMT) was addressing the issues highlighted. Members also indicated their strong support for the introduction of mandatory health and safety training, both for new employees as part of their induction and also as regular refresher training for all employees.

In response to questions the University Secretary confirmed the process for monitoring progress in relation to recommendations from the internal auditors.

The Court decided: (i) to indicate support for the introduction of mandatory health and safety training; and

(ii) otherwise, to approve the report.

8. HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Court received a report of the meeting of the Committee on 30 September 2014 (Appendix 7). Members noted discussions in relation to health and safety matters, the dispute with DUCU, and the new Out of Hours policy approved by the Committee.

The Court decided: to approve the report
9. **SENATE BUSINESS**

(1) **Communications from the Senatus Academicus**

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Senate on 15 October 2014 (Appendix 8). Members noted that the Senate had endorsed to Court the Annual Report to the Scottish Funding Council on Quality. The Court also noted discussions in relation to the University’s current financial situation and strategic implications in the context of the transformation agenda.

**The Court decided:**

(i) to approve the recommendations concerning the conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus on Professors Samuel Cadden, Allan Gillespie, David Miller and Roger Soames; and

(ii) otherwise, for its part, to note the report.

(2) **Senate Election**

The Court noted that Ms Janice Aitken (Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design) had been elected to serve on the University Court as a non-professorial member of the Senatus in accordance with Ordinance 18. Ms Aitken would serve until 31 July 2017 (that being the remainder of the term of Dr Sam Crouch).

**The Court decided:** to congratulate Ms Aitken on her election to Court.

(3) **Annual Institutional Statement to the Scottish Funding Council on Quality**

The Court received the University’s annual statement to the SFC detailing the subject reviews that had been carried out over the past year. The report had been submitted to the SFC by its deadline of 30 September with a note, as required by the SFC’s guidance, explaining that it had yet to be endorsed by the Court. Members noted that the report had been approved by the Senate and its Learning & Teaching Committee, and had been circulated to the Court electronically.

Noting the responsibilities of the Court in relation to the report, members were keen that in future years the report should be fully considered prior to its submission and in this respect asked that officers remind the SFC of the poor timing of the deadline in relation to meetings of the Court (which was almost certainly a sector-wide issue). Members also suggested that to help the Court to meet its obligations, the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) could be asked to present the report in future years.

In approving the report the Court was asked to: confirm that it had considered the institution’s arrangements for the management of academic standards and the quality of the learning experience for AY 2013-14, including the scope and impact of these; confirm that the institution had effective arrangements to maintain standards and to assure and enhance the quality of its provision; and therefore to provide assurance to the Council that the academic standards and
the quality of the learning provision at the University of Dundee continue to meet the requirements set by the Council.

The Court decided: to approve the report.

10. COURT RETREAT

Members received a report which summarised activities, discussions and feedback from the Court Retreat on 11 and 12 September 2014.

The Court decided: to note the report

11. WELFARE & ETHICAL USE OF ANIMALS COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Welfare and Ethical Use of Animals Committee on 1 August 2014 (Appendix 9). Members noted the importance of the work of this committee.

The Court decided: to approve the report

12. ACADEMIC COUNCIL

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Academic Council on 1 July 2014. The Court noted discussions relating to the University’s approach to overseas recruitment, the transformation agenda, and matters relating to the Voluntary Severance Scheme.

The Court decided: for its part, to note the report

13. DISCOVERY CENTRE

The Court decided: to approve the naming of the Centre for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR) as the Discovery Centre (for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research).

14. STAFF

(1) Professorial and other Grade 10 Appointments

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

Paul Allanson Personal Chair of Economics 1 May 2014
Yu Zhu Chair of Economics 1 September 2014
Nic Beech Vice-Principal & Head of the College of Arts & Social Sciences 1 October 2014
Paul Harris Dean, Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design 1 August 2014
APPENDIX 1

PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

(Minute 3)

As members will be aware, the University is facing a number of significant financial challenges in the immediate future. Therefore it seems appropriate that, while the appendices to my report continue to provide members with a flavour of University activities which may aid them in their role as ambassadors for the institution, I have refocused my report to the Court as a vehicle for communicating Senior Management Team (SMT) discussions and perspectives primarily relating to financial performance and the transformation agenda. This mirrors a recommendation of the Review of the Effectiveness of Court, and I hope that it will be considered a suitable conduit for enhanced communication between the SMT and the Court at this crucial time.

Finance & Transformation

Over the last few meetings, discussions at Court have focussed on the financial challenges which led to the approval at the meeting of Court in June of a deficit budget forecast for 2014/15, and the targets we need to hit if we are to return to a surplus by 2016/17. The need to address financial security has been approached in a manner consistent with achieving our longer term ambitions, the associated need for investment in academic activities, estates and infrastructure, and the University’s core values. Effective action is however required to deliver future financial security, and the previously agreed reductions in the academic staff profile to achieve significant and long-term savings on pay costs are just one aspect of the approach we are taking. It is vital that in parallel to the approved reductions we also achieve a substantial growth in net income and target a sustainable reduction in non-pay costs. These three elements need to be implemented in a coherent and co-ordinated way - so that action on one front does not slow progress on others and so that we protect our reputation and high quality student experience.

The growth of unregulated (International and rest of UK (rUK)) teaching income represents the best means by which the University may generate higher levels of net income. In approving the budget and three year forecast in June the Court noted the risks and assumptions with respect to tuition fee income. We have delivered a greatly improved performance in rUK undergraduate recruitment in uncontrolled subjects and in overseas undergraduate numbers, which reflects our investment in Student Recruitment & Admissions Services and in marketing (where our testdrive campaign has recently won two national prizes). However, a shortfall in tuition fee income relating to the home and overseas taught postgraduate market means that reaching the targets within the three year forecast will be very challenging given the reduced baseline start point for the next two years. An additional £9m in tuition fees is required by 2016/17 compared with the forecast outcome for 2014/15.

The shortfall in taught postgraduate recruitment relative to targets is a matter of on-going scrutiny, however it appears to be at least in part a sector-wide matter, and the maintenance of recruitment levels despite a significant decrease in applications has been a significant achievement. Nevertheless, it may take more than the anticipated two years to rebuild the tuition fee income to the required scale, and therefore we must accelerate other plans for cost reductions and achieve savings on staff costs equivalent to the 120 academic posts envisaged in our stretch target. Following the SMT away day on 13 October 2014, the Colleges, and individual schools, have been charged with identifying how to deliver the remainder of this stretch target. As indicated by the Court at the Retreat, earlier delivery of these savings would maximise the recurrent savings and create the headroom required to facilitate growth in other areas. In addition the SMT has charged the University’s ‘One-Dundee Board’, recently formed to bring together Directors and Senior Staff from across the institution, with releasing significant savings through the improvement of the efficiency and productivity of the University’s business processes and systems across the range of our activities.

These matters have been a consistent focus of recent SMT meetings, including the ‘Away Day’ on 13 October 2014 at which a thorough analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each of our Schools were discussed as part of a ‘footprint review’. Options in relation to individual Schools, especially in relation to opportunities to increase income and reduce costs, were identified in outline. The Vice-Principals & Heads of College have now commenced detailed discussions on these options and opportunities with the Deans of their Schools and will finalise plans as to how each can deliver improved academic and financial contributions in order to collectively meet the agreed institutional targets. The outcomes of these discussions will be considered at the meeting of the SMT on 5 November, after which time the SMT will produce a full and detailed proposal for the Court in December on how the financial targets for the next two years will be met.
Organisational and Management Structures Review

Members will recall that a review of the current University organisational and management structures took place over the summer. The working group is now considering the outputs of the University-wide consultation and I expect to provide a report to the December meeting of Court on this topic. The preferred structure will need to align with the school plans referred to above and support the delivery of our savings and income targets.

Sectoral Matters

Following the ‘No’ vote in the Referendum on Scottish Independence on 18 September, the focus has moved to the debate on further devolutionary powers for Scotland, with Lord Smith of Kelvin appointed to oversee the process of taking forward the cross party commitment on more powers for the Scottish Parliament. Universities Scotland is leading the debate of issues relating to Higher Education and the sector’s position regarding influencing the policy outcome and I would be interested in hearing the Court’s views on this.

In the coming phase of government it seems likely that HE governance will continue to be the focus of close scrutiny, and legislation on those aspects of the report of the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland (by Professor Ferdinand von Prondzynski) not covered by the Code appears increasingly likely. The Court has previously expressed concern at the potential for further legislation in these areas, and I will endeavour to keep you apprised of developments in this respect.

Members may also be interested to note the references within the Ministerial Letter of Guidance from the Cabinet Secretary for Life Long Learning to the SFC to Innovation Scotland and the Innovation Scotland Forum. This group have been charged with improving Scotland’s performance in growing innovative companies and promoting University: Industry collaboration. I will be attending a series of meetings throughout November in relation to the innovation forum, however the seemingly negative perception of Universities in relation to the management of intellectual property and the ‘business friendliness’ of HE institutions is concerning, and it is important that a balance is struck between the interests and autonomy of individual institutions and the role of the HE sector in driving this aspect of the Scottish economy.

League Tables

It would be remiss not to draw the Court’s attention to the University’s performance in recently published league tables. While the improvement in our ranking from 49th to 45th in the Times League Table (Good University Guide) is welcome news (resulting mainly from our improved NSS performance), we are disappointed in the decline in our Quacquarelli Symonds ranking which is down from 219 to 230. We have also dropped to just outside the top 200 within the Times Higher International League Table from 196 last year. Our reflections on these will be included in the annual report on League Tables which the Court receives at its December meeting.

Concluding Remarks

I look forward to the meeting on 27 October which will be held at Ninewells and hope that members will take the opportunity to visit the new teaching facilities during the tour at 1pm and to hear the presentation from the Vice-Principal & Head of the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing regarding the achievements and aspirations of the College in the context of the transformation agenda.

I would also like to your attention to the winter graduation schedule and the dates for the annual Discovery Days which have been enclosed with the Court papers and would encourage you to attend wherever possible.

Professor Pete Downes
Principal & Vice-Chancellor
Senior Management Team Meetings (SMT)
http://www.dundee.ac.uk/academic/court/com/smt/

Since the last report to the Court, the Senior Management Team met on 25th June, 9th July, 23rd July, 6th August, 20th August, 3rd September, 24 September, 8 October and 13 October 2014 when the following matters were considered:

Corporate Issues

- Fundraising
- Future Strategy/Sustainability
- The Children’s University@Dundee
- Universities Scotland: Referendum Issues
- League Tables
- Policy on Consultancy and Service Work
- Leadership of the Medical School
- EU FP7 grants
- Ministerial Letter of Guidance to the Scottish Funding Council
- Potential land swap with Dundee City Council (Park Place Primary School site)
- 2015/16 to 2017/18 Operating Plans and Budget Setting
- Review of University Organisation and Management Structures survey
- Information Classification Scheme

Learning & Teaching Issues

- MOOCs
- Exploration of off-shore blended learning opportunity
- NSS results
- Employability Statistics
- Fulbright Summer Institute
- Review of Fees and Scholarships
- EU Funded Research Grants
- Admissions figures

Human Resources

- HERA
- Academic vacancies
- Developing Leaders programme
- Health & Safety
- Equality & Diversity
- VS Scheme
Vice-Principals’ Highlights
As with my previous report, I have asked the five Vice-Principals to highlight activities and achievements across the University that may be of interest to the Court. The list is not exhaustive and major grant awards and prizes are still contained within later appendices.

National symposium ‘Professions, place-making and the public: what next?’ to be hosted by the School of the Environment
Run jointly with partners and collaborators (including Architecture Design Scotland, Academy of Urbanism, RTPI, RICS, Planning Aid for Scotland, CECHR, Homes for Scotland), more than 100 experts are expected from all disciplines across the UK including government, policy makers, NGOs, voluntary Sector and academia developers, clients, architects and planners.

MRC Suffrage Science Initiative 2014
Professor Kate Storey head of the Division of Cell and Developmental Biology at the College of Life Sciences has been awarded a prize by MRC Clinical Sciences Centre, recognising her achievements as a woman leader in science. Kate is one of eleven leading women scientists who have been honoured in the MRC’s Suffrage Science initiative in 2014.

International Translational Collaboration
The University of Dundee has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Bangalore BioCluster in India with the aim of creating a joint Drug Discovery Centre to tackle antimicrobial resistance. There is already an active programme of scientific collaboration between Dundee and the Bangalore BioCluster. The BioCluster is jointly supported by the Departments of Biotechnology and Atomic Energy of the Government of India.

Times Higher Education Awards
The University has been listed for a number of Times Higher Education Awards, including: The Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification (CAHID) for ‘Research Project of the Year’ for its work in developing techniques to identify offenders by examining their hands, and the University’s CASTLE and OPD units for their cross-institutional mentoring scheme (University of Dundee and University of St Andrews) in the category of ‘Outstanding Support for Early Career Researchers’.

CASTLE
The University has launched a collaborative centre creating the ‘one-stop’, ‘one-Dundee’ approach to academic skills support, academic professional development and digital literacies training and support.

HEA Strategic Enhancement Programme
The University received confirmation that its strategic enhancement programme bid to the HEA for ‘embedding employability into the curriculum’ had been successful. Acceptance onto the highly competitive HEA programme demonstrates the importance and strength of the project.

Equality Challenge Unit
The University was successful in its application to the Equality Challenge Unit programme: Attracting diversity: equality in student recruitment in Scottish HEIs. The Programme will see the University collaborate with four other Scottish universities on a project focused in particular on addressing gender imbalances in the student population - a government priority as set out in this year’s ministerial letter of guidance.

More information on the achievements of staff and students within the Colleges can be found at:
College Art, Science & Engineering http://www.dundee.ac.uk/case/
College Arts & Social Sciences http://www.dundee.ac.uk/cass/news/
College of Life Sciences http://www.lifesci.dundee.ac.uk/news/2013/
College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing http://www.cmdn.dundee.ac.uk/main-news
The University’s press releases can be found at http://www.dundee.ac.uk/news/.
People & Prizes

**Dr Victoria Cowling**, of the College of Life Sciences, has been awarded the inaugural Women in Cell Biology Early Career Award Medal by the British Society for Cell Biology.

Nobel Laureate, President of The Royal Society of London and Honorary Graduate of the University **Sir Paul Nurse** officially opened the new £26million Discovery Centre.

Ultravizion, a start-up business headed by **Muhammad Sadiq** from the Medical Research Institute, took second place in the 2014 Converge Challenge, a prestigious national contest which champions enterprise and entrepreneurial innovation from within Scotland’s academic community.

Student **Christopher McCann** won the Kickstart Award at the same event for his proposed development of Snap40 - a wearable technology to continuously monitor patient vital signs.

**STAR-Dundee**, a company started by **Professor Steve Parkes**, Director Space Technology Centre at the University of Dundee, was named as Business of the Year at the Scottish Chambers of Commerce’s inaugural awards.

**Sara Robertson** Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design and her collaborator Sarah Taylor won the 2014 Design Exhibition Jury Award for Fibre Arts at the International Symposium of Wearable Computers. Their project, 'Digital Lace', uses smart inks and fibre optic technologies, to create ambient materials that respond to heat by colour change and light emission.

**Professor Sue Black** was named as a winner of the Saltire Society’s Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun Award. Established in 1988, the award forms part of the Saltire Society’s annual awards programme, which recognises and celebrates Scottish culture and heritage.

**Professor Sandy Cochran**, based in the Institute for Medical Science and Technology, was appointed a Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit Award holder.

**Professor Tracey Wilkinson**, of CAHid, has been appointed to the Cox Chair of Anatomy.

The University of Dundee’s commitment to the environment has been recognised with a nomination for a prestigious **Green Gown Award** (winners announced in November).

Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification (CAHID) has been named the winner of the Forensic Education Award 2014 by Forensic Industry E-Mag.

**Medical Awards**

Dr James Chalmers, a Wellcome Trust Intermediate Fellow, is to be awarded the inaugural John Munro Medal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh for excellence in clinical teaching in Medicine. Earlier in the year, Professor Sara Marshall was awarded the Chiron Medal of the College for excellence in mentorship of clinical academics. Professor Rory McCrinnmon has been awarded the prestigious RD Lawrence lectureship of Diabetes UK for 2015.
Major Grants and Awards
With over 200 grants and awards since my last report, the following represents a selection of the grants and awards that have been awarded by funders in open competition since my last report. The awards have been selected to celebrate the achievements of the staff involved, the breadth of our success, and the value of collaboration across the University.

Professor AL Hopkins (Biological Chemistry and Drug Discovery)
£8m from the Scottish Funding Council for UK National Phenotypic Screening Centre (NPSC).

Professor IH Gilbert (Biological Chemistry and Drug Discovery)
£2.3m from the Wellcome Trust for Chemical Biology: Leveraging Phenotypic Hits Against Kinetoplastids.

Professor DMF van Aalten (Molecular Microbiology)
£1.75m from the Medical Research Council for Genetic Structural and Chemical Validation of Aspergillus Fumigatus Cell Wall Targets (Programme Grant).

Professor AD Morris (Medicine)
£1.5m from the Medical Research Council for UK Health Informatics Research Network (Additional Funding).

Dr SJ Coulthurst (Molecular Microbiology)
£1.49m from the Wellcome Trust for Deployment Consequences and Utility of Bacterial Effectors (Senior Research Fellowship).

Professor PR Crocker (Cell Signalling and Immunology)
£1.3m from the Wellcome Trust for Molecular Dissection of Siglec-Mediated Regulation of Neutrophil Inflammatory Responses (Senior Investigator Award).

Professor AI Lamond (Gene Regulation and Expression)
£1m from the Wellcome Trust for Multidimensional Proteomic Analysis of Metabolic Stress & Cellular Phenotypes (Strategic Grant).

Dr GG Simpson (Plant Sciences)
£0.78m from the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences for Diversifying Transcription Termination.

Professor IM Leigh (Division of Cancer Research)
£0.68m from Cancer Research UK for Non Melanoma Skin Cancer from the Laboratory to the Clinic: Cancer Research UK SkinTumour Laboratory.

Dr S Rocha (Gene Regulation and Expression)
£0.5m from Cancer Research UK for Mechanisms of Inflammation and Hypoxia-Induced Responses Mediated by HIF and NF-kappaB in Cancer (Senior Cancer Research Fellowship).

Professor SM Parkes (Computing)
£0.33m from the Natural Environment Research Council for NERC Earth Observation Data Acquisition and Analysis Service (NEODAAS) (2014/15).

Dr J Morris (Nursing & Midwifery)
£0.25m from the Chief Scientist Office for Dynamic Lycra Othoses as an Adjunct to Upper Limb Rehabilitation After Stroke: A Feasibility Study.

Professor E Pearson (Division of Cardiovascular & Diabetes Medicine)
£0.22m from the European Foundation for the Study for Diabetes for Effect of SGLT2 Inhibition in Heart Failure with Diabetes Mellitus: A Randomized Controlled Study.

Professor MLJ Ashford (Division of Cardiovascular & Diabetes Medicine)
£0.15m from Alzheimers Research UK for Alzheimer's Research UK Scotland Network Centre Grant.

Dr J Rogers (Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design)
£141k from Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council for Connected High Street (Joint with University of Edinburgh).
**Dr R Skenepnek** (Electronic Engineering & Physics)
£94.6k from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council for Dry Active Matter on a Sphere (First Grant Scheme).

**Dr JS Rowan** (Geography)
£87k from the Scottish Government for Centre of Excellence - Climate Control - Adaptation Module (Year 4) (Joint with James Hutton Institute, Scottish Agricultural College, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, Universities of Edinburgh and St Andrews, Forest Research and Heriot Watt University).

**Ms F Gottmand** (History)
£79.5k from the Leverhulme Trust for National, European or Global: The Prussian East India Company (Fellowship: Felicia Gottmann) (Early Career Fellowship).

**Dr E Shemilt** (Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design)
£75.5k from the Leverhulme Trust for Material Tensions: Artistic Tensions between the Material and the Image in Digital Moving Image Art (Early Career Fellowship).
A meeting of the Committee was held on 6 October 2014.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Dr WGC Boyd, Mr R Van Mulders, and Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: Dr AD Reeves; Mr KA Richmond; University Secretary; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; and Policy Officer (Corporate Governance).

Apologies: Ms B Malone, Ms CA Potter.

1. MINUTES
   Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting of 12 May 2014.

2. MATTERS ARISING
   (1) Corporate Governance: Chairman of Court (Minute 3)

   The Committee received a paper summarising discussions from the annual review of the performance of the Chair of Court that took place at the meeting of the Court on 9 June 2014. Members noted that the Chair of Court had, as recommended, left the meeting during the discussions and that the Chancellor’s Assessor and University Secretary had subsequently provided the Chair with feedback on his performance. Members noted that the Chair had welcomed the feedback and supported his responses.

   Resolved: (i) to endorse the proposals made by the Chair of Court; and

   (ii) otherwise, to note the report.

   (2) Professional Advice for Court Members (Minute 7)

   Members noted that the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs would provide a report to the next meeting of the Committee on 17 November 2014.

   Resolved: to note the update.

3. ALIGNMENT TO THE SCOTTISH CODE OF GOOD HE GOVERNANCE
   (1) Correspondence from the SFC

   The Committee considered the Scottish Funding Council’s guidance on ‘Requirements for higher education institutions to comply with The Scottish Code of Good HE Governance’. The Convener confirmed that this would be a topic of discussion at the next Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) meeting, and members noted both the importance of complying with the Code as far as possible and also the potential for further legislation by the Cabinet Secretary.

   Resolved: to note the guidance from the Scottish Funding Council.

   (2) Statement of Primary Responsibilities

   The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs introduced a paper outlining proposed amendments to the Statement of Primary Responsibilities. Members noted that the Statement had last been reviewed in April 2009, and that the amendments were guided by the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance and the outputs of the Review of the Effectiveness of the Court.

   Members highlighted significant improvements to the Statement in the areas of: monitoring and benchmarking of key performance indicators, the monitoring of the performance of the Principal,
increased emphasis on risk and reference to the responsibilities of the Senate to regularly review its effectiveness. Members suggested that reference to the requirement for an annual internal review of the effectiveness of Court should be added to the Statement.

**Resolved:** to endorse the revised Statement to the Court for approval (annex).

(3) **Skills Matrix**

Members considered content, structure and scoring of the draft skills matrix developed during the Court Retreat sessions on 11 September 2014. Members also received a summary of the self-evaluation responses to the matrix completed by members of Court using the Bristol Online Survey tool.

Although considered useful for the appointment of new members to the Court, members felt there was limited benefit for existing members particularly with regard to the mapping of essential attributes. Some members questioned whether the matrix should reflect current skills or the skills which the individual demonstrated prior to their membership on the Court.

The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs made a number of suggestions for the presentation of the summarised matrix to the Court and undertook to revise the summary accordingly.

**Resolved:** to note the responses and endorse the sharing of the summary with the Court subject to the revisions proposed.

4. **QUINQUENNIAL REVIEW OF COURT EFFECTIVENESS**

(1) **Minutes from the meeting of the Review of Court Effectiveness Sub-Group**

The Committee received minutes from the meeting of the Court Effectiveness Review Group on 5 August 2014.

**Resolved:** to approve the minutes.

(2) **External Facilitator’s Report**

The Committee received the report from the external facilitator for the Review of the Effectiveness of the Court. Members noted that Mr John Lauwerys, a former Registrar at the University of Southampton and a member of the LFHE Governor Development Programme team, had been selected as the external facilitator for the review based upon his knowledge of the HE sector. Members also noted that as part of the review Mr Lauwerys had met with all members of the Court and that his observations during these interviews had aligned closely with the responses to the Court members’ questionnaire which were to be considered separately on the agenda (minute 4(3)).

In introducing the report, the Convener highlighted that in his report the external facilitator had concluded that the University had effective governance arrangements, and that the recommendations within the report were therefore suggestions for the further enhancement of the effectiveness of existing governance practices. In determining its recommendations to the Court the Committee was encouraged to consider each of the external facilitator’s recommendations alongside the responses proposed by the Review Group in their report (minute 4(4)).

In relation to reference within the report to the balance of the College backgrounds of elected members of the Court, members noted that, although at the time of the review four of the six elected members were from the College of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing, the elections concerned had been contested by candidates from other Colleges. Accepting therefore that the electorate had arguably had the opportunity to make an informed choice, some members were keen that the democratic choices of the Academic Council and Senate were respected. Members however agreed that it was important that suitable candidates from across the University be encouraged to stand for election, and indicated that more should be done to ensure that the electorate was fully informed of the nature of the role of members of the Court and of the importance of Court hearing perspectives from different parts of the University.

**Resolved:** to note the report and thank Mr Lauwerys for his work.
(3) Court Members’ Questionnaire: Synopsis and Statistical Summary

The Committee received a synopsis and statistical summary of responses to the Court Members’ Questionnaire. Members noted that the Review Group had been satisfied that all of the issues emerging from the questionnaire were covered by the external facilitator’s report and recommendations.

Resolved: to note the summary.

(4) Report from the Review of Court Effectiveness Review Group

The Committee received a report from the Review Group outlining the context of the review, the processes undertaken, and highlighting the responses proposed by the Group to the recommendations from the external facilitator. The Convener of the Review Group introduced each of the recommendations and highlighted the response proposed by the Review Group. Members reviewed each recommendation in turn and the outcomes of these discussions are summarised in the Report of the 2014 Review of Court Effectiveness for presentation to the Court on 27 October 2014.

Resolved: to note the report.

5. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP 2014/15

Members noted that, at the business meeting of the Court Retreat, in light of membership changes to the Court, the Court had asked that the Committee review the commitments of individual members to ensure good governance practice.

The Committee considered a table summarising the commitments of individual members of the Court in terms of serving on the various Committees and Sub-Committees.

Noting that the election by the Senate of a replacement for Dr Sam Crouch on Court had not yet taken place, members proposed that the membership of the Governance & Nominations Committee (for which Dr Crouch was previously a member) and the overall balance of membership commitments be considered after the outcome of the election was known. In the interim, members expressed their thanks to Dr Boyd for agreeing to represent the Court on the Welfare and Ethical Use of Animals Committee in addition to his existing commitments.

Members also noted that a replacement for Mr Andrew Richmond on the Board of Trustees of the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (UoDSS) was sought following his appointment as Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee and proposed that Mr Iain Howie be approached to serve in this respect.

Finally, members noted that Ms Sheila Krawczyk, the member of Court elected by the non-teaching staff, had been absent due to ill-health from the Court since its meeting on 28 October 2013. Members were concerned that Court was therefore currently not benefitting from the perspective of the non-teaching staff and suggested that the Chair make enquiries with Ms Krawczyk regarding the likely timeframe for her return.

Resolved: to note the summary and ask that the Convener speak with Mr Howie regarding becoming a trustee of UoDSS.

6. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: CORPORATE GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

Members noted that the draft Corporate Governance Statement for the University’s Annual Financial Statements would be circulated following the discussion at Court of the recommendations from the Review of the Effectiveness of the Court to enable any changes in governance practice to be reflected in it.

Resolved: to note the update.
7. GRADUATES’ COUNCIL ASSESSOR ON COURT

The Committee received an update from the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs in relation to the identification of a successor for Mr Iain Wright as Graduates’ Council Assessor when he reached the end of his term of office on 31 July 2015. Members noted that Privy Council approval for changes to the mechanism of selection was in process but discussed scenarios for taking forward the process depending upon the timing and outcome of the Privy Council decision. The Director confirmed that the Convener of the Graduates’ Council Business Committee would be consulted as the matter progressed, and that graduates would be kept informed of what was being done and why.

Resolved: to note the update.
STATEMENT OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

The primary responsibilities of the Court, as the governing body of the University, are:

Strategy and Mission

1. to approve the mission and the strategic vision of the University, setting out its aims and objectives in teaching, research and wider impact and identifying the financial, physical and staffing requirements for their achievement;
2. to ensure the quality of the educational provision of the University and, in consultation with the Senatus, to make such provision as it thinks fit for the general welfare of the students;
3. to oversee the management of all of the revenue and property of the University and to exercise general control over its affairs, purposes and functions, taking all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern to the institution;
4. to safeguard the good name and values of the University and to ensure that the institution is responsive to the interests of its stakeholders, including students, staff, graduates, the local community and funding bodies;
5. to assist the University in the promotion and development of its activities in Scotland, the UK and internationally, in a way which enhances the financial sustainability, visibility and reputation of the University;
6. to approve a financial strategy, long-term business plans and annual budgets for the University and to ensure its solvency and safeguard its assets;
7. to monitor the University’s performance against approved plans and key performance indicators, benchmarking these where appropriate against comparator institutions;
8. to approve an estates strategy for the management and development of the University’s land and buildings in support of institutional objectives;
9. to approve a human resources strategy and to ensure that reward arrangements for its employees are appropriate to the needs of the University;

Governance and Control

10. to ensure compliance with established principles of good governance in higher education and moreover ensure the University transacts its business in accordance with its Charter, Statutes, Ordinances and other rules and regulations, as well as with Scottish, UK and EU law where applicable;
11. to appoint the Principal & Vice-Chancellor of the University, including the terms and conditions attaching to the appointment, and to put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring his or her performance through consultation with all members of the Court;
12. to appoint a Secretary of the University and to ensure that he or she has separate lines of accountability for the provision of services to the Court and for the fulfilment of managerial responsibilities within the institution;
13. to make clear and to review regularly the executive authority and other powers delegated to the Principal & Vice-Chancellor, to other senior officers and to other bodies of the University including the Senate and Committees of Court;
14. to ensure the proper use of public funds awarded to the University as well as adherence to the funding requirements of the Scottish Funding Council in its Financial Memorandum and any other documents;
15. to establish and monitor effective systems of internal control and accountability throughout the University, oversee the University’s arrangements for internal and external audit and to approve the University’s annual financial statements;
16. to ensure that arrangements are in place for the proper management and assessment of risk within the University and that appropriate arrangements are in place in respect of the health and safety of students, staff and other persons affected by University operations;
17. to act as trustee for any legacy, endowment, bequest or gift in support of the University’s activities;

Effectiveness and Transparency

18. to ensure, through the appointment of co-opted lay persons in accordance with the Statutes, a balance of skills and experience amongst the membership of the Court sufficient to meet these primary responsibilities;
19. to ensure that the proceedings of the Court are conducted in accordance with the seven principles of public life drawn up by the Committee on Standards in Public Life: selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty, leadership;
20. to ensure that the Court takes effective steps to communicate its decisions and its work to the staff and students of the University, and to other stakeholders as appropriate;
21. to ensure that procedures are in place in the University for dealing with internal grievances, conflicts of interest and public interest disclosure; and
22. to monitor its own performance and that of its Committees through an annual internal review of effectiveness, with a formal, externally facilitated evaluation of effectiveness undertaken not less than every five years and to ensure that the Senatus reviews its own effectiveness on a regular basis.

Revised October 2014
APPENDIX 3
REPORT FROM THE 2014 REVIEW OF COURT EFFECTIVENESS
(MINUTE 4(2))

Introduction

Under Principle 16 of the Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance, the Court is required to undertake an externally facilitated review its effectiveness every five years, with effectiveness being assessed against the Statement of Primary Responsibilities and the Code.

