

UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE**UNIVERSITY COURT**

A meeting of the University Court was held on Monday 22 February 2010.

Present: Mr JR Milligan (in the Chair), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Mr M Arnott, Mr WI Ball, Professor Emerita A Burchell, Mr R Burns, Mr D Cathcart, Dr J Lowe, Dr LI McLellan, Dr H Marriage, Professor GJ Mires, Dr AM Roger, Mr EF Sanderson, Mr A Smith (President of the Students' Association), Professor J Taylor, Mr IDM Wright

In Attendance: Vice-Principal Professor J Calderhead, Chaplain (Item 39), Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Human Resources, Director of Information Services & Deputy Secretary, Director of Strategic Planning, Mr R Isles & Clerk to Court

Apologies: Ms A Newton

38. PROFESSOR MICHAEL PITTILO MBE

The Principal informed the Court of the sad death of Professor Pittilo, Principal of the Robert Gordon University in Aberdeen, and paid tribute to Professor Pittilo's dedication to and passion for his work. Court members joined with the Principal in expressing their condolences to Professor Pittilo's family.

39. PRESENTATION BY THE UNIVERSITY CHAPLAIN

The Court received a presentation from the University Chaplain, Revd Dr Fiona Douglas, in which she explained her role and that of the Chaplaincy team, which comprised a number of honorary chaplains ministering to a range of different faith groups represented in the University community. She discussed the range of activities in which the team was engaged: from the large-scale ceremonial occasions (graduations, baptism, weddings and funerals) to the more personal pastoral support role, for both staff and students of the University. She touched also on the educational activity of the Chaplaincy in promoting a greater understanding of the world's religions, and beyond this her role in bridging gaps between communities to bring people together.

Court members were grateful for the opportunity to hear about the Chaplain's work, and there was discussion about whether she should be invited to provide Court with a regular report. It was agreed that the Chaplain would discuss this matter further with the Principal. It was also suggested that the Chaplain might have a useful role to play in the University's early dispute resolution processes.

40. MINUTES

The Court decided: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 14 December 2009.

41. **MATTERS ARISING**(1) Voluntary Severance (Minute 25)

In response to a request from Court members at the meeting on 14 December 2009, the Director of Human Resources provided updated information on the impact of the scheme according to a range of diversity criteria. Members provided comments on how such information might best be presented in future equality impact assessments undertaken by the University.

(2) University Statutes: Statute 9 – The Court (Minute 32)

The Court decided: to confirm the decision, taken at its previous meeting, to approve amendments to Statute 9 – The Court (Appendix 4 to the minutes of the meeting on 14 December 2009), noting:

- (i) that Senate, at its meeting on 10 February 2010, had endorsed the amendments; but
- (ii) that the amendments were now subject to the approval of the Privy Council and any subsequent changes it may require.

(3) Communications from the Senatus Academicus: Rectorial Election (Minute 33)

The Court noted the results of the rectorial election and recorded its congratulations to the winner, Brian Cox. The President of the Students' Association reported that he had recently been in contact with Mr Cox, who was excited about his new position and keen to play an active role on Court.

42. **CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS**

The Chairman reported on the visit members had paid earlier that day to the University's Archive, Records Management & Museum Services. This had provided an informative and fascinating insight into the archive collections of the University. He invited those members who had been unable to participate in the visit to contact the Archivist to arrange separate viewing.

The Chairman also reflected on the success of the Discovery Day, which had taken place in January, and likewise commended it to members who had been unable to attend.

43. **PRINCIPAL'S REPORT**

The Court received a report from the Principal (**Appendix 1**). In introducing the report, the Principal discussed the current financial position and the challenging budget-setting round for 2010-11. He provided an assessment of the English and Scottish funding landscapes, pointing, in particular, to the lack of clarity in the Scottish context. The University would receive its funding letter from the Scottish

Funding Council (SFC) in late March 2010. He also commented on the personal remarks made by Professor Bernard King (Principal of the University of Abertay Dundee) supporting the introduction of a graduate tax, noting that, whatever one's own view, it was important that there was a wide-ranging debate of higher education funding, and Professor King's remarks had at least served to bring the issue out into the open.

The Principal noted also the progress being made with the V&A at Dundee project. A charitable company had now been established, Design Dundee Ltd, and a chair for the company's board would be announced in due course.

He highlighted a number of recent achievements: the award to Professor Roland Wolf of an OBE in the New Year Honours list; the news that the University had come 8th in a recent UK-wide survey of the student experience; and also that the University's pharmacology research had been named best in the world according to citations. The Court welcomed the achievements and also noted the recent agreement to develop closer articulation links with Adam Smith College in Kirkcaldy.

Members sought clarification on the progress of the strategic review, as well as on how plans emanating from the review would be discussed with and communicated to staff. In response, the Principal made clear that the review was being driven by the need to support and promote excellence, and hence a number of important strategic decisions required to be fully explored. To go into detail about the process at this stage would therefore be premature, he said, although he did understand the concerns of the staff in the University who would be eager to know what form the proposals coming out of the review would take. Once proposals crystallised there would be an opportunity for wider debate across the institution.

44. FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 1 February 2010 (**Appendix 2**). The Director of Finance presented the report, noting in particular the approval by the Committee of a treasury management policy, and its endorsement of a set of Financial Regulations which would now be considered by the Audit Committee at its meeting on 9 March 2010.

In reference to the capital bid to the Wellcome Trust/Wolfson Foundation for a Centre of Translational & Interdisciplinary Research, the Director reported that a full capital proposal would be presented both to the Committee and to the Court if the bid were to prove successful.

It was noted that estates matters were now being considered by the Committee, and that a means for reporting on important estates issues had been agreed with the Director of Campus Services. At its recent meeting, the Committee had discussed two important issues: Carbon Management and Space Management. In relation to the former, it was noted that the University's commitment to a reduction of 20% in its carbon footprint was in line with that of other higher education institutions.

The Court decided: to approve the report.

45. **UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE SUPERANNUATION SCHEME**

Note: Vice-Principal Professor Calderhead, the University Secretary and the Director of Strategic Planning, as employer-nominated trustees of the scheme, withdrew from the meeting for this item. Mr Cathcart, an employee-nominated trustee and member of the scheme, declared his interest as a member of Court but remained present.

The Court received a report from the Pensions Review Group, which the Court had established at its meeting on 15 June 2009 to consider future options for the development of the scheme (UoDSS). As part of its work, the Group had consulted the University's pensions advisers, KPMG, who had brought invaluable expertise from outside the University. The Convener of the Group, Mr Sanderson, presented the report, highlighting in particular the University's recognition of its pension scheme as an important part of the employment package for its staff, and emphasising that the University wished to preserve it as such. Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that the costs of the scheme had risen significantly in recent years and it would become increasingly difficult to maintain the current benefits without additional funding.

The Director of Finance provided additional background information as well as the financial context within which the University had to operate the scheme. In particular, he noted the sizeable deficit in the scheme's funding, the risks of which fell entirely on the University. He noted contributing factors to the deficit such as increased longevity and the volatility in the stock market, which had brought poorer investment returns. The Group had realised that action was necessary to address the increasing costs and rising deficit, and as part of its discussions had proposed a broad range of possible options for negotiation with the trustees of the scheme. The Court was therefore invited to delegate to the Directors of Finance and Human Resources the authority to initiate such negotiations with the trustees alongside further discussions with employee representatives such as the relevant campus unions.

Having noted his conflict of interest, Mr Cathcart made a statement to the Court. This was an emotive issue that could potentially affect the retirement provisions of large numbers of the University community, he said, and he also pointed to the industrial action which had arisen as a result of proposals to change similar schemes at institutions in England.

The Court decided: to approve the delegation to the Directors of Finance and Human Resources of the authority to negotiate with the trustees of the scheme and to consult with appropriate trades unions and scheme members.

46. **CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL: CENTRE FOR ANATOMY AND HUMAN IDENTIFICATION**

The Court considered a capital proposal for refurbishment of the mortuary and embalming facilities located at the Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification (CAHId). Following a report by HM Inspector of Anatomy for Scotland, the Centre had been required to update its facilities in order to retain its licence under the Anatomy Act 1984. The proposal had received the endorsement of the Finance & Policy Committee at its meeting on 1 February 2010, although the issue of the future

provision of anatomy teaching to medical undergraduates was raised. Since that meeting, the School of Medicine had engaged in discussions on potentially moving away from dissection in the delivery of anatomy training, although the outcomes of these discussions were not yet known. Nevertheless, the requirements of CAHId for embalmed bodies would remain, in particular in the teaching of Life Sciences programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate level and in developing research activity with the Institute for Medical Science & Technology (IMSaT). The University therefore had an ongoing requirement for refurbished mortuary and embalming facilities, irrespective of any curriculum decisions within the School of Medicine.

In discussion, members sought clarification on the funding for the project, and also asked officers to ensure that refurbishment proposals of this nature and size were presented in a similar fashion to full proposals for new capital developments.