At the meeting of the Governance & Nominations Committee (G&NC) on 27 January 2014 members approved the following proposals for the conduct of the quinquennial review of the effectiveness of the Court:

a. that a small steering group (the Review Group) be established to oversee the review, prepare the final questionnaire and engage and liaise with an external facilitator;

b. that the Review Group should have the following composition:
   i. lay member of G&NC as Convener (but not the Chairman of Court);
   ii. lay member of Court (not a member of G&NC);
   iii. staff member of Court; and
   iv. independent student member of Court or President of DUSA.

c. that in line with the requirements of the Scottish code of Good HE Governance, an external facilitator be engaged. The facilitator’s role would be to conduct interviews with Court members and, as determined by the Review Group, with internal and external stakeholders as appropriate; and that the facilitator should work closely with the Review Group and officers on the development of recommendations as one outcome of the review process; and

d. that the facilitator’s report along with the analysis of the questionnaire completed by Court members be submitted to Court together with the proposals of the G&NC made after they had considered the Review Group’s views.

The Review Group had the following composition: Mr Iain Wright as Convener, Mr Andrew Richmond, Dr Alison Reeves and Mr Iain Mackinnon. It met on three occasions (3 March 2014, 12 May 2014 and 5 August 2014). The Review Group reported its findings to the Governance & Nominations Committee at an additional meeting of the Committee on 6 October 2014.

Process – Review Group

As part of the review, the Review Group considered four main elements as follows:

1. **Alignment to the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance**: based upon the assessment by the internal auditor (KPMG) and the University’s submission to a request from Universities Scotland for an update on the University’s alignment to the Scottish Code at the end of July 2014 which was communicated to the Court at the Retreat in September 2014.

2. **Statement of Primary Responsibilities**: the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs carried out a review of the Statement of Primary Responsibilities based on sector-wide best practice. Amendments to the Statement were considered and endorsed to the Court by the Governance & Nominations Committee at its meeting on 6 October 2014.

3. **Court Members’ questionnaire**: A questionnaire was made available to members electronically in April 2014 and responses to the survey along with a statistical summary and synopsis were considered by the Group in parallel to the external facilitator’s report. The questionnaire was based upon that used in the 2009 Court Effectiveness Review with modifications taken from the sample questionnaire available within the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE) Governor Development Programme online resources package.

4. **External Facilitation**: the Group was guided by the requirements of the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance\(^1\) with respect to effectiveness reviews:

---
The governing body shall keep its effectiveness under annual review. Normally not less than every five years, it shall undertake an externally-facilitated evaluation of its own effectiveness, and that of its committees, and ensure that a parallel review is undertaken of the senate/academic board and its committees. Effectiveness shall be assessed both against the Statement of Primary Responsibilities and compliance with this Code. The governing body shall, where necessary, revise its structure or processes, and shall require the senate/academic board of its Institution to revise its structure and processes accordingly. [Main Principle – Number 16].

The Review Group considered a range of options and, at its meeting on 24 March 2014, the Governance & Nominations Committee approved the engagement of Mr John Lauwerys, a former Registrar at the University of Southampton now working as a consultant for the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE), as the external facilitator for the review.

Mr Lauwerys presented his report to the Review Group on 5 August 2014. The Group at that meeting was satisfied that the recommendations within Mr Lauwerys’ report captured all aspects emerging from the review on which the Group wished to bring forward proposals. The recommendations and proposals from the Review Group were subsequently considered by the Governance & Nominations Committee on 6 October 2014, with a series of proposals being agreed and subsequently submitted to the Court.

Outputs from the Review

At its meeting on 27 October 2014 the Court considered recommendations from the external facilitator together with the views of the Governance & Nominations Committee. The outputs of the review, as agreed by the Court, are summarised below as a series of responses to the external facilitator’s recommendations.
The Role and Responsibilities of the Court

Recommendation 1

The Statement of Primary Responsibilities should be reviewed to take full account of the Scottish Code of Good H.E. Governance and the Statement should be actively reviewed by Court on an annual basis.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety.

Proposed implementation date: Immediate.

[Secretary’s note: At its meeting on 27 October 2014 the Court approved a revised Statement of Primary Responsibilities].

Recommendation 2

Court should be mindful of the distinction between its responsibilities for the governance of the University and the separate responsibility for the management of the University which rests with the Principal and Senior Executive. The Senior Management Team should not be seen as a Committee of Court.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation and propose that the Principal’s Report to each Court meeting be the main route for communication between the SMT and the Court.

Noting the overlap with recommendation 4, members agreed that the Court should also consider how at a future meeting both Court and the SMT might be supported in gaining a greater mutual understanding of the distinction between governance and executive management beyond the introduction of Corporate Governance training proposed at recommendation 4.

Proposed implementation date: 15 December 2014 and annually thereafter at the start of each academic year.

Recommendation 3

The Scheme of Delegation should be revised and then reviewed annually by the Court.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety.

Proposed implementation date: 15 December 2014

The Overall Effectiveness of the Court

Recommendation 4

A special half day meeting of Court should be arranged, supported by an experienced external facilitator, to explore and seek to resolve the concerns of a minority of the Court members about the relationship between Court and the Senior Executive (evidenced in particular over the consideration of the ‘Transformation Agenda’) and to clarify the nature of the governance role of Court members.

The Court Decided:

That, noting the importance of addressing this recommendation, particularly in the context of recent difficult discussions around the Transformation Agenda, a training and discussion session, led by an external facilitator with extensive knowledge of corporate governance, should be scheduled for the Court and the Senior Management Team to enhance their respective mutual understanding of the role and perceptions of Court members as governors and of the SMT as managers. It was also agreed that induction sessions for new Court members should include corporate governance training.
The Court asked that the University Secretary identify a suitable facilitator(s) for consideration and an informal environment for this training session.

**Proposed implementation date:** 16 February 2015/20 April 2015, prior to the meeting of Court.

**Recommendation 5**

Court should consider having pre-meeting sessions to allow for information/briefing presentations and visits to departments/centres in the University.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety and that, for example, the presentation by the Sports Union President of the annual report from the Sports Union be replaced by a tour of ISE and Sports Union accommodation prior to the meeting of Court, led by the President and the Director of ISE.

**Proposed implementation date:** Immediate.

**Court Meetings and Papers**

**Recommendation 6**

The agendas for Court meetings should be re-ordered to ensure key items for discussion are taken first. Briefings on key issues, such as on the financial position, should continue to be given at Court meetings but they should be carefully designed to deliver the key information in a succinct and clear manner. Major issues should come to Court for discussion and consideration of options rather than just for formal approval or noting.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety with the understanding that where significant and sensitive items were presented the discussion should be sufficient for all issues to be raised appropriately. It is also decided that:
- reserved business items, while remaining confidential, should be taken in the appropriate order on the agenda rather than as a distinct section at the end;
- presenters should be reminded that their introduction of papers should be succinct and cover only key points and updates; and
- in advance of meetings of Court the Chair should take a view of the appropriate duration of each item and give an indication to the Court at the start of the meeting of the expected time for conclusion of the meeting – taking into account both the indicative timings and the importance of maintaining the balance of discussion.

**Proposed implementation date:** 15 December 2014

**University Strategy, Reviewing Risk and Monitoring Institutional Performance**

**Recommendation 7**

The Vision and Institutional Strategy should be subject to review to ensure it takes account of the rapidly changing context of higher education. A clear implementation plan should then be developed with targets and benchmarks against which progress towards achieving the Institutional Strategy can be assessed.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety. The Court will consider the institutional strategy and Vision in the context of the University’s position two years after the launch of the Vision, a schedule for the review will also be developed, and an implementation plan for the strategy and the transformation agenda is to be provided as part of the review.

**Proposed implementation date:** 8 June 2015.
Recommendation 8

The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) should be reduced in number to perhaps ten or so and these should be included in a dashboard/traffic light format on the agenda of every Court meeting.

The Court Decided:

To ask the Senior Management Team to consider which KPIs were most appropriate for presentation to the Court to enable regular monitoring and meaningful discussion of institutional performance data. Members also made a number of suggestions for the improvement of the presentation of the data.

It was further agreed that the most recent set of the management accounts should be provided to each meeting of the Court for members’ information.

Proposed implementation date: 15 December 2014.

Composition of Court and the Appointment and Conduct of Members

For reference, the current composition of the Court is attached along with a note of officers normally in attendance of meetings.

Recommendation 9

The size of Court should be reduced by two and the presence of those 'in attendance' at meetings should be reviewed. Without increasing the number regularly attending, two of the Vice- Principals should always be at Court meetings to support Court in its deliberations. The University Secretary should however attend all parts of all meetings of Court.

The Court Decided:

Noting that the Court size of 23 members was already within the maximum 25 number of members recommended by the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, to reject the recommendation that the size of the Court be reduced by two (see recommendations 12 & 14), but to approve elements of the recommendation relating to those in attendance of the Court. In particular, the Court agreed that:

- in the interests of continuity the same two Vice- Principals be asked to attend every meeting - for the time being defined as those with the University-wide portfolios for Learning & Teaching and Research. This should be reviewed annually.
- other Vice- Principals be invited to attend the Court for distinct agenda items relevant to their portfolios on the invitation of the Chair of Court.
- the Director of External Relations and the Director of Human Resources should attend only for relevant agenda items as identified by the Chair of Court.

Proposed implementation date: 15 December 2014.

Recommendation 10

The post of Chancellor’s Assessor should be deleted as an explicit membership category, but the number of co-opted members should then be increased by one.

The Court Decided:

To implement the recommendation in its entirety, subject to the following provisions being in place:

- the Chair of Court and/or Secretary are to meet with the Chancellor at least annually to update him/her on matters of particular interest to the Court;
- the role of Senior Independent Member of Court should be incorporated within the position of Deputy Chair/Vice-Chair created in recommendation 10.11.
- as such, the role of Senior Independent Member & Vice-Chair should be filled by the same person and consideration should be given to the name of the position;
- that the responsibilities of the Deputy Chair/Vice-Chair include bringing appropriate Court matters of to the attention of the Chancellor as necessary; and
- that the position, however named, be filled now by the person currently designated as Chancellor’s Assessor.
In reaching its decision, the Court noted both the importance of the link between the Chancellor and the Court (and in turn the historic and symbolic nature of the title of Chancellor’s Assessor), and the rationale behind the proposed change - to improve governance practice by ensuring that no single individual should have the statutory right to appoint a member of Court. Members noted that the Chair of Court and Principal had consulted the Chancellor and that he was content with the recommendation.

Proposed implementation date: 1 August 2015

Recommendation 11

The post of Deputy or Vice Chair of Court should be established to be appointed from among the lay members of Court.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety, noting the agreement of recommendation 10. It was also agreed that the Standing Orders of Court should be updated to reflect the arrangement.

It was also agreed that:
- the role of Senior Independent Member on Court and Deputy/Vice-Chair should be fulfilled by the same person;
- that the appointment of the Senior Independent Member & Deputy Chair should be determined by the Court following recommendation from the Governance & Nominations Committee;
- that the appointment be subject to the appointee’s existing term of office and that, unlike the position of Chair of Court, the role not be considered a distinct category in terms of starting a new period of office; and
- that the remit of the role include briefing the Chancellor on matters of Court as necessary.

Proposed implementation date: 1 August 2015

Recommendation 12

The Lord Provost of Dundee should cease to be an ex-officio member of the Court and the total lay membership should be reduced by one.

The Court Decided:
To reject the recommendation.

The Court highlighted the importance of the relationship between the University and the City, and the role of the Lord Provost in this relationship. Having considered other opportunities for maintaining the balance of skills on the Court members considered that the loss of this position on Court would be detrimental.

Proposed implementation date: Not applicable

Recommendation 13

Senate should be invited to consider how it might ensure that its elected representatives on Court are drawn from across the University rather than predominantly from one College.

The Court Decided:
While respecting the choice of the electorate, the Court recommended that the Senate be invited to work with the Governance & Nominations Committee to consider best practice and potential enhancements in this respect.

Proposed implementation date: 15 December 2014

Recommendation 14

The Academic Council Representation on Court should be reduced by one to reflect the reduction in the lay membership arising from Recommendation 12.

The Court Decided:
Following the decision to reject recommendation 12, to reject the recommendation.
Recommendation 15

The Governance and Nominations Committee should develop a template to help in achieving a well-balanced membership of Court. In addition to advertising vacancies on Court, the Committee should ensure a parallel 'headhunting' exercise takes place to find good candidates.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety and that:

- the Governance & Nominations Committee should be asked to consider the number of core committees that each member of Court is asked to serve on in order to avoid any individual member serving on too many;
- that the G&NC should be encouraged to take a proactive view to ensuring diversity on the Court, through the development of an action plan or statement of intent (see Scottish Code);
- that the use of recruitment consultants should be considered to help identify a more diverse range of candidates and relevant skill sets and;
- that the skills matrix developed at the Court Retreat should be used to inform the advertisement and interview process.

Proposed implementation date: 1 August 2015

Recommendation 16

When a vacancy for the post of Chair of Court occurs, this should be advertised externally as well as internally. The [Governance & Nominations] Committee should then make a proposal to Court for the appointment of a Chair. Court should then make an appointment on the basis of this recommendation but not hold a ballot among its members.

The Court Decided:
To approve the recommendation that the Court move to an appointment rather than election process to select the Chair of Court to ensure compliance with the Scottish Code of Good HE Governance, and to ask the Governance & Nominations Committee to consider and make proposals to the Court regarding the process for selection, noting the suggestion that:

- the existing Chair should not be involved in the appointment of his/her successor;
- that consideration should be given to whether the Governance & Nominations Committee, or a specially convened panel of the Court should consider and make a proposal to the Court for the appointment of a Chair;
- that any member applying for the position should not be considered eligible to participate in the appointment process;
- that the timing of the process should be sufficiently in advance of the end of the period of office of the outgoing Chair to enable an appropriate handover/shadowing period;
- that existing members of the Court would be eligible to apply, but should the appointment be from an application external to the Court then there should be a mechanism to provide an introduction to the Court prior to the end of the term of office of the outgoing Chair; and
- that the Governance & Nominations Committee should be asked to consider the experience and competencies required for the role of Chair of Court for inclusion in external advertisements.

Proposed implementation date: 15 December 2014

Court Committees

Recommendation 17

The Chair of the Audit Committee should cease to be a member of the Remuneration Committee.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety.

Proposed implementation date: With immediate effect.
Secretary's note: At the meeting of Court on 27 October 2014 the Convener of the Audit Committee resigned from membership of the Remuneration Committee.

Recommendation 18

The Committees of Court should, on major issues, ‘prepare the ground’ for discussion and determination of matters by the full Court but not seek to pre-empt the decision Court might reach by making a firm recommendation.

The Court Decided:
The recommendation should be implemented in an issue dependent way using a risk-based approach to these items. Templates for papers of this nature should include the presentation of options and deliberations at the Committee level in addition to the recommendation from the Committee.

Proposed implementation date: With immediate effect.

Recommendation 19

The items on the agendas of Court Committees should enable members to contribute to the early stage of the development of policy.

The Court Decided:
The recommendation should be implemented for all major policy developments.

Proposed implementation date: With immediate effect.

Other Issues

Recommendation 20

Court should consider ways to raise its visibility within the University and to improve its understanding of the University’s activities.

The Court Decided:
To ask officers and the DUSA President to consider ways in which this could be achieved, suggesting for example: Court visits to Schools/Colleges, the use of electronic screens around the campus, announcements of Court appointments and the use of the Contact Magazine in highlighting the role of Court at the time of elections to the Court.