The Court decided: to approve the proposal that the existing allocation of £1.5m be released to the project, noting that:

- i. any additional expenditure would be met by external sources; and
- ii. the final specification would be dependent on the outcomes of further discussions with the School of Medicine.

47. REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 1 February 2010 (**Appendix 3**). One member raised an issue relating to the procedure adopted in the current year for nominations to the Committee. In contrast to previous years, the Senior Management Team had taken the decision that, given the financial context, senior managers would be asked to nominate deserving cases for consideration and that professors and equivalently graded staff would not be invited to submit self-nominations. Whilst Court understood why the Senior Management Team had taken the decision that it had, it was suggested that the revised procedure should have been communicated to relevant staff to ensure a transparent and open process.

The Court decided:

- (i) having noted the explicit consideration given by the Committee on a long-standing basis to issues of gender pay equity, to request that it extend such consideration also to ethnic background; and
- (ii) noting the comments raised in discussion, to approve the report.

48. GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

The Court received a report of the meeting of the Committee on 2 February 2010 (**Appendix 4**).

The Court decided:

- (i) to approve the recommendation that Dr Janet Lowe be appointed, with immediate effect, as

Chancellor's Assessor, noting that the Chancellor had provided his consent;

- (ii) to approve the recommendation that Mr Keith Swinley be appointed to the Court as a co-opted lay member in accordance with Statute 9(1)(l) for a period of four years from 1 March 2010;
- (iii) to approve the recommendation that Mr Ralph Adams be appointed to the Court as a co-opted lay member in accordance with Statute 9(1)(l) for a period of four years from 1 March 2010 or as soon as possible thereafter, subject to the formal agreement of Mr Adams; and
- (iv) otherwise, to approve the report.

49. **STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK: AIMS 6 & 7**

The Court received a report from the Director of Strategic Planning, which outlined the progress being made by the University against the targets set in the Strategic Framework in the two areas of support services' responsiveness and the University's long-term financial sustainability. The Director highlighted four main issues arising from the report: i) that the efficiency of the support services in financial terms was high, although their effectiveness needed to be explored; ii) that income per academic staff fte was improving, although comparator institutions were improving at a faster rate; iii) that the University was now grasping the nettle in relation to the management of its energy consumption and teaching space, although considerable work remained to be done; and iv) that there was good evidence that performance management was now fully embedded for the professoriate and would be rolled out to other staff groups, with the process renamed 'objective-setting and review'.

50. **SPIN-OUT, SUBSIDIARY & OTHER ASSOCIATED COMPANIES**

The Court received and noted a summary report detailing the status of the University's spin-out, subsidiary and associated companies.

51. **NOTICE OF ELECTION: CHAIRPERSON OF COURT**

The Court received notification that nominations had opened for the post of Chairperson of Court, which would become vacant at the end of July 2010, when John Milligan's second term as Chairperson would come to an end. Nominations would close at 4pm on Monday 15 March 2010, following which a ballot would be held in the case of more than one nomination being received.

52. **COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS**

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Senate on 10 February 2010 (Appendix 5).

The Court decided: to note the report and, in particular, the date of the November graduation ceremony.

53. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

The Court received reports from the following:

Human Resources Committee	2 February 2010	Appendix 6
Ethical Review Committee	Annual Report	

The Court decided: to approve the reports.

APPENDIX 1

PRINCIPAL'S REPORT (Minute 43)

Financial Situation

As the minutes of the Finance & Policy Committee meeting on 1 February 2010 show, the University is currently tracking broadly in line with budget with a forecast year-end position of a small surplus of £0.1m. The budget-setting process for 2010-11 has also now begun, with Colleges and SASS Directorates receiving guidance on the assumptions to be used in constructing their budgets. The overall objective is to achieve a surplus of 1%, but this will be a challenging target.

Court members will no doubt have seen the extensive coverage in the press on the funding situation for English universities, in particular Lord Mandelson's announcement of reductions amounting to 12.5% of HEFCE funding over the next three years. There has also been widespread reporting of the measures being taken at many English institutions to address the situation. In Scotland, on the other hand, the draft budget from the Scottish Government indicates a modest increase in funding to the sector of 2.1% for 2010-11, although there has as yet been no word on the funding situation beyond April 2011. How the Scottish Funding Council will translate this 2.1% into the allocations contained in its grant letter to universities in March is unclear; so too is the outlook for 2011-12 and beyond, although the consensus is to expect funding reductions in the medium term. Much of this will depend on the outcomes of the Westminster elections, and thereafter on those of the Holyrood elections, and the current political climate only serves to cloud the issue and foment anxiety.

As the opening salvo of his assumption of the convenership of Universities Scotland, the Principal of the University of Abertay Dundee, Professor Bernard King, recently called for the introduction of a Graduate Tax. Whatever one's position on such a tax, this is a welcome contribution to the debate on sustainable and effective funding for Scottish universities. In the midst of such pressure on the public purse, a re-evaluation of how Scotland pays for its higher education is both timely and necessary.

Strategic Review

The Senior Management Team held an extended meeting to listen to Heads of College explain the progress being made in Schools to develop proposals to implement the excellence agenda and generate financial improvements. In many parts of the University, Deans have been engaging readily with this issue and plans are reaching maturity, but elsewhere there is still work to be done to embrace the review fully and to think strategically about strengthening excellence. The immediate priority is to intensify dialogue within Colleges in preparation for a further extended SMT meeting in March, with a view to presenting formal draft proposals to Court, possibly at its meeting in April 2010.

V&A at Dundee

Members will have seen in the press that a site has now been announced for this project. The museum will occupy a prime location at the heart of the Dundee waterfront and extending out into the River Tay. An architectural competition has been launched, which is attracting world-class entries. The University continues to play a pivotal role in the project along with its partners: University of Abertay, Dundee City Council, Scottish Enterprise and the Victoria & Albert Museum itself.

Discovery Day 2010

The seventh annual Discovery Day took place on 15 January, when thirteen new professors shared their ideas with the rest of the University community. The day was a fascinating and breathtaking journey through a wide variety of subjects from climate change to breast cancer, and outsourcing to primary education. The new professors presenting their ideas were: Mike Bonell, David Coates, John Connell, Andy Evans, Tim Hales, Kevin Hiom, Brian Hudson, Catia Montagna, David Muir Wood, Yolande Muschamp, Chris Reed, Roger Soames and Chris Spray. A booklet is being produced summarising their talks.

Pete Downes
Principal and Vice Chancellor

Major Grants & Awards

- **£1.5m renewal from Cancer Research UK to the Division of Molecular Medicine** for Exploiting Tumour Suppressor Gene Pathways to Develop New Therapies for Cancer
- **£1m from the Medical Research Council to Professor Annie Anderson** for BeWEL: The Impact of a Body Weight and Physical Activity Intervention on Adults at Risk of Developing Colorectal Adenomas (Joint with Universities of Aberdeen, Stirling and Strathclyde and University College London)
- **£0.7m from the Wellcome Trust to Dr Mikael Bjorklund** for Regulation of Cell Size in Multicellular Organisms (A Research Career Development Fellowship)
- **£0.2m from European Commission Framework 7 Cooperation Programme** to Mr Andrew Allan (UNESCO Centre) for GENESIS (GENeric European Sustainable Information Space for environment)

Learning & Teaching News

- The University has launched a new MSc in Business Intelligence.
- The University of Dundee and Adam Smith College in Kirkcaldy have signed an agreement to forge closer links between the two institutions. This will see closer links established between both institutions, and is intended to increase the number of students from Adam Smith College who go on to achieve a degree at Dundee
- The University was ranked 8th in the UK (and 1st in Scotland) in the recent Times Higher Education student experience survey, scoring particularly highly in the categories of teaching & learning and facilities.

People & Prizes

- Professor Roland Wolf, director of the Biomedical Research Institute, was rewarded for his services to science with an OBE in the New Year's Honours list
- The three final-year students from Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design - Nick Coccozza, Kirsty Macfarlane and Heather Brennan - will take up placements with German companies after being chosen as among the 10 best entrants to a competition run by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) challenging them to create a modern fairy tale.
- PhD student, Geoff Wood, took the best student project prize at the Green Energy awards in Edinburgh before Christmas.
- Dr Maheshwar Pauriah, an MD student at the University, received the American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics Presidential Trainee Award for a paper submitted for inclusion at the upcoming ASCPT Annual Meeting in Atlanta in March.
- Dundee has been selected for the third year in four as the one of the seven most intelligent communities around the world by influential US think tank, the Intelligent Community Forum.
- The University of Dundee has been ranked top in the world for the impact of its research in pharmacology.

APPENDIX 2

FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE (Minute 44)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 1 February 2010.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor J Calderhead, Dr J Lowe, Dr LI McLellan, Mr JR Milligan, Mr A Smith (President of the Students' Association), Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: Mr R Burns, University Secretary, Director and Deputy Director of Finance, Director of Campus Services, Director of Strategic Planning and Clerk to Court.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 23 November 2009.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (Minute 2(1))

The Director of Finance indicated that a paper would be presented to Court at its meeting on 22 February 2010.