Proposed implementation date: 15 December 2014.

Recommendation 21

The induction process for new Court members should be reviewed to provide a more tailor designed programme for each person.

The Court Decided:
To implement the recommendation in its entirety and recommended that consideration be given to the introduction of a mentoring scheme with new members assigned an academic and a lay member of Court to provide mentoring in their first year.

Proposed implementation date: 1 August 2015.

Recommendation 22

Court should review the time of its meetings and in doing so give particular thought to the convenience of the timing of meetings to members and potential members, who may be at a demanding stage in their careers and have limited flexibility in taking on external commitments.

The Court Decided:
That a review of the timing of meetings should be undertaken, noting in particular that the timings of meetings may be of importance in ensuring diversity on the Court, but also the need to balance the requirements of existing members with that of potential new members. As part of this review it is proposed
that officers be asked to provide a report to the Governance & Nominations Committee on practice elsewhere in the sector and undertake a survey of views from existing members.

**Proposed implementation date:** The meeting of the Governance & Nominations Committee on 23 March 2014

**Recommendation 23**

The University should consider undertaking a revision of the Charter and Statutes so that they reflect current practices and policies.

The Court Decided: To implement the recommendation in its entirety, noting the need to reflect on previously agreed and newly agreed changes.

**Proposed implementation date:** 1 August 2015.

**Recommendation 24**

The University should provide additional professional support for Court and the whole governance process.

The Court Decided: To ask that officers provide information from comparator institutions on support for governing bodies across the sector to inform consideration of this recommendation.

**Proposed implementation date:** 15 December 2014
The current composition of the Court is:

**Lay (Independent) Members (13)**
- The Chair of Court elected by the Court from amongst the existing lay members of Court;
- The Rector or an Assessor, nominated by the Rector after consultation with the Students Association, for the whole of their term of office;
- The Chancellor’s Assessor, historically nominated from the existing lay membership of Court on the advice of the Governance & Nominations Committee;
- The Lord Provost of Dundee City Council or Assessor nominated by the Lord Provost for the whole of their term of office (Ex officio);
- Two Graduates’ Council Assessors (change to the selection method currently pending Privy Council approval);
- Seven members co-opted by the Court.

**Internal Elected/Ex Officio Members (10)**
- The Principal (Ex officio);
- Two Professors elected from amongst its members by the Senate
- Two Readers, Senior Lecturers or Lecturers elected from amongst its members by the Senate;
- Two members of Academic Council elected by the Academic Council;
- A member of the non-academic staff elected by the non-academic staff;
- The President of the Dundee University Students’ Association (Ex officio);
- A matriculated student of the University; and

The following officers are currently in regular attendance of the meetings of Court (6):
- The University Secretary;
- The Director of Finance;
- The Director of External Relations;
- The Director of Human Resources;
- The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; and
- The Policy Officer (Corporate Governance) as the Clerk to Court.
APPENDIX 4

FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE
(Minute 6(1))

A meeting of the Committee was held on 18 August 2014.

Present: Mr KA Richmond (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Deputy Principal Professor SM Black, Mr R Bowie, Mr IC Howie, Mr I MacKinnon (President, Students’ Association), and Mr EF Sanderson.

In Attendance: Mr J Elliot; University Secretary; Vice-Principal Professor K Leydecker; Development Manager (Minute 10); Director of Campus Services; Director of Finance; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; Director of Strategic Planning; Head of Alumni Relations & Development Services; and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Mr D Taylor.

1. **MINUTES**

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting of 12 May 2014.

2. **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

   In introducing the meeting the new Convener thanked his predecessor, Mr Richard Burns, for his guidance of the Committee prior to 1 August 2014 and members noted their appreciation for the contribution of Mr Burns during his service on the Committee. The Convener also welcomed Mr Iain Howie to his first meeting of the Committee, and members noted that Mr Denis Taylor had offered his apologies for the meeting but would join the Committee at its next meeting in October. The Convener encouraged members to provide comment and suggestions in relation to the structure of business, the regularity of items, and topics that they wished to be further explored.

Resolved: to thank Mr Burns for his commitment and service to the Committee and to welcome the new members to the Committee.

3. **MATTERS ARISING**

   (1) **Dundee Student Villages (Minute 5 (2), 24 March 2014)**

      The Director of Finance provided the Committee with an update on discussions relating to Dundee Student Villages (DSV) and reminded members of the position in respect of the risks, assets and liabilities associated with the DSV arrangement.

      The Director reminded members that there had been some concern that the assumption in the DSV financial model relating to future rent increases was unrealistic and that QMPF (formerly Quayle Munro) had been engaged by the DSV board to stress-test the model and put forward options for revising it. These options had been subject to a preliminary discussion by the DSV board on 29 May 2014 and would be discussed in detail at its next meeting in September. The Committee noted the range of options presented and their potential to ensure the long-term sustainability of the financial model for DSV.

      Notwithstanding the work of the DSV board, members considered that it was important for the University to engage its own expert to consider all possible options in relation to DSV and to provide it with independent advice on the best solution from the University’s perspective. Members were particularly keen to ensure that any changes to operational aspects of the model did not impact upon the quality of the student experience.

      Resolved: (i) to ask management to determine an appropriate source of independent advice on options relating to DSV; and

      (ii) otherwise to note the report and await the outcome of the further discussions that would take place at the DSV board meeting in September 2014.
(2) **2014/15 Budget and Three year Forecast (Minutes 3 & 4, 12 May 2014)**

The Committee noted that following the previous meeting on 12 May 2014, the then Convener, Chair of Court, and the current Convener had met with management to discuss the 2014/15 budget and three-year forecast and that revisions had subsequently been circulated to the Committee prior to their presentation and approval at the meeting of Court on 9 June 2014.

**Resolved:** to note that discussions had taken place.

(3) **Energy Savings Update (Minute 5(2), 12 May 2014)**

The Director of Finance presented information regarding the budgeted energy costs for the Ninewells and Kirkcaldy campuses. The Committee noted the figures relative to those provided previously for the City Campus.

The Committee indicated a number of additional areas where it felt management should review expenditure and consider opportunities for introducing mechanisms to improve accountability, ensure greater engagement and provide incentives that would change behaviours and thereby drive cost-savings.

**Resolved:** to ask that the Senior Management Team consider areas of expenditure where costs could be allocated to Colleges and Schools as part of the future planning and budgeting process.

4. **UPDATE ON TRANSFORMATION**

The Director of Finance introduced a paper designed to allow the Committee to monitor progress on some of the key projects which would have a financial impact on the University’s transformation and its ability to improve the financial position. It was expected that this would become a standing item of business and that the scope and content of the report would be refined over time. Areas contained within this first report included: an update on voluntary severance (VS) applications and related financial projections; a student recruitment overview; a pension costs update; and an IT projects overview, and members noted that future updates would include Research Excellence Framework 2014 (REF2014) updates and an overview of significant grant awards. Members noted that as the UCAS Clearing process was ongoing at the time of the meeting, it would have been premature to estimate the financial impact of the student recruitment figures presented, but noted that that this would be included in future reports.

Through discussion members noted that savings through VS were projected to be close to the target for the period to date, but at this stage well below those required in future years. The Director confirmed that the Pensions Sub-Group would meet following the meeting of the Finance & Policy Committee to discuss in more detail the Universities UK (UUK) and Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) consultations, and added that an increase in employer contributions capped at 18% was now being discussed - which members noted was slightly below the 19% projected for the 2015/16 budget.

The Committee noted that the cost and savings of the Biomedical and Life Sciences teaching project would be reported to the Court at its Retreat on 11 and 12 September 2014, and members suggested that it would be helpful if future reports to the Finance & Policy Committee were expanded to include an update on total staff costs. The Committee also indicated an interest in receiving further background to Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) figures so that, for example, the net cost of research and improvements to this TRAC figure could be more fully and confidently understood.

Turning to the IT projects update, members noted that work was underway to scope a project to replace the existing finance, human resources, payroll, research and procurement systems and that it was expected that a detailed analysis and proposal would be brought to the Committee in January 2015. Members commented on the kind of information they would wish to see in such a proposal and welcomed the suggestion that the Chief Technology Officer be invited to present the proposal and the IT vision to the Committee at a future meeting, and encouraged management to consider the inclusion of a presentation from the Chief Technology Officer in the schedule of Court business for 2014/15.

**Resolved:** to note the report and suggestions for future reports.
5. STUDENT RECRUITMENT UPDATE

The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) introduced a report from Admissions and Student Recruitment Services summarising the University’s position as at 11 August 2014 in relation to undergraduate and taught postgraduate recruitment for entry in 2014/15. An update was also tabled which included changes resulting from Clearing activity on 14 and 15 August.

The Committee noted that the University’s performance had been strong in relation to MD40, EU and Home undergraduate student recruitment, and that the University would meet the MD40 targets agreed with SFC. The Vice-Principal told the Committee that although applications for RUK and Full Fee undergraduate students had decreased compared to last year, improvement to the conversion of offers to acceptances and a strong performance in Clearing meant that acceptances for these student groups were now ahead of the same point last year. Members noted that the recruitment figures were still subject to change, but that it was now anticipated that RUK recruitment would be above that of the previous year and within 15% of target. The Vice-Principal highlighted factors contributing to the improved performance in Clearing including the impact of marketing and advertising activities targeting students for entry in 2015/16 and also the significant operational enhancements to the University’s internal approach to Clearing.

Turning to taught postgraduate recruitment, members noted the decline in both Home and Full Fee applications. Despite improved conversion rates, acceptances remained down by 6% and 13% respectively at the time of the meeting and members noted that although a surge in Home applications was typical between the end of July and the end of matriculation, it was likely that overseas acceptances would remain below that of the previous cycle.

In response to questions the Vice-Principal highlighted key trends across the Schools and Colleges. He also confirmed that, as with the rest of the sector, there had been a decline in applications from Northern Ireland and he highlighted investment and initiatives already undertaken and planned in order to seek to improve this position in the coming cycle. The Vice-Principal also summarised the expected uptake of bursaries and scholarships in 2014/15 - while the final position would be calculated and reported to the Committee at its meeting on 6 October, it was noted that an initial analysis had indicated that the number of students achieving the grades required to qualify for the academic excellence scholarship (ABB) was below estimates and that the final costs were therefore likely to be lower than the projected costs in the 2014/15 budget as highlighted in the paper. Members noted that a review of the uptake and impact of the bursary and scholarship schemes would be presented to the Committee at a meeting in autumn 2014.

The Committee noted that the Admissions and Student Recruitment Services strategy circulated to Court over the summer included a range of activities designed to increase the number of RUK and Full Fee applications in future cycles and that the University would be monitoring market changes resulting from the removal of recruitment caps in England.

Turning to the taught postgraduate student recruitment figures members noted that the market was increasingly challenging and that sector figures were not yet available, but would be important in the recruitment analysis. The Chair of Court highlighted discussions at recent HEPI meetings relating to problems in the overseas taught postgraduate market associated with the strength of Sterling and members noted that the University had been diversifying its target international markets.

Resolved:
(i) to note the report and await future reports on this topic; and
(ii) to ask that the strong performance of the Admissions and Student Recruitment Services team during Clearing be noted.

6. OVERSEAS TUITION FEES AND SCHOLARSHIPS

The Committee received a proposal from the Head of International Operations and the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) in relation to fees and scholarships for uncapped, full-fee, full-time, on-campus undergraduate and postgraduate taught students applying to the University outwith formal partnership agreements. The Committee noted that the proposal had been considered and endorsed by the Internationalisation Committee and the Senior Management Team (SMT) prior to its presentation at the Finance & Policy Committee. The proposal would see the University raise its baseline standard tuition fee for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes to bring them into line with competitors; this was, the Vice-Principal said, designed to improve the perception of the courses in a market where price and quality
were often considered analogous. It would also help the University to tackle postgraduate taught programmes which were not viable at current student levels or which were making minimal margins of return in the context of the fees being charged. The paper also proposed the standardisation of scholarships across the University, which would both simplify the marketing of postgraduate taught programmes and enable additional market flexibility for overseas students – factors which Admissions and Student Recruitment Services had identified as being important in improving the University’s recruitment performance.

The Committee discussed the potential impact that increased fees could have on the number of student applications and members noted that market pricing would be kept under review. One member highlighted the importance of flexibility in fees for some programmes which were financially viable below the standard fee proposed, particularly where a ‘one-fee’ approach was taken for Home/EU and overseas students, however the Committee noted and accepted the importance in the market place of a single institutional policy and of taking a corporate and strategic approach to income generation. The Committee acknowledged the potential for student numbers to be negatively affected by the change, but accepted that Admissions and Student Recruitment Services were well placed to understand the market place and had indicated that this change was required in order to deliver University targets. Members also noted the processes proposed for the exemption of specialist courses, particularly in the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing where fees were currently higher than the proposed fee and demand exceeded capacity.

In discussing the paper members noted the proposal included a guarantee that fee rises would be capped at 5% for each year of study and suggested that Admissions and Student Recruitment Services be asked to consider if it would instead be appropriate to fix prices for the duration of the course. Members also indicated that Postgraduate Research student fees should be reviewed in addition to the postgraduate taught fee to ensure a holistic approach to fee setting.

Resolved: to approve the approach outlined and suggest that the cap for increases of fees be further considered and remit the matter to the Senior Management Team to agree an appropriate solution.

7. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS PERIOD 11

The Committee received the management accounts for the period to the end of June 2014. Period 12 accounts were tabled at the meeting.

Resolved: to note the accounts.

8. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS PERIOD 12 AND YEAR END TIMETABLE

The Director of Finance presented the management accounts for the period to the end of July 2014 which were tabled at the meeting. The Committee noted that the figures were still subject to final review and external audit which would commence in September 2014.

The Committee noted that following a decrease of £38k in the forecast during period 11, the period 12 accounts now indicated an operating surplus of approximately £376k, representing a favourable variance of £288k relative to the budget, and an improvement of £251k from the previously reported Period 8 forecast. Members noted that cash and short-term investments were likely to end the year at around £30m.

In response to questions the Director highlighted factors which could impact upon the end of year forecast, including year-end adjustments to pension costs and provisions required by FRS17 and increases in provisions for unfunded pensions acquired with Northern College in 2011/12. The Director also highlighted provisions within the 2014/15 budget approved by the Court at its meeting in June relating to the projected exposure arising from possible under-recruitment of unregulated students and adjustments made in relation to projected Bursaries and Scholarship costs.

Resolved: to note the draft accounts.

9. ESTATES & BUILDINGS REPORT

The Director of Campus Services introduced his regular report to the Committee. In doing so he updated members on progress in relation to the capital plan. Members noted that tender documentation in relation to Phase 3 works for the Ninewells Library and Teaching Accommodation project were expected to be completed by December 2014. The programme of works relating to the Duncan of Jordanstone College of
Art & Design were also progressing well with all works scheduled to be completed by December 2014, and the Design stage for works to 1-3 Perth Road were expected to be completed by September 2014 following further discussion between the Design Team and users.

The Director told the Committee that tenders had been invited for design services with regard to the overcladding and replacement of windows within the Tower Building. At the time of the meeting tenders were being evaluated and members noted that the appointment of a design consultant would be subject to consideration of the likelihood of obtaining funding from the SFC. Members noted that as the Tower Building was a listed building there were added costs and restrictions to the scope of the project. Members also noted that the completion date for the installation of a 4th Combined Heat and Power (CHP) generator had been extended from June to August/September largely as a result of the restricted working area for the installation and diversion of existing services.