(2) Investment Management Tender (Minute 2(2))

The Director of Finance reported that, following a competitive tender process, Barclays Wealth had been re-appointed as the University's endowment investment managers.

(3) Treasury Management Policy (Minute 7)

Resolved: to approve the policy, considered at the Committee's meeting on 23 November 2009, in its entirety, and present it to Court for information (annex).

3. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 5

The Director of Finance presented the management accounts for the period to 31 December 2009. The accounts showed that the University was tracking broadly in line with budget. Confirmation had been received from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) that there would be no clawback in respect of nursing recruitment. The final figures relating to the January 2010 student intake would be known in two to three weeks' time.

The Director notified the Committee that there were difficulties in achieving the disposals target of £1.5m for the year. This was mainly as a result of delays in the planning process associated with one set of disposals and protracted negotiations on another. It was possible that these would be completed before the year end, but it was looking increasingly unlikely. Given the current market conditions, the general outlook in relation to other planned disposals was not positive.

Capital expenditure was currently in line with the capital plan, and the University was also trying to accelerate expenditure in line with the capital funding brought forward by the SFC. Working capital movements continued to be negative (£2.1m), mostly from the unwinding of research projects, and this would be monitored closely.

4. BUDGET SETTING: 2010-11

The Committee received for information a paper that had been circulated to College Offices and to Directors of Student & Academic Support Services to assist them in drafting their budgets for 2010-11. The overall objective was to achieve a budget with an operating surplus of 1%. The Committee considered the assumptions upon which the budget setting would be based and judged them to be reasonable, given the economic situation. It was the Committee's opinion that the budget-setting process was robust.

5. STRATEGIC REVIEW

The Principal provided the Committee with an update on progress with the review. An extended Senior Management Team would consider the initial results of School analysis; and an update would be conveyed to the Court at its meeting on 22 February 2010. It was hoped that more detailed proposals would be presented to the Court at its meeting on 26 April 2010. It was expected that the University would begin the implementation process of the proposals, subject to Court approval, before the end of the academic year. In conclusion, the Principal pointed to the strategic focus of the exercise on excellence and impact.

6. STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK – AIMS 6&7

The Director of Strategic Planning presented a report which set out the University's progress in meeting the targets set out in the Strategic Framework to 2012, as measured by (key) performance indicators. The report focussed on the responsiveness of the support services and the University's long-term financial sustainability. The Director highlighted four key issues: i) the financial efficiency of the support services was high, and ongoing work on process reviews would help to strengthen effectiveness; ii) academic productivity was improving, although perhaps not as fast as the University's competitors; iii) space and energy management remained areas requiring significant improvement, and the estates team was working hard to address these issues; and iv) the system of performance management for the professoriate and comparable grades had now been fully embedded, with the future challenge being to spread the system, now renamed 'objective setting and review' to the wider University community.

In discussion the Committee considered the relationship between the cost of support services and the productivity of academics. The low cost of support services could be masking the fact that some academics might be overly involved in administrative tasks.

The Committee discussed at some length the importance of space management, and in particular the efficient use of teaching rooms. The introduction of central timetabling for teaching would facilitate a more even spread of use throughout the week. It was acknowledged that individual behaviour would need to be modified, but also that a will was emerging to tackle this issue comprehensively. A Space Management Group had been constituted and this would help in challenging space requirements around the institution.

Resolved: to ask the Director of Campus Services to bring a paper to the next meeting setting out next steps and appropriate objectives to address the issue of space management and energy efficiency.

7. ENDOWMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report of the Sub-Committee's meeting on 23 November 2009.

Resolved: to approve the report.

8. FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

The Director introduced draft regulations. These represented a high-level set of principles, beneath which detailed procedures and individual policies would sit. Members were invited to submit detailed comments to either the Deputy Director of Finance or the Clerk to Court. The Committee welcomed the document as an overarching framework, and provided some general comments on improving phraseology in certain areas. It was proposed that the document should be considered by the Audit Committee at its meeting on 9 March 2010, following which it would be presented to Court for final approval.

Resolved: to endorse the regulations for approval by the Court, following their consideration by the Audit Committee.

9. ESTATES BUSINESS

(1) Carbon Management Programme

The Director of Campus Services reported on steps being taken to reduce the University's carbon footprint. The Principal, soon after taking office, had signed the University up to a

Carbon Management Programme with the Carbon Trust, with the objective of cutting the University's footprint by 20% over the next five years. Aside from the environmental impact of such reductions, the programme will save the University money and contribute to its reputation among its stakeholder groups. In implementing the programme the University would need to change its attitude to energy management and to assist in this, targets for carbon reductions would be set for Colleges and Directorates. A message from the Principal to all staff would be distributed in the near future.

- Resolved:**
- (i) to endorse the sentiment of the Principal's message to staff; and
 - (ii) to ask the Director of Campus Services to update the Committee on progress annually.

(2) Capital Project Progress

The Director provided the Committee with progress reports on each of the current capital projects (Matthew and Crawford buildings, Scymgeour building, and Fulton building), all of which were making good progress. He also reported on three recently completed projects (Institute for Sport & Exercise, Dalhousie building and the main library extension) whose final account projections had reduced by almost £0.5m in total. The Committee congratulated the Estates Team on achieving such a favourable outcome from the project closure negotiations.

10. **CAPITAL DEVELOPMENTS**

(1) Centre for Anatomy & Human Identification

The Director of Finance presented a paper which sought the Committee's approval for a capital proposal to refurbish and extend the Centre for Anatomy & Human Identification (CAHId). Approval was being sought for the expenditure of £1.5m on behalf of the University, which was already contained within the capital plan. It was noted that HM Inspector for Anatomy, who licences the facility, identified in 2007 that the existing University mortuary facilities located within the Medical Sciences Institute were substandard and required substantial renovation to raise the facilities to acceptable operating standards

The paper set out a number of options ranging from maintaining the status quo to a new build development. Given the current constraints on capital, the focus of the capital plan was on statutory and backlog maintenance, and as a consequence an allocation of £1.5m has been made to refurbish these facilities.. Above this level the scale of the project would be limited by the level of external funding that could be attracted. The current preferred options were the refurbishment of the existing facilities plus an extension to permit embalming using a new method or the development of a new mortuary to enable embalming using the new method (called the Thiel process). The Committee raised a number of issues in discussion, including the early discussions with the School of Medicine on the future provision of anatomy teaching, the potential for increased income and links to research being carried out at the Institute for Medical Science and Technology (IMSaT). Officers were requested to clarify certain aspects of the paper before the paper was submitted to the Court for full and final approval.

- Resolved:** to recommend to Court that it approve the proposal, subject to a maximum spend on behalf of the University of £1.5m.

(2) Centre for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research

The Committee received a paper which reported that a grant proposal had been submitted to a Wellcome Trust/Wolfson call for large capital projects. The potential capital project which was the subject of the bid would create a Centre for Translational & Interdisciplinary Research on land adjacent to the Wellcome Trust Biocentre and the James Black Centre. The total projected cost of the proposal was £12.5m, and the bid to Wellcome Trust/Wolfson was for £5m which, if successful, would need to be matched by the University, the remainder (£2.5m) to be raised from external sources. It was stressed that, at this stage, the University was not seeking approval for the project, since this would depend on the success of the grant proposal. If it were successful, the Committee and the Court would have the opportunity to consider a full capital proposal. The University would learn in May 2010 whether the bid had been successful. Members noted the position.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY

1. INTRODUCTION

This document sets out the policies, practices and objectives of the University's treasury management activities, as approved by the Finance and Policy Committee.

The University defines its treasury management activities as:

- The management of the University's investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks.
- The University regards the successful identification, monitoring and control of risk to be the prime criteria by which the effectiveness of its treasury management activities will be measured. Accordingly, the analysis and reporting of treasury management activities will focus on their risk implications for the University.
- The University acknowledges that effective treasury management will provide support towards the achievement of its business objectives. It is therefore committed to the principles of achieving value for money in treasury management, and to employing suitable comprehensive performance measurement techniques, within the context of effective risk management.

This policy is specific to cash management and therefore excludes the management of the permanent endowment assets which is managed separately by the Endowment Committee which is a sub-committee of Finance and Policy Committee. Any cash balances held by the University in relation to the permanent endowments assets and the capital associated with any expendable endowments will be managed as part of the overall University's cash balance and will therefore be covered by this policy and not the Endowment Committee.

The core principles the University will follow when investing money are:

- to make deposits secure;
- to ensure they have sufficient liquidity for their daily demands;
- finally, to produce the highest return, once the first two considerations have been met.

No treasury management activity is without risk and therefore defining the level of acceptable risk is essential. The treasury policies are designed to minimise the risk of capital loss but cannot eliminate it entirely.