Turning to projects previously reported to be in dispute, members were pleased to note that the contractor for the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR) had agreed liability for the defect in the curtain walling and was on site to carry out remedial work. These remaining works and outstanding landscaping were expected to be completed by mid-September prior to the official opening of the CTIR on 1 October 2014. The Committee noted that there were no further updates on other projects previously reported as ‘in dispute’ but these would continue to be monitored and any change would be reported to the Committee.

Members suggested that it would be useful for future reports to include tracking of each individual project throughout its duration, particularly in terms of financial matters.

The Director also presented an update on the opportunity for a land swap with Dundee City Council in relation to the Park Place Primary School. Members noted the valuations for the sites under discussion as part of the proposed land swap and the associated opportunity to consolidate the use of off-campus sites and reduce associated rental costs.

Resolved: (i) to ask the Director of Campus Services to take the land swap discussions forward with Dundee City Council and to explore a range of options relating to the swap, including options that would involve retention or leasing of existing University sites under discussion; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

10. ANNUAL REPORT ON FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGNS

The Development Manager and Head of Alumni Relations & Development Services presented an annual report on fundraising campaigns. In doing so they provided an update on: cash receipts during the 2013/14 financial year; performance relative to competitors in terms of cash received and cost per pound of cash received; and the strategy and future approach to fundraising activities for the next five years.

The Development Manager highlighted the importance of improving how fundraising opportunities were defined to be attractive to potential donors as well as improving the effectiveness of the University’s prospect research database. Members noted that the overall approach to fundraising was increasingly focused on facilitating the engagement of potential donors with leading academic, researchers and defined projects.

The Committee discussed the University’s fundraising performance relative to competitors and noted the wide divergence of performance in this area across the sector, taking particular note of the outstanding performance of some institutions. In response to questions the Development Manager outlined proposed future staffing structures and members noted that the stewarding of legacy gifts was one area where the University aimed to improve its performance.

Through discussion of the five-year plan for fundraising and philanthropic activities the Committee suggested that it may be helpful for a target to be set for fundraising by management in the context of an overall strategy and staffing plan.

Resolved: to note the report.
11. REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

In line with the recommendation from the 2012 review of the remit, composition and role of the Remuneration Committee, the Finance & Policy Committee received a paper from the Senior Management Team outlining aspects that needed to be taken into account when considering the University’s position with regard to remuneration of senior staff in this year’s round.

The Committee recommended that the Court approve the notional remuneration budget for 2014/15 of £100k and, bearing in mind a range of pressures on this budget, the Committee further recommended that the Remuneration Committee be given the option to, with appropriate justification, bring revised proposals to the Finance & Policy Committee for consideration.

Resolved: to recommend to Court that the notional budget for the Remuneration Committee be approved.

12. TREASURY POLICY

The Director of Finance introduced a number of proposed revisions to the Treasury Management Policy (http://www.dundee.ac.uk/finance/procedures/tmp/treasuryindex.htm) which had been designed to reduce potential issues that may arise as a result of significant Euro cash balances being held by the University in accordance with the Euro hedging policy.

The proposed changes included the addition of Handelsbanken to the approved financial institutions, and the Director told the Committee that an initial £10m limit on deposits would enable the University to improve the rate of return achieved on Euro cash balances. The revised policy also included an agreement to allow the Director of Finance to enter into forward currency purchases where they were matched with equivalent currency sales. Through discussion members noted that this would be an important element of the overall currency hedging strategy, and would negate the risk of needing to draw down on existing sterling facilities to fund intra-month lows in sterling cash balances. The Committee proposed that a maximum total for forward purchases and sales at any one time be included within the policy and be set at Euro10m.

Resolved: to recommend to Court that it approve the amended policy, subject to minor amendment as outlined above.

13. ENDOWMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report from the meeting of the Endowments Sub-Committee on 29 May 2014. In presenting the report the Convener told the Committee that the investment performance had been strong and that the investment managers had been performing well.

Members noted that Mr Andrew Richmond, as Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee, was to assume the role of Convener of the Endowments Sub-Committee and that Mr Iain MacKinnon, Dundee Students’ Association President, would join the Sub-Committee for 2014/15.

Resolved: to note the report

14. CAR PARKING CHARGES (FOR INFORMATION)

The Committee noted that revisions to car parking charges for 2014/15 would be approved by the University Secretary under delegated authority and agreed that it did not wish such changes to be reported to the Committee in future.

15. PENSIONS SUB-GROUP

Members noted that the Pensions Sub-Group would meet immediately following the conclusion of the meeting of the Finance & Policy Committee. As a result of change to membership of the Finance & Policy Committee and the Court in 2014/15, revisions to membership of the Sub-Group were proposed and approved. Members noted that although it was desirable for the Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee to be a member of the Pensions Sub-Group, there was a potential conflict of interest in this respect as Mr Richmond was also a Trustee of the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (UoDSS). Mr Richmond indicated that he had already agreed with the Chair of Court that he would step down from his role as a Trustee of the UoDSS once a suitable replacement had been identified, but the Committee recommended that meantime Mr Richmond be in attendance at the Sub-Group meetings.
Resolved: (i) to note that the revised membership for the Pensions Sub-Group would be Mr Eric Sanderson (Convener), Mr Ronald Bowie, and Mr Jo Elliot, with Mr Andrew Richmond, the University Secretary, and the Directors of Finance and Human Resources in attendance; and

(ii) to ask officers to give thought to identifying a suitable lay member of Court to recommend to Court as a replacement for Mr Richmond on the UoDSS Board of Trustees.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 6 October 2014.

Present: Mr KA Richmond (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Deputy Principal Professor SM Black, Mr R Bowie (by telephone), Mr IC Howie, Mr EF Sanderson; and Mr D Taylor.

In Attendance: Mr J Elliot; University Secretary; Vice-Principal Professor K Leydecker; Director of Campus Services; Director of Finance; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; Director of Strategic Planning; and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Mr I MacKinnon (President, Students’ Association).

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting of 18 August 2014.

2. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS (PERIOD 1)

The Director of Finance presented the management accounts for the period to the end of August 2014. The Committee noted that at the time of the meeting the forecast remained subject to analysis of final student recruitment figures and that the projections were consistent with those provided to the Court at its Retreat in early September. Thus, as a result of a £2.2m shortfall in total fee income and despite provision within the budget and targeted action on costs, there was a predicted deficit of £189k against the budget. The year-end forecast before VS/Redundancy and gain on disposals was therefore a deficit of £2.89m. Members also noted inherent risks/assumptions within the forecast.

The Committee discussed measures being taken to mitigate the shortfall in fee income, and noted that the shortfall was largely due to targets in full fee postgraduate recruitment not being reached, particularly in one College. The University Secretary highlighted the fact that the level of tuition fee risk associated for that College had been recognised by the provision made in the budget, but nevertheless indicated that work was underway to review the process for establishing future tuition fee projections so as to ensure an appropriate balance between ambition and realism.

The Committee considered the expected growth, including tuition fee income, within the three year projections, and noted that the stretching target would be even more challenging given that the forecast starting point had slipped by £2.2m. Members asked that an analysis of the reasons for the shortfall be undertaken and were interested in receiving information which would provide context to the actions being taken to achieve the three year projections and associated risks.

Turning to Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) data previously provided, members highlighted the need to consider the optimum balance between research and teaching activities in striving for financial sustainability and the Director of Finance undertook to provide members with further information with regard to the breakdown of research income and costs.

The Director went on to highlight the projected decline in cash balances resulting from: the operating deficit, the cost of Voluntary Severance, and the potential unwinding of research monies received in advance. Members noted that a new Research Accountant had been appointed, who would focus initially on improvements to forecasting and analysis of cash commitments. Noting that around 38% of University income was from research, the Committee asked the Director to provide a breakdown of cash balances by research, teaching and central services so that the associated risks could be more easily considered by members. The Committee also noted that at the time of the meeting 73% of total research income for 2014/15 was already secure, which was higher than in previous years, and members indicated that the inclusion of data relating to research income in previous years would be welcomed.

The Committee highlighted the importance of returning to a position of achieving an operating surplus and of diligent forecasting to ensure that working capital and net funds were sufficient to ensure on-going liquidity.
3. UPDATE ON TRANSFORMATION

The Director of Finance introduced a paper outlining progress on some of the key projects which would have a financial impact on the University’s transformation and its ability to improve the financial position. Areas contained within the report included: an update on the outcome of the voluntary severance (VS) scheme and related financial projections; pension costs update; and an IT projects overview. Members also noted that the results of the Research Excellence Framework 2014 (REF2014) would be known in December 2014 and would be included in the report at that time, although the financial impact of the results would not be known for some time afterwards. With regard to grant awards, members noted that the first forecast would be made in the period 2 accounts, at which point a clearer view of any grant awards not anticipated in the budget or exposures on grant income would be included in reports to the Committee.

The Convener told the Committee that the Senior Management Team (SMT) would meet on 13 October 2014 to consider the University’s strategy in relation to achieving the budget and three year forecasts and that this would include a School by School analysis of performance and a consideration of the University’s overall academic footprint.

Members also noted the work of the Review of Organisational and Management Structures – a University wide consultation led by the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) and the range of options being considered by the Group. Members noted that communication and culture were key aspects of the review and that any proposal for change would be driven by improved ability to achieve the goals of the institution. Members were keen that optimal management structures were in place, but noted that any substantial change may in itself impact negatively on the efficiency of the institution while it was being implemented and that as such the timing of any change should be carefully considered. The Committee suggested that the report from the review should include any cost implications within the options appraisal.

Turning to student numbers, members noted that an update on recruitment figures for 2014/15 entry had been circulated to the Court and that there had been an overall decrease in taught postgraduate recruitment (home and overseas) despite an improved conversion rate, reflecting what appeared to be a national trend. Members noted that the context for the reductions was being analysed and that efforts were being made to improve the position for 2015/16 entry including: the introduction of foundation courses, withdrawal of inefficient programmes, consideration of blended learning opportunities, rationalisation of postgraduate fees and scholarships, and an International Student Recruitment Summit for academic and relevant professional services staff to ensure that resources were aligned to a single strategy.

In response to questions, the Director confirmed that 45.9 FTE savings had been identified through the VS scheme and that the SMT was considering the next steps in relation to achieving the targets set - but that further reductions towards the 80-120 target needed to be achieved as early as possible to enable the recurrent savings to be made in line with projections. The Committee was largely supportive of an acceleration of the timescale to achieve the targets, and noted that the Court would be asked to consider reopening the VS scheme as and when suitable projects were identified. The Committee highlighted the need for a range of solutions to be presented by management and asked that an update be provided to the next meeting of the Committee.

The Director highlighted the timeframe proposed by Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) for completing changes to the USS pension scheme and members noted that the implementation date for change was later than had been budgeted for, with potential savings of around £1.5m in 2015/16 and £750k p.a. thereafter compared to the existing three year plan.

In relation to IT projects, members highlighted the importance of the Committee and the Court understanding the range of options under consideration and asked that the Chief Technology Officer attend a future meeting to outline the project and vision for IT at the University, including an options appraisal.

Resolved: to note the report and suggestions for future reports.
4. YEAR END

The Director of Finance confirmed that the year-end process was on track and that there were no major findings from the external auditor at the time of the meeting.

Resolved: to note the update.

5. DUNDEE STUDENT VILLAGES

[Secretary’s note: Mr J Elliot declared a potential conflict of interest in the item as a former member of the company now known as QMPE which was providing consultancy advice to the DSV board].

The Director of Finance presented a report routine report which outlined the structure and performance of Dundee Student Villages (DSV) during 2013/14. Draft accounts for DSV were also provided. Members noted that financial performance remained within the limits of the underlying financial model, with high occupancy rates an important factor in this respect. In response to questions the Director confirmed that there remained a good relationship with partners in DSV and that the residences were of a high quality. Members noted that officers were, as requested by the Committee at the last meeting, considering potential sources of external advice and would provide an update to the next meeting of the Committee in this respect.

Noting that the University Secretary and Director of Finance were both Board members of DSV the Committee asked that consideration be given to whether this membership remained appropriate in the light of the likelihood of future negotiations between the University and the DSV Board.

Resolved: to note the report and await further updates.

6. ESTATES & BUILDINGS REPORT

The Director of Campus Services introduced his regular report to the Committee, indicating that it was his intention that future reports had a more strategic focus, providing an overview and proposed approach for distinct elements of the Estates Strategy, including for example: the Campus Services Review; energy strategy for the city campus; the DUSCo operating Model, the Space Strategy; carbon reduction; income generation; and backlog maintenance.

The Director also provided an update on the capital plan, which included information to enable the tracking of projections relating to the cost and completion timeframe for projects. Members noted updates in relation to: phase 3 of the Ninewells Library & Teaching Accommodation project; the potential Tower overcladding project; phase 4 of the DJCAD project; the 1-3 Perth Road project; the installation of the 4th Combined Heat and Power (CHP) engine; and the Discovery Centre – formerly known as the Centre for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR).

The Director told the Committee that the Ninewells Library & Teaching Accommodation project, and DJCAD projects were proceeding to the schedule previously reported. Members also noted that consultants had been appointed in relation to the Tower project, with the tender stage expected to take place in January 2015. With regard to the 1-3 Perth Road project, it was noted that a feasibility cost would be prepared once feedback on the initial designs were received. The Committee was also pleased to note that the 4th CHP had been installed and was operational, and the Director confirmed that the engine would be handed over shortly once snagging was complete. Finally, members noted that the Discovery Centre had been handed over and officially opened on 1 October 2014, and the Director confirmed that the associated refurbishment of the Sir James Black Centre was expected to be completed by the end of October 2014. There were no changes noted to the projects previously reported as being in dispute.

In response to questions the Director confirmed that discussions were on-going with regard to the proposed land swap considered at the previous meeting, and that a proposal would be submitted to the Committee once negotiations with the City Council had concluded.

Resolved: to note the report.

7. DRAFT FINANCIAL MEMORANDUM

The Committee received the post-consultation draft of the Scottish Funding Council Memorandum with HE institutions. Members noted that the final draft incorporated a number of changes made in response to feedback from the sector and that the SFC intended it to come into force in early November 2014.
Resolved: to note the draft Memorandum and ask that the internal audit plan be updated to reflect the requirement for regular review of systems for the determination and payment of severance settlements; and that the University’s current policies in that regard be revised.

8. MINISTERIAL LETTER OF GUIDANCE

The Committee received a copy of the Strategic Guidance from the Cabinet Secretary for Life Long Learning to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) (see http://www.sfc.ac.uk/web/FILES/About_the_Council/SFC_letter_of_guidance_2015-16.pdf). Members noted the policy objectives and alignment of discretionary funding indicated within the letter and discussed elements of the letter pertinent to the University’s outcome agreement with the SFC.

Resolved: to note the letter of guidance.

9. PENSIONS SUB-GROUP

The Committee received a minute of the meeting of the Pensions Sub-Group on 18 August 2014. Members noted the Group’s discussion of the consultation paper from Universities UK (UUK) ‘USS Funding and Benefits’ and the Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) paper ‘An integrated approach to scheme funding’.

Resolved: to approve the report.
APPENDIX 6

AUDIT COMMITTEE
(Minutes 6)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 23 September 2014.

Present: Mr J Elliot (Convener), Mr R Bint, Dr WGC Boyd, Ms SS Morrison-Low, Mr I Stewart.

In Attendance: Director of Finance; Director of Human Resources (minutes 1-5), Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; Director of Strategic Planning (minutes 1-5); Miss B Grieve (KPMG) (minutes 1-5(5)); Mr A Shaw (KPMG) (minutes 1-5(5)); Mr J Thompson (Scott-Moncrieff); Ms C Connor (PwC); and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Ms B Malone, Mr KA Richmond, and University Secretary.

[Secretary’s note: prior to the meeting members of the Audit Committee met privately and discussed the system in use for recording and monitoring the progress of internal audit recommendations and the training needs of members of the Committee.]

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting of 21 May 2014.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Compliance with Information Legislation: Statistical Summary (Minute 12)

The Committee noted that for the period 1 April 2013 to 31 December 2013, that being the period for which the Committee had at its last meeting received a report, the University had a 96.5% compliance rate for responding to information requests within the statutory time period.

Resolved: to note the update.

(2) Audit Contracts (Minute 14)

The Committee formally noted the appointment of Scott-Moncrieff as the internal auditor from 1 August 2014 for the period of two years initially, with the option to renew the contract for a further year. Members noted that the appointment had been approved by the Committee by electronic circulation on 6 August 2014 under powers delegated by the Court and had been ratified by the Court at its meeting on 12 September 2014.

The Director of Finance also updated the Committee on arrangements relating to Value for Money (VFM) audit proposals. He told the Committee that following enquiries with possible external providers he believed that it would prove better value to expand the role of the Head of Procurement to take on this function, which in the short term would in any case be focused on IT procurement. The Director told the Committee that he would investigate this option further in the coming weeks and he undertook to update the Committee at the next meeting.

Resolved: (i) to note the appointment of Scott-Moncrieff as the internal auditor; and

(ii) to await a proposal from the Director of Finance in relation to Value for Money audit work.

(3) Information Security (Minute 2(3))

The Committee noted that the internal audit follow-up by KPMG included updates on the implementation of recommendations relating to information security and that the Chief Technology Officer would provide an update to the Committee on the installation of technological solutions and training compliance at its next meeting on 1 December 2014.

Resolved: to note the update.
3. **CONVENER’S REPORT**

Members noted that the Convener had met with the internal and external auditors and that both were satisfied with the relationship with the University. The Convener also told the Committee that he had discussed the internal audit plan with the Senior Partner from Scott-Moncrieff and that he would highlight these discussions at the relevant points in the agenda.

**Resolved:** to note the update.

4. **EXTERNAL AUDIT PLAN**

The external auditor provided an update on progress in relation to the external audit. The Committee noted that there was one week remaining of on-site field work and that at the time of the meeting no significant issues had been raised. The auditors also confirmed that pension assumptions were in-line with normal expectations and that their audit of the subsidiary companies was almost complete.

The auditors went on to outline their approach to consideration of the interests of the governing body and senior officers, in particular an increased scrutiny of related parties. Members noted that a list of related parties (defined as dependants of the individual) and a record of their interests was not currently held and that the annual declaration of registered interests had just been completed for the governing body, the University Court. Given the lateness in the audit cycle of the request for this additional information the external auditor undertook to confirm requirements with the Senior Partner and to update the Committee if additional information was required.

**Resolved:** to note the update and await further clarification.

5. **INTERNAL AUDITORS**

(1) **Data Returns – analysis and verification**

The auditors provided an overview of their report into data returns. In doing so they highlighted that the review had found that the processes and procedures in operation within the University for preparing and validating data returns were robust and well established and that the staff involved were knowledgeable and experienced in their roles. The auditors made one moderate and three low risk recommendations relating to the creation of process notes for HESA data validation and submission, operational resources for data validation and benchmarking.

In response to questions the auditor confirmed that the audit had focussed on the flow of data from internal databases rather than the quality of data input into the databases, however the Director of Strategic Planning outlined ways in which data errors would be detected and in doing so he confirmed his confidence in the accuracy of the data within the returns to HESA. Members were also supportive of management’s plan, indicated within the management response, to review the Key Performance Indicators, the approach to reviewing and acting upon them, and to give further consideration to the benchmarking group.

In response to questions regarding the limited facility for individuals to write their own reports using the COGNOS tool the Director of Strategic Planning highlighted the complexity of the tool and confirmed that additional training for use of COGNOS would be considered alongside the implementation of an alternative tool which would require a lesser degree of technical knowledge to use.

Members queried the possibility of the inclusion of Rest of UK (RUK) recruitment analysis within the institutional KPIs, however it was confirmed that this data was not available at present through HESA and that bespoke admissions data from UCAS would need to be commissioned for this purpose.

**Resolved:** to note the report

(2) **Health & Safety Implementation**

The Auditors introduced their report on health & safety implementation. In doing so the auditors highlighted the fact that the focus of the audit had been to follow up on progress in relation to
recommendations made in the 2012 Health & Safety Review. The report made one high and six moderate risk level recommendations in areas where the audit team believed there was still scope to tighten up arrangements including: the clarity of roles, ensuring effective consultation, effective tracking of completion of health and safety training, embedding health and safety in University culture, training for overnight security staff, out-of-hours campus security control measures, resources in relation to inspections, and ensuring risk management plans were updated to reference quantifiable targets.

The Director of Human Resources provided the Committee with an outline of changes implemented since the audit which took place in June/July 2014, and members noted in particular the creation of an institutional group with the remit of improving both practice and the approach to health and safety matters. The Committee heard that the Group was meeting on a fortnightly basis, with representation from across the institution, and had thus far taken a systematic approach to practical issues arising. Members heard that the Group reported any issues directly to the Senior Management Team through the University Secretary and the Director of HR and had thus far provided proposals in relation to out of hours working and technical solutions to address the recommendations within the report such as recording training compliance.

The Director told the Committee that she was disappointed to hear of instances of non-compliance with University policy identified by the auditors and that, while she was confident that these were exceptions to the rule, she nevertheless took them very seriously. Members discussed what sanctions were available in instances of non-compliance with the Health & Safety Policy and the Director confirmed that in her view, while it was the responsibility of managers to ensure adherence, it could well be considered a disciplinary offence.

Noting that many of the recommendations made were being addressed by the newly formed Group including: the clarification of roles; out-of-hours access, CCTV and staffing; sharing of training databases; and formatting of local risk management plans, the Committee asked that the Director provide an update on progress in relation to the recommendations at the next meeting on 1 December 2014.

Resolved:
(i) to note the report and ask that the Director provide an update on progress at the meeting on 1 December 2014; and
(ii) to ask that the details of the report be discussed with the Senior Management Team and the Court.

(3) Follow-up Report

The auditors presented a report which set out the University’s progress in implementing internal audit recommendations from previous years.

As part of the review the auditors considered the progress made by management in addressing 96 recommendations either outstanding at the time of the last report, those subsequently made in 2012-13, and those within the 2013/14 audits where the implementation dates had passed. It was reported that 60 (63%) of these recommendations had been implemented, with 18 (19%) ‘in progress’. Thirteen of the recommendations reviewed were deemed to be no longer applicable/duplicated in more recent reports and were recommended for closure. Members also noted that a number of the recommendations which had not been implemented related to the iBuy project or were subject to the implementation of a single University IT solution for Finance, Payroll and Human Resources. In response to questions the Director of Finance confirmed that it would likely take in the region of two years to procure and implement a system, and the Committee asked to be kept informed of developments.

In discussing the follow-up report, some members questioned the risk levels assigned to individual recommendations. The auditor confirmed that these were the levels as judged at the time of the production of the report, based upon the information available at that time, and the Committee agreed with the proposal from the new internal audit team (Scott-Moncrieff) that they include within their follow-up work a review of the risk levels and relevance of historic recommendations.

Resolved: to note the report.
(4) **Status Update**

The Committee received a report on progress with the internal audit programme to date. Members noted that all work within the audit plan had been completed with the exception of the 2014 IT review which was being scoped at the time of the end of the contract and had, with the agreement of management, not been taken forward.

**Resolved:** to note the report.

(5) **2013-14 Annual Internal Audit Report**

The Committee received the auditors’ annual report on the effectiveness of the system of internal control. The auditors’ assessment was that ‘University’s systems provide a reasonable basis for maintaining control’ and ‘the control framework provides reasonable assurance regarding the effective and efficient achievement of strategic objectives’. The report summarised the major recommendations from the year’s audit work.

Noting that it would be the final meeting for KPMG as the internal auditors, members thanked the Director (Assurance) for the contributions made by him and his team over the past 4 years.

**Resolved:** to note the report.

(6) **2014-15 Internal Audit Plan**

The Audit Manager for the new internal audit team, Scott-Moncrieff, outlined the planned approach to the management of the transition between audit teams. He also tabled for discussion a list of potential areas for inclusion in the 2014/15 audit plan drawn from meetings with management and the Convener of the Audit Committee.

Members highlighted a number of areas where internal audit would be particularly valuable including: risk management, research strategy, a review of progress in relation to the five-year strategy and key performance indicators, communications, core financial systems, data accuracy and robustness, ICT, project management methodology, health & safety, and fraud risk including treatment of private consultancy and research contract income/expense claims.

In response to questions the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs outlined the normal approach to reviews of Schools. He went on to outline the arrangement with Dundee University Students’ Association regarding annual audit reviews and the Committee reiterated their continued support for inclusion of this aspect within the internal audit plan. Members also agreed with the recommendation from the internal auditor that time should be set aside for consultation with management on emerging issues.

**Resolved:** to note that an audit plan for 2014/15 would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee on 1 December 2014, and that in the meantime audit work would begin with reviews of core financial systems and risk management.

6. **CAPITAL INVESTMENT – POST COMPLETION REVIEWS**

The Committee received post-completion reviews for recent capital investments. Members noted the importance of both the financial summaries and user feedback and that further reports would be provided to the committee on the completion of capital building projects and major IT investment projects.

**Resolved:** to note the report.

7. **BUSINESS CONTINUITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT: UPDATE ON ARRANGEMENTS**

The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs introduced a paper outlining arrangements for risk management and Business Continuity Planning (BCP). Members noted that the Directors & College Secretaries Group (DCSG) would provide a formal report to the Audit Committee on its work in relation to risk management at least twice annually and that local risk registers would be reviewed at the next meeting of the DCSG on 28 October 2014 and used to inform updates to the institutional risk register. In response to questions the Director went on to confirm that the Institutional Risk Register would be
updated to reflect the outcome of the Scottish Referendum on Independence and that it would be presented to the Committee for consideration at its next meeting on 1 December 2014.

The Director also confirmed that local BCPs were in place for all critical areas and the majority of non-critical areas, and that the BCP sponsor would ensure that all local BCPs were completed and aligned to the responsibilities outlined within the institutional BCP. The Director went on to outline the role of the crisis management team and in doing so he clarified the membership of this team with respect to the Principal’s Office. Members suggested that officers should also liaise with the Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA) to ensure complete coverage.

Resolved:  
(i) to suggest that officers liaise with DUSA regarding BCPs; and  
(ii) otherwise, to note the report and the arrangements outlined.

8. LEGAL MATTERS

The Committee received a routine report detailing the current legal cases involving the University, including updates since its last meeting. Members noted the risks relating to one insured Court Action and indicated that they were content that the approach being taken was appropriate.

Members also noted that, at the time of the meeting, a decision was awaited in relation to a case where there was potential reputational risk and asked that officers update them in relation to this case at the meeting on 1 December 2014. In response to questions the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs confirmed that an internal analysis of the robustness of the University’s approach and procedures in relation to this case was being undertaken.

Resolved: to note the report.

9. HEALTH & SAFETY SUB-COMMITTEE

The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs introduced the report of the Sub-Committee’s meeting on 9 September 2014. Members noted that the report mirrored the earlier discussion of the Health & Safety report from the internal auditors (minute 5(2)). Members were pleased to note that the Dean of the Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art had, in the wake of the Glasgow School of Art fire, made health and safety training mandatory for staff within the School.

Resolved: for its part, to note the report.

10. ANNUAL REVIEW OF REMIT AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

Noting that the remit and terms of reference of the Audit Committee were a matter for the Court, the Committee nevertheless reviewed its remit and terms of reference. The Committee noted that the changes proposed largely reflected historic changes to membership of the Committee and the changes to risk management arrangements as outlined in minute 7. Members were also supportive of updates introduced to clarify existing practice in relation to the terms of office of lay Audit Committee members.

In reviewing the duties and responsibilities of the Committee, members discussed the role of the Committee in monitoring the University’s arrangements to secure Value for Money (VFM) and suggested that it would be helpful if one of the University’s Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) provided benchmarking in this respect. The internal auditor, Scott-Moncrieff, proposed that the opportunity to collaborate with other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in this manner could be included within the internal audit plan. Through discussion, members highlighted their preference for VFM work to focus on institutional level activities, for example IT procurement, rather than stand-alone projects and the Director of Finance undertook to provide a proposal for the Committee in this respect.

Members also suggested that the Committee’s role in reviewing the Institutional Risk Register be explicitly included within the Terms of Reference.

Resolved: to ask officers to revise the remit and terms of reference for the Audit Committee as indicated for the approval of Court subject to minor amendment as indicated above (annex).
11. AUDIT COMMITTEE TRAINING SESSIONS

The Committee was invited to discuss potential topics for Audit Committee training sessions in 2014/15. Members suggested that, in addition to the induction training for new members which would highlight the institution’s approach to internal and external audit, a session highlighting the organisational structure and constitutional arrangements and detailing FRS102 and the institution’s approach to changes resulting from its introduction would be welcomed.

Resolved: to note the suggestions.

12. PRIVATE MEETINGS

Members, auditors, and officers indicated that a private meeting was not necessary and that all were satisfied with the working relationship between the University and its auditors.
AUDIT COMMITTEE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

CONSTITUTION AND OPERATION

Membership

- The Committee shall comprise not less than three members of the Court, all of whom shall be lay members, i.e. to the exclusion of members of staff of the University and full-time students.
- The Chairperson of Court shall not be a member of the Committee.
- The Committee may co-opt, with the approval of the Court, additional lay persons with appropriate expertise who are not members of the Court. The number of such co-opted members shall not exceed half of the membership. The term of office for these additional lay members shall be in line with the period of co-option for members of Court as defined in Statute 9(2)(g).
- At least one member of the Committee shall have a financial or accounting background.
- The Convener of the Committee shall be appointed by the Court and shall be a member of the Court. In the absence of the Convener at any meeting of the Committee, the Committee shall appoint any of its members as Acting Convener for that meeting.
- The quorum for any meeting of the Committee shall be three members, at least one of whom must be a member of the Court.
- No member of the Committee shall concurrently be a member of the Court’s Finance & Policy Committee, although the Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee may attend meetings of the Audit Committee.2

Authority

- The powers delegated to the Committee by the Court shall be as defined in the Schedule of Delegation.
- The Committee shall have full authority to undertake and review activities associated with any matters within its terms of reference. For the purposes of such activities it shall be provided with adequate resources and full access to information and University personnel.
- The Committee shall have authority to obtain, without prior approval, legal or other independent professional advice within a financial limit determined by the Court (currently £15,000).

Proceedings

- The Committee shall meet four times annually and shall report, through submission of the minutes of each meeting, to the next available meeting of the Court.
- Each meeting of the Committee shall normally be attended by the University Secretary, Director of Finance Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs and, where business relevant to them is to be discussed, representatives of the internal and external audit services.
- The Committee’s Secretary shall normally be the Clerk to Court.

---

2 A reciprocal right of attendance at meetings of the Finance & Policy Committee is granted to the Convener of the Audit Committee.
DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Effectiveness and Financial Control

- to review the robustness of financial and other control systems and to ensure that the Court’s policies on internal control are implemented by delegated officers.
- to ensure that all significant losses have been properly investigated, and that the internal and external auditors and the Funding Council have been informed if appropriate.
- to oversee the University’s policy on fraud and irregularity, and to receive regular reports on any incidents of fraud.
- to oversee the University’s policy for the prevention of bribery and corruption and the University’s gifts and donations policy and to receive reports as appropriate on activity in this area.
- to oversee the University’s corporate governance arrangements.
- to monitor, annually or more frequently if necessary, the implementation of approved recommendations arising from both internal and external audit reports and management letters.
- to monitor the effectiveness of the internal and external audit services, including attendance at Committee meetings, and promote co-ordination between the two.
- to monitor the University’s arrangements to secure value for money, whether these are made via internal or external audit or other means.