2. RISK MANAGEMENT

The Director of Finance will design, implement and monitor all arrangements for the identification, management and control of treasury management risk, will report at least annually on the adequacy/suitability thereof to the Finance and Policy Committee, and will report to the Finance and Policy Committee, as a matter of urgency, the circumstances of any actual or likely difficulty in achieving the University's objectives in this respect. In respect of each of the following risks, the arrangements which seek to ensure compliance with these objectives are set out in Schedule A.

2.1 Credit risk management

The risk of failure by a counterparty to meet its contractual obligations to the University under an investment, borrowing, capital, project or partnership financing, particularly as a result of the counterparty's diminished creditworthiness, and the resulting detrimental effect on the University's capital or current (revenue) resources.

The University regards a key objective of its treasury management activities to be the security of the principal sums it invests. Accordingly, it will ensure that its counterparty lists and limits reflect a prudent attitude towards organisations with whom funds may be deposited, and will limit its investment activities to the

instruments, methods and techniques listed in Schedule A: 1.1. The list will be reviewed on an ongoing basis by the Director of Finance and at least annually by the Finance and Policy Committee.

The Finance Director will have the power to temporarily remove (and then to reinstate) any counterparty if any current issues should result in doubts over that counterparty's ability to repay funds.

2.2 Liquidity risk management

The risk that cash will not be available when it is needed, that ineffective management of liquidity creates additional unbudgeted costs, and that the University's business objectives will be thereby compromised.

The University will ensure it has adequate though not excessive cash resources, borrowing arrangements, overdraft or standby facilities to enable it at all times to have the level of funds available to it which are necessary for the achievement of its business objectives. Funds available to the University are listed in Schedule A: 1.2.

2.3 Interest rate risk management

The risk that fluctuations in the levels of interest rates create an unexpected or unbudgeted burden on the University's finances, against which the University has failed to protect itself adequately.

The University will manage its exposure to fluctuations in interest rates with a view to containing its interest costs, or securing its interest revenues while maintaining the security of the invested funds. It will achieve this by the prudent use of its approved financing and investment instruments, methods and techniques, primarily to create stability and certainty of costs and revenues but at the same time retaining a sufficient degree of flexibility to take advantage of unexpected, potentially advantageous changes in the level or structure of interest rates.

2.4 Exchange rate risk management

The risk that fluctuations in foreign exchange rates create an unexpected or unbudgeted burden on the University's finances, against which the University has failed to protect itself adequately.

The University will manage its exposure to fluctuations in exchange rates so as to minimise any detrimental impact on its budgeted income/expenditure levels. The University will normally only retain funds in currencies to the extent that payments are due to be made in these currencies. This will be reviewed quarterly and any currency balances surplus to requirement will be transferred into sterling at the best rate achievable at that time. Further details are set out in Schedule A: 1.3.

2.5 Refinancing risk management

The risk that maturing borrowings, capital, project or partnership financings cannot be refinanced on terms that reflect the provisions made by the University for those refinancings, both capital and current (revenue), and/or that the terms are inconsistent with prevailing market conditions at the time.

The University will ensure that its borrowing, private financing and partnership arrangements are negotiated, structured and documented, and the maturity profile of the monies so raised are managed, with a view to obtaining offer terms for renewal or refinancing, if required, which are competitive and as favourable to the University as can reasonably be achieved in the light of the market conditions prevailing at the time.

It will actively manage its relationships with its counterparties in these transactions in such a manner as to secure this objective, and will avoid over reliance on any one source of funding if this might jeopardise achievement of the above.

2.6 Legal and regulatory risk management

The risk that the University itself, or an organisation with which it is dealing in its treasury management activities, fails to act in accordance with its legal powers or regulatory requirements, and that the University suffers losses accordingly.

The University will ensure that all of its treasury management activities comply with its statutory powers and regulatory requirements.

2.7 Fraud, error and corruption, and contingency management

The risk that the University fails to identify the circumstances in which it may be exposed to the risk of loss through fraud, error, corruption or other eventualities in its treasury management dealings, and fails to employ suitable systems and procedures and maintain effective contingency management arrangements to these ends.

The University will ensure that it has identified these circumstances and has taken the appropriate action, including the provision of appropriate and adequate internal controls and insurance cover. These activities will be reviewed on a regular basis as part of the internal audit plan.

2.8 Market risk management

The risk that, through adverse market fluctuations in the value of the principal sums the University borrows and invests, its stated treasury management policies and objects are compromised, against which effects it has failed to protect itself adequately.