Risk Management

- to advise the Court on the effectiveness of risk management in the University, on the basis of regular reports on risk management from the Directors & College Secretaries Group and appropriate audit work.
- to review twice annually the Institutional Risk Register and make recommendations to the Court in this respect.

Internal Audit

- to advise the Court on the appointment and remuneration of internal auditors.
- to consider and advise the Court on the internal audit needs assessment and the strategic and annual internal audit plans.
- to consider and advise the Court on issues arising from internal audit reports.
- to receive an annual report from the internal audit service, which should include an opinion on the degree of assurance that can be placed on the system of internal control.

External Audit

- to advise the Court on the appointment and remuneration of external auditors.
- to guide the external auditors on the nature and scope of the audit as necessary.
- to consider and advise the Court on external audit reports and management letters.
- to consider and advise the Court on the University’s annual financial statements, ensuring the proper application of agreed accounting policies.
- to monitor any advisory or other non-audit work undertaken for the University by the external auditors, to ensure that their independence is not compromised.

Other

- to oversee the University’s policy on public interest disclosure and receive reports on the outcomes of investigations of public interest disclosures.
- to receive routine reports from the University Solicitor on legal matters involving, or likely to involve, the University.
- to ensure the University’s compliance with the Funding Council’s Code of Audit Practice.
- to receive and review reports relating to audit prepared by the Funding Councils, National Audit Office, European Commission and other bodies, and to advise the Court as necessary.
- to make an annual report on the work of the Committee for submission to the Court and the Funding Council.

Last reviewed September 2014
AUDIT COMMITTEE

AUDIT COMMITTEE REMIT

To advise University Court in relation to its responsibilities for:

- proper financial management;
- the effectiveness of internal control and management systems;
- safeguarding the assets of the University and public funds;
- the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the University’s activities; and
- corporate governance and conduct of the University’s operations.

Membership

The normal membership of the Committee is six members. All members are independent, at least half drawn from the lay membership of University Court, whence also the Convener is drawn. Remaining members are co-opted with the approval of the Governance & Nominations Committee. The term of office for lay members co-opted to serve on the Audit Committee shall be in line with the period of co-option for members of Court as defined in Statute 9(2)(g).

In Attendance

Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee
University Secretary
Director of Finance
Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs
Internal Auditors
External Auditors
Other officers at the discretion of the Director of Finance

Secretary

Clerk to Court.

Meetings

The Committee shall meet 4 times in each session. One meeting each year will incorporate a private meeting of the Committee with the internal and external auditors without officers present.

Quorum

Three members shall constitute a quorum.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 30 September 2014.

Present: Mrs C Potter (Convener), Dr W Boyd, Professor K Leydecker, Dr A Reeves, Mr D Taylor, Professor G Mires

Apologies: Mrs S Krawczyk, Ms S Campbell, Mrs P Milne, Professor Luc Bidaut

In Attendance: Deputy Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development, Mrs Maggie Davidson, Dr Ian Scragg for Item 4

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 19 May 2014 were approved.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Statute 16 Policies

The University Secretary reported that no issues had been raised by the Scottish Government in respect of the University’s request to revise Statute 16. However, in the light of recent use of Statute 16, it was considered sensible for the management group, together with DUCU and HR, to reflect on its practical application and have the opportunity to refine the proposals accordingly.

Resolved: to support the approach proposed.

(2) HR Operational Plan

The Committee was advised that the SWOT analysis and the Operational Plan would be subject to its annual revision shortly and that certain items would be updated. Attention was drawn to the weakness identified within the Directorate in terms of low resilience, potential single points of failure and a heavy operational requirement that created challenges in terms of identifying resources to support strategic initiatives. The Committee was apprised that this had been addressed to some extent by a recent appointment to focus on supporting the aspects of University strategy which required HR input and that this appointment had made a significant difference with regard to the recent Biomedical and Life Sciences and Teaching Review Project.

It was noted that the Operational Plan was currently being updated and that this would be finalised after discussion at the HR Away Day and circulated to the Committee for comment thereafter.

Resolved: to provide the Committee with the updated SWOT analysis and Operational Plan.

(3) Promotion Procedure for Academic Staff

The Convener confirmed that the Promotion Procedure had been approved previously by the Committee subject to input from DUCU. It was noted that the procedure had been launched and that feedback from the academic community had been positive. Briefings and individual sessions had been held in support of the launch and these had been well attended. Gender data had been provided to Heads of College and Deans to enable them to be clear about the profile of their area/s of responsibility and in furtherance of the Athena Swan agenda. A process for considering mitigating circumstances had been introduced whereby individuals who considered that certain conditions (medical or other) may have disadvantaged their capacity to gain promotion had the opportunity to have their case considered by a panel of University officers. Panel members will have undertaken the University’s Equality & Diversity modules and be experienced in this area due to their involvement in a similar exercise which accompanied REF.
It was acknowledged that the criteria equalised the prospects for promotion for Teaching & Scholarship and Teaching & Research staff by removing the binary divide between teaching and research. Applications would be considered holistically against a set of expected behaviours. The individual member of staff would have the primary responsibility for submitting a persuasive and evidenced case for promotion and an evaluation by their Dean together with references will complete the case to be considered. This approach modernised the previous procedure which relied to a significant extent on nomination by Deans or other senior officers.

It was highlighted that the numbers of applications for academic promotion were not excessive which was reassuring in that the standards of excellence required for promotion appeared to be appropriately set. It was agreed that the outcomes of the process would require to be monitored carefully, particularly in relation to gender, and the procedure itself would be evaluated after use.

Resolved: to update the Committee on the progress of the new Promotion Procedure.

3. **HUMAN RESOURCES AND ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

   (1) **Organisational Change/Strategic Initiatives**

   The Committee heard details of the change process that had been undertaken in respect of the Biomedical and Life Sciences Undergraduate Teaching Review, which had previously been reported to Court at its Retreat. Members were pleased to note that the exercise had been completed without the need for any compulsory redundancies, which represented a satisfactory conclusion to the Review. 2.7 FTE posts in the new structure had not been filled due to applicants not meeting the criteria standards for the roles and the recruitment process for these vacancies was in progress at present.

   It was confirmed that a meeting was planned with DUCU which would draw upon the experiences from those involved in the Review as learning points for the future.

   Resolved: to arrange the meeting and compile a list of learning points that would be subsequently considered by the Committee.

(2) **Voluntary Severance Scheme**

   It was reported that all applications for Voluntary Severance had been considered by the Senior Management Team and in addition those applications that had been rejected had been subject to further review. Fifty-five applications had been approved; 34 had been rejected; 4 applications had been withdrawn and 7 had remained as informal enquiries, totalling 100. Of the 55 approved applications, 38 settlement agreements had been signed and, although 17 approvals remained to be finalised the Committee understood that on the basis of previous experience the risk of these individuals not completing acceptance of Voluntary Severance was low.

   A saving of £2.5m had been achieved for 2014/15, which exceeded the target for this period and £2.7m represented the year-on-year savings. It was acknowledged that this did not meet the saving of 80-120 academic posts discussed by Court and that further projects would be brought forward to achieve this objective. It was noted that the next projects were likely to relate to unfunded and underfunded research and that a Voluntary Scheme would be a component of the University’s Avoidance of Redundancy strategy for such projects.

   Resolved: to note the position.

(3) **Staff Survey**

   A report was made to the Committee on the progress that had been made to date and the proposed actions over the forthcoming period on five University level actions. The Committee considered that there could have been some interim communication in response to the Staff Survey results sooner. A member of the Committee who was also a member of a College, indicated that they felt there had been no noticeable actions taken in respect of the Staff Survey results. It was acknowledged that the priorities chosen to be addressed by individual Schools and Directorates might be different from those prioritised at University level and that a mechanism had been developed for gathering the various actions that had been taken at School and Directorate level in order that good practice could be shared across the University. The Committee reiterated that early
and regular communication, at least at 3 monthly intervals, was essential and recommended communication take place as early as possible.

In respect of the actions taken and proposed on Harassment and Bullying, the Committee felt that they should be supplemented by positive approaches actions, involving staff input would be more engaging, not least because the issues raised in the survey in that regard had been focused on a relatively small number of areas of the University where there had been known issues at the time. It was, however, accepted that the Dignity at Work and Study policy required updating and that senior management had agreed to work with DUCU on this agenda.

The action on raising the profile of Career Development within the structure of the University’s Objective-setting and Review process was welcomed and the Committee approved the proposed review after one year.

The Committee also considered that it was important that the project to review the University’s approach to workload management should be re-established following the departure of the Vice-Principal who had previously been leading it.

Resolved: to refer the matters of communication and progressing the projects to the Senior Management Team and ask for regular reports on progress to each meeting of the Committee.

(4) Pay Negotiations

The Committee heard that the national pay negotiations for 2014/15 were concluded and a 2% increase had been applied to the JNCHES single pay spine from 1 August 2014.

At local level, DUCU’s dispute with the University in response to prospective redundancies and targeted Voluntary Severance in connection with the Biomedical and Life Sciences Review had been formally withdrawn at the Local Joint Committee on 26 September 2014.

At national level the University has been notified of UCU’s intention to ballot members in pre-92 institutions over proposed changes to the pension scheme. The ballot was due to open on 6 October 2014 and close on 20 October 2014.

Resolved: to note the position.

(5) Living Wage

It was reported that senior management had agreed to discuss the Living Wage with Unison representatives. Members noted that at present JNCHES is working with the trade unions to explore HEIs’ practices across the sector on the use of pay points at the bottom of the scale, taking account of different weekly hours and the actual hourly equivalent rates of pay.

Resolved: to await the outcome of local and national discussions.

(6) Recruitment

A report was provided to the Committee illustrating equality data on recruitment activity for the year 2013/14 against the previous years.

Members commented that they would be interested in future reports in the categories of jobs into which the appointments were made, particularly in relation to gender and that they would also welcome a focus from management on the their conclusions and proposed actions arising from their analysis of the data. A member drew attention to the different recruitment markets the University utilised: national, international and local and the expectation is that diversity would be reflected differently in the distinctive markets. In accordance with the University’s strategic aim of being employer of choice the committee agreed that the goal of all recruitment activity should be to attract quality candidates.

Resolved: to provide conclusions and recommendations for action in future reports.
(7) Policy Development: Out of Hours Policy

It was explained to the Committee that over many years a culture had emerged, within the University, of Schools allowing undergraduate students access to premises and equipment, in some cases perhaps without having given full consideration to issues of security and health and safety. Management had identified that this practice posed a challenge in terms of the Duty of Care owed to staff, students and visitors. The Committee therefore was invited to discuss a new ‘Out of Hours Policy’ as a framework for focusing out of hours activities on core buildings with appropriate security cover. This would facilitate educational opportunities whilst minimising the risk to people. The proposal included a request for two additional campus security officers to manage the security aspects. Any exceptions to the terms of the policy would be subject to prior approval of Deans, Directors or the University Secretary as appropriate.

The Director of Estates and Buildings and College Secretaries will communicate the details of the policy to Deans and Directors.

Resolved: to approve the policy (annex).

(8) Organisational and Professional Development

The Committee was invited to discuss the OPD programme for 2014/15 in addition to the highlights of 2013/14 and the course attendance and engagement statistics provided. The programme was commended for its range of activities and clarification was given that consultation had taken place with Deans and Directors to ensure courses supported their Operating Plans and with the Research & Development Group to ensure the University’s commitments to research staff were fulfilled. This meant that there was a clear relationship between courses provided and the University’s strategic aims. It was noted that approximately 25% of staff attended at least one course in 2013/14 and the Committee encouraged even greater coverage. It was accepted that the training database did not capture all training delivered across the University and that development activities also took place within other units and at School/College level (for example in respect of professional registration).

The Committee congratulated the University for being shortlisted for a THE award along with St Andrews University for the cross-institutional mentoring scheme for early career researchers which had been developed collaboratively.

4. HEALTH & SAFETY

(1) Report from the Head of Safety Services

The Head of Safety Services referred to the Review commissioned in 2012 and conducted by an eminent Health & Safety consultant. Much work had been completed in response to the recommendations, but one particular issue had been that the University’s Health & Safety function was highly devolved and fragmentary in nature, which heightened the risk factors. To address this issue and achieve greater consistency the present network of 60 Health & Safety contacts was being reduced to 8-10 people which would improve the management and communication of Health & Safety in the institution. A core group of key individuals with health and safety responsibilities from each College and SASS were now meeting as a Group with the Head of Safety Services on a frequent and regular basis. Other measures being executed include the development of an on-line training package; a thorough inspection programme of University buildings and the expansion of a risk assessment database operated by the College of Life Sciences across the University.

In terms of health and safety performance statistics it was reported that the University was slightly better than the sector benchmark, but nevertheless ‘near miss’ statistics indicated that there was no room for complacency and that health and safety should remain an important focus for the institution.

The HSE report in 2013 emphasised that further attention should be given to overseeing and verifying the NHS statutory inspections of their safety critical equipment used by University employees and this had now been addressed.

In order to track understanding of health and safety policies and practice, a survey had been conducted which indicated an improvement over the previous time it had been carried out. It was clear, however, that there was a great deal more work to be done in this area and progress needed
to be accelerated. Management training for staff who were responsible for small groups (staff and students) was key; it was estimated that there were 500 people in people management positions within the University and the number who had already undergone training was detailed in the paper. The Head of Safety Services was commended for the amount of training carried out to date and the further training planned (including the new online training package referred to above).

A member queried the voluntary nature of the invitation to attend fire safety briefings in Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design and was advised that the Dean had indicated that all staff should attend. The Committee agreed that the requirement for Health & Safety training should not rely on the discretion of the Dean but be mandatory, monitored and tracked. It was considered essential that 1st year students should also have mandatory Health and Safety training.

It was reported that following the fire at Glasgow School of Art, the Crawford and Matthew buildings had been subject to a thorough survey (notwithstanding the installation over the last year of a new fire alarm system). The Fire Safety Officer had identified some further simple, cost-effective methods to address potential risks and the work identified was currently being prioritised by Campus Services.

Resolved: (i) to note progress made with training activities.
          (ii) to agree that the new online Health & Safety training should be mandatory and that compliance should be tracked and reported.

(2) Minute of the Health & Safety Sub-Committee held on 9 September 2014

It was noted that the minute reflected the issues discussed in the report from the Head of Safety Services, which had been extensively discussed by the Sub-Committee.

Resolved: to approve the minute.

5. HERA MAINTENANCE 2014

The Committee was advised that, once per year, staff were invited to submit details of their roles, if they felt they had changed substantially, to the Maintenance Procedure of the University’s job evaluation process, HERA. It was noted that the Dean or Director was required to verify the details of the information submitted for accuracy. Seventy-one submissions were received, 20 of which were regraded at a higher grade. Currently, pre-appeal interviews were proceeding with HR Officers who are also HERA job evaluators. Thereafter, appeals will be heard and the final report provided.

Resolved: to report to the Committee following completion of the process.

6. LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES

(1) Approved minute of the University/UNISON Joint Committee held on 9 May 2014.

Resolved: to approve the minute.

(2) Approved minute of the University/Unite Joint Committee held on 17 January 2014.

Resolved: to approve the minute.

(3) Approved minute of the University/DUCU Joint Committee held on 6 May 2014.

Resolved: to approve the minute.
Annex

Transforming the way we use our City Campus buildings and fulfilling our Duty or Care to staff, students and visitors

Background

1. We intend to become Scotland’s leading University whilst fulfilling our purpose to transform lives locally and globally.

2. In our journey to become Scotland’s leading university we must maximise the opportunities for staff and students to be creative, and to share and apply their knowledge. However, in doing so we must not lose sight of our Duty of Care to staff, students and visitors.

3. Our Duty of Care requires us to manage the risks to personal safety when staff, students and visitors are within our buildings, or present on our Campus. This has become a significant issue since in maximising learning and research opportunities for staff, students and visitors we are open 24/7 and 365 days per year. These risks therefore need to be considered in the context of the expectations of our students, staff and visitors in terms of the availability of facilities in a modern and ambitious University and our need not simply to maximize use of our key buildings for educational purposes but also in relation to our responsibility for ensuring that staff and students using our facilities are not exposed to unnecessary risk and have at all times access to support in emergency situations.

Current Position

Generally, building opening hours are 8:00am to 6:00pm Monday to Friday. For these hours Schools are responsible for students and should have robust emergency arrangements in place (eg first aid and fire).

The current resource level within Campus Security is 4 teams of 5. However with Holiday cover and absence this is normally 4 teams of 4. Outwith hours, one person has to be stationed at the Tower Building, one in CLS, one in DJCAD until 9pm and one in Dalhousie. Therefore if there is an incident someone has to leave one of these buildings. Presently, custom and practice within certain Schools has allowed undergraduate students to work unsupervised out of hours in several buildings:

a) DJCAD – despite one campus security officer (CSO) monitoring the entrance, there was a recent incident where a student avoided the CSO until the building was locked then started working with dangerous equipment overnight.

b) Fulton Building – No CSO staff presence in the building but 24hr access

c) QMB – No CSO staff presence in the building but 24hr access

d) OTI – No CSO staff presence in the building but 24hr access

The University Insurance Officer has advised that it is likely that this practice is not consistent with the University’s insurance policy, which would expect all undergraduate students to be supervised. In addition, by way of comparison, Abertay University has four teams of four operating out of hours for a much smaller Campus.

Proposal

1. During term time undergraduate students, and visitors by prior arrangement, will be given access to facilities at the hours stated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Opening Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching facilities within buildings</td>
<td>8am to 6.30pm, Mon to Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC Main Library</td>
<td>7:30am to 2:30am (Longer at peak periods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC Matthew Library</td>
<td>9:00am to 6:00pm, Mon to Fri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Given the current resource levels out of hours it would be proposed that all building outwith the Dalhousie and LLC should be closed to Undergraduates AND Taught Post Graduate students (U&TP Students) after 6.30pm. Evening classes and public events must be held in the Dalhousie Building (or the Tower?).

3. During vacations undergraduate students and visitors by arrangement will be given access to the Library & Learning Centre- see web site for details (Main Library 7:30am to 10:00pm, Mon to Fri and 9:00am to 10:00pm, Sat to Sun).

4. The Dalhousie Building will be used for evening and weekend lectures & classes (i.e. after 6.30pm Mon to Fri, and at the weekend by arrangement).

5. During term time after 6.30pm Mon to Fri and at the weekend, and at anytime during vacations, undergraduates and visitors on specific courses may be given access to buildings by their Dean of School when the following criteria are met:
   a) It is considered essential for their education and learning
   b) Equivalent resources are not currently available, and cannot be made available, in the Library & Learning Centre or Dalhousie Building
   c) They are supervised at all times by staff of the School in the first instance at a level determined by risk assessment
   d) Buildings have swipe card access control
   e) Building entrances are monitored by CCTV
   f) Fire exit doors are alarmed
   g) Prior approval of the University Secretary (or his nominee) has been obtained.
   h) Staff will be given access to buildings they work in according to their contract, and are required to follow the guidance in the staff H&S Handbook. The expectation is that staff will normally carry out their work in the period covered by the period between 8.00am and 6.30pm (with core hours generally being between 8.45am and 6.30pm Mon to Fri). Work outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.30pm must be agreed by their line manager. Lone working must be risk assessed in accord with Safety Policy Arrangement 8-2002.
   i) Research post-graduate students may be given access to buildings they work in 24/7 by formal agreement with their supervisor in the same manner as staff and are required to follow the guidance in the staff H&S Handbook. This access will be granted by their supervisor for study/research purposes only and may be withdrawn if the student abuses this privilege. Lone working must be risk assessed in accord with Safety Policy Arrangement 8-2002 with particular attention paid to laboratory and other practical work.
   j) If a member of staff or a post graduate student wishes to work out of hours they must ensure they have the necessary keys, staff card and if applicable intruder alarm code. They must also inform security of their presence in the building between the hours of 6.30pm and 8.00am, Mon to Fri and at the weekend.
   k) Deans and Directors are responsible for ensuring arrangements are in place for their staff, students and visitors to manage foreseeable emergencies such as fire, accidents and illness between 8.00am and 6.30pm, Mon to Fri. They are responsible for ensuring students are supervised appropriately
during these times and should consult with the Director of Campus Services to ascertain the level of supervision provided by Campus Security.

l) Campus Services Security patrols will be in place to manage foreseeable emergencies such as fire, accidents and illness from 6.30pm to 8:00am, Mon to Fri and at the weekend. This will be reviewed on a regular basis by the Head of Security to ensure adequate resources are available.

m) All staff and post-graduate students are required to wear their ID cards when working in buildings between 6:30pm and 8:00am Mon – Fri and at the weekend so that they can be easily identified by Campus Security patrols and other staff.

n) Students must carry their ID cards and be prepared to show them when asked. In some buildings they may be asked to wear them for security reasons.

Summary of Resource implications

Under this proposal all buildings other than the Dalhousie and Main Library open to Undergraduates and Taught Postgraduates will close at 6:30pm. There is no resource implication with this option.

1 Access control and CCTV to be extended to all building entrances which undergraduates have access to - starting with Crawford/Matthew Buildings, Fulton Building, Tower Building, Scrymgeour Building and OMS.

2 Security Control Centre to be established with CCTV monitors and alarms (fire, security, lift, freezer).

3 Security staff to be trained in first aid to a standard where they can use defibrillators and other emergency procedures eg Evac Chair, evacuation lifts, dealing with floods.

4 System to be introduced to record when staff, Undergraduate and Postgraduate students are working in buildings between 6.30pm and 8.00am, Mon to Fri and at the weekend.

5 CSO’s will be required to monitor the Emergency No 4141.

6 Two additional CSO’s would be required to patrol the Campus to enable a rapid response to any emergency which might arise.

7. Staff would be asked to work out of hours to supervise the students and CSO’s would only be called upon if there was an emergency.

At its meeting on 30 June the SMT agreed that, unless by special agreement (which required additional health, safety and security provision), only Main Library and Dalhousie should offer out of hours access to Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate students.

August 2014
APPENDIX 8

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS
(Minute 9(1))

1. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

The Senatus received a report from the Principal on issues arising from the most recent meetings of the Senior Management Team, the One-Dundee Board (formerly the Senior Staff Workshop) and the University Court.

The Principal introduced the report as the main item for discussion by the Senate and explained that it was important for members to understand the University’s current financial situation and to discuss its strategic implications in the context of the Transformation Agenda.

The Principal outlined the current budget forecast and noted that the expected £2.7 million deficit in 2014/15 itself represented a challenging target and would need continuing financial restraint in order to be achieved.

On the question of sources of income, the Principal noted that Scottish Funding Council (SFC) grants represented a relatively high proportion of the University’s current core funding and that there was no expectation that this income would increase in the medium-term, given the serious constraint on public sector spending.

The Principal went on to explain that while research funding had increased in recent times, the income generated was used for the purposes of carrying out that research and that while it did increase turnover (and while there was room for increasing the recovery of overheads) it was unlikely to make a significant contribution to the generation of an operational surplus.

Turning to a third source of income, in the form of unregulated student tuition fees, the Principal reported that poor performance in attracting enough overseas and rest of UK (RUK) students was both the main cause of the current deficit and the main source of income that could return the University to surplus. The Principal noted concern over the scale of the current deficit but pointed out that overcoming a budget deficit of this size was well within the capacity of the University if it attracted overseas and RUK students just as well as other similar institutions and that a return even to just the average income of the University’s benchmarked competitors would deliver a return to surplus.

The Principal reported that the University had started to move in the right direction to grow these sources of income and noted the substantial increase in the number of UK and overseas undergraduate students joining the University in 2014/15. Noting the relatively weak performance in overseas taught postgraduate recruitment, despite improvements to conversion rates, the Principal argued that income generation from unregulated tuition fees must continue to be a priority for the University.

The Principal then outlined the equally pressing need for reductions in both pay and non-pay costs as an integral part of the plan to return the University to surplus.

On the question of non-pay cost reductions the Principal explained that progress would be driven and maintained through the more efficient provision of academic support services, focussed business improvements, careful budget management, structural changes, hub and spoke delivery of professional services and a One-Dundee approach to systems and process reviews.

In relation to pay costs, Senate was asked to note that the reorganisation of biomedical science teaching in the Colleges of Life Sciences and Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing had been completed without the need for redundancies and that teaching was now being delivered under the new arrangements.

Senate was also asked to note that while the Voluntary Severance Scheme had delivered the necessary savings for the current year, the target of reaching a total of 80-120 posts remained challenging over the next two years. The Principal explained that action to control and eliminate the deficit required co-ordinated action, on a number of fronts, to reduce costs and increase marginal income towards the top end of the agreed target range.
The Principal reported that the Senior Management Team, at its recent away day, had carried out a detailed analysis of the academic and financial health of each School and that this assessment will be used, along with recommendations from the Review of the University’s Structure, to develop proposals for rapid and substantial cost reductions to produce savings both in the current year and beyond.

The Principal reassured members of the Senate that while the current financial situation had highlighted the need for decisive action on cost-reduction and income-generation the University continued to thrive, deliver on its core mission and press on with the Transformation Agenda. The Principal concluded his report by underlining the fact that the University was not in crisis but that if action were not taken now to build a more secure and sustainable financial position then crisis would inevitably follow.

In response to a question the Principal reported that the One-Dundee approach had been adopted by all of the Senior Management Team who were determined to take positive action to provide both a solution to the current financial challenges and to the deeper historical problem of failing to produce surpluses for investment or for building reserves.

The Principal was asked why the University’s income from unregulated tuition fees was so much lower than other similar institutions. The Principal, while acknowledging that the reasons were complex, supported the explanation put forward by the Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) and others, that very low numbers of undergraduate students from overseas and the lack of a private-partnership, foundation level entry for such students had contributed to the University’s poor performance in this area.

It was argued that a more dynamic, international approach would improve performance but that occasionally some aspects of the University’s outward facing communication, such as the website, could appear unprofessional. However, members acknowledged that recent marketing activity, such as Test-Drive Dundee, had proven to be very effective and that investment over the last two years in Admissions & Student Recruitment was having a positive impact.

Members of Senate acknowledged the need to seek cost-reductions across a range of activities but sought to emphasise the role of Senate in safeguarding excellence so as to help avoid the potential dangers of compromising on the quality of the University’s academic programmes and student experience.

Senate went on to discuss the need to properly value and reward excellence in teaching, to ensure staff see the direct benefits of their efforts to support increases in income and decreases in costs, to encourage an entrepreneurial approach in opening up new markets for student recruitment, to use social media more effectively in support of recruitment and to make more use of the University’s students and graduates as ambassadors for the institution. Members recognised that improving the University’s performance in unregulated student recruitment represented a key priority for academic staff.

The Principal concluded that turning the University’s finances around would require sustained effort and focus but that the necessary changes were ones that the University could implement while still maintaining a commitment to the Transformation Agenda. The Principal argued that the University must have the resolve to stop activity that was not economically viable or sustainable and instead have a clear focus on excellence with impact.

The Principal thanked members for their positive contributions to the debate.

**The Senatus decided:** to note the Principal’s report.

2. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received communications from the Meeting of 9 June 2014 and the Court Retreat on 12 September 2014.

The principal introduced the report by highlighting the discussions surrounding the progress of the CMDN and CLS Biomedical Teaching Project and the conclusion of the externally facilitated review of Court Effectiveness.

The Secretary explained the purpose of the review and asked Senate to note that planning for a similar review of the effectiveness of Senate was now underway and any members who wished to participate as part of a Steering Committee for the Review were asked to register their interest with the Clerk to Senate in the first instance.

**The Senatus decided:** to note the report.
3. LEARNING & TEACHING COMMITTEE

The Senatus received a report from the Learning & Teaching Committee meeting of 30 September 2014.

The Vice-Principal (Learning & Teaching) introduced the report and asked Senate to note, in particular, the Student Partnership Agreement that had been agreed between the University and the Students’ Association so as to help align the priorities of the University and the manifesto commitments of the DUSA Executive and set out a programme of agreed activity on shared concerns such as improvements to assessment and feedback. The Vice-Principal reported that the Agreement had been approved by both the Committee and the Student Representation Council.

The Senatus decided: to approve the report.

4. RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The Senatus received a report from the Research Committee meeting of 6 October 2014.

The Vice-Principal (Research) introduced the report and asked Senate to note, in particular, that the University would receive an embargoed notification of its Research Excellence Framework outcome on 16 December 2014 in advance of public release on 17 December. The Vice-Principal reported that the financial implications of the results would not emerge from the SFC until sometime after the initial notification.

The Vice-Principal also asked Senate to note that the recent Senior Management Team away-day had included an analysis of research strengths at School level and that further reviews would now take place based on these discussions. In response to a question, the Vice-Principal explained that unfunded and under-funded research activity formed an important part of the analysis and would not be addressed as a stand-alone project.

The Vice-Principal reported that the Committee would be leading discussions on the need to develop interdisciplinary research capabilities in order to respond to EU research funding initiatives on a more competitive basis.

The Vice-Principal also drew attention to the Committee’s support for encouraging the wider use of the PURE research information management system.

The Senatus decided: to approve the report.

5. PROFESSORES EMERITI

The Senatus decided: subject to the concurrence of Court, to confer the title of Professor Emeritus upon the following:

   Professor Samuel Cadden
   Professor Allan Gillespie
   Professor David Miller
   Professor Roger Soames

6. ANNUAL QUALITY REPORT TO SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL (SFC)

The Senatus received the Annual Quality Report for 2013/14 as submitted to the Scottish Funding Council.

The Senatus decided: to endorse the Report to Court.
APPENDIX 9

WELFARE AND ETHICAL USE OF ANIMALS COMMITTEE
(Minute 11)

A meeting of the Welfare and Ethical Use of Animals Committee was held on 1 August 2014.

1. PROJECT LICENCE APPLICATIONS

   Three applications for project licences were reviewed. All were approved, with some amendment being necessary to three of them.

2. THE BROWN REPORT

   The Committee received a further progress report from the Director of Biological Services on the actions that had been approved at its meeting in January.

3. REPORT FROM THE NAMED VETERINARY SURGEON

   The NVS reported that he had inspected some anaesthetic machines and had found that a few of them had been modified by the users. Any serious faults had all now been rectified and a standard operating procedure for the use of these machines was to be posted prominently in all the resource units.

4. REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF BIOLOGICAL SERVICES

   The Director of Biological Services reported that, since the last meeting, three applications for amendment to existing project licences had been approved by the fast-track procedure and a more substantial amendment had been approved by the full Committee. Three applications for new licences (to authorise continuing programmes of work) had also been approved.

5. APPROVAL OF DOCUMENTS

   A revision to the document describing the operation of the Committee was approved. An expanded document describing local best practice was also approved.