The University will seek to ensure that its stated treasury management policies and objectives will not be compromised by adverse market fluctuations in the value of the principal sums it invests, and will accordingly seek to protect itself from the effects of such fluctuations.

2.9 Covenant breach risk

The risk that the University fails to meet terms set by lenders which leads to default of loans and the resulting withdrawal of credit facilities.

The University will monitor its loan covenant compliance on an ongoing basis appropriate to the risk. The Director of Finance will report annually to Finance and Policy on this as part of the annual treasury management report. The University will seek to minimise the security requirements of new debt and maximise the opportunity of the existing debt portfolio.

3. DECISION MAKING AND ANALYSIS

The University will maintain full records of its treasury management decisions, and of the processes and practices applied in reaching those decisions, both for the purposes of learning from the past and for demonstrating that reasonable steps were taken to ensure that all issues relevant to those decisions were taken into account at the time.

4. APPROVED INSTRUMENTS, METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

The University will undertake its treasury management activities by employing only those instruments, methods and techniques detailed in Schedule A and within the limits and parameters approved by the Finance and Policy Committee.

5. ORGANISATION AND SEGREGATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

The University considers it essential for the purposes of the effective control and monitoring of its treasury management activities, for the reduction of risk of fraud or error, and for the pursuit of optimum performance, that these activities are structured and managed in a fully integrated manner, and that there is at all times clarity of treasury management responsibilities. The principle on which this will be based is a clear distinction between those charged with setting treasury management policies and those charged with implementing and controlling these policies, particularly with regard to the execution and transmission of funds, the recording and administering of treasury management decisions, and the audit and review of the treasury management function.

The Director of Finance will ensure that there are clear written statements of the responsibilities for each post engaged in treasury management and the arrangements for absence cover. These are set out in Schedule B. The Director of Finance will also ensure there is proper documentation for all deals and transactions, and that procedures exist for the effective transmission of funds.

6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

The Finance and Policy Committee will as a minimum receive an annual report, covering:

- the strategy and plan to be pursued in the coming year;
- the performance of the treasury management function during the year, including the reasons for and the effects of any changes to the strategy set at the beginning of the year;
- the performance of any external service providers.

Further details are set out in Schedule B.

7. ACCOUNTING AND AUDIT ARRANGEMENTS

The University will account for its treasury management activities in accordance with appropriate accounting practices and standards, and with statutory and regulatory requirements in force for the time being.

The University will ensure that its auditors and any other bodies charged with regulatory review have access to all information and papers supporting the activities of the treasury management function as are necessary for the proper fulfilment of their roles, and that such information and papers demonstrate compliance with external and internal policies and approved practices.

8. CASH AND CASH FLOW MANAGEMENT

The Director of Finance will have responsibility for the cash management of the University and its subsidiaries as defined under this policy.

The Treasury Manager will prepare a weekly funds report detailing bank balances, deposits and borrowings and provide commentary on significant transactions.

Cash flow projections will be prepared on a regular and timely basis, and the Finance Director will ensure these are adequate for the purposes of monitoring compliance with treasury management practice on liquidity risk management.

9. INVESTMENTS

The Director of Finance together with the Director of Research and Innovation Services (RIS) will have responsibility for the management of investments in spin-out companies. The Director of Finance and the Director of RIS will report annually to Finance and Policy on the University's interests in spin-out companies, associates and subsidiary companies.

The Director of Finance will have responsibility for the management of all other investments. The investments in Government bonds inherited from the mergers of Duncan of Jordanstone Art College and Northern College will be redeemed as they fall due.

10. MONEY LAUNDERING

The University is alert to the possibility that it may become the subject of an attempt to involve it in a transaction involving the laundering of money. Accordingly, it will ensure that staff involved in this are properly trained and fully aware of the University's Fraud Prevention Policy.

11. STAFF TRAINING AND QUALIFICATIONS

The University recognises the importance of ensuring that all staff involved in the treasury management function are fully equipped to undertake the duties and responsibilities allocated to them. It will, therefore, seek to appoint individuals who are both capable and experienced and will provide training for staff to enable them to acquire and maintain an appropriate level of expertise, knowledge and skills. The Director of Finance will recommend and implement the necessary arrangements.

12. USE OF EXTERNAL SERVICE PROVIDERS

The University recognises the potential value of employing external providers of treasury management services, in order to acquire access to specialist skills and resources. When it employs such service providers, it will ensure it does so for reasons which will have been submitted to a full evaluation of the costs and benefits. It will also ensure that the terms of their appointment and the methods by which their value will be assessed are properly agreed and documented, and subjected to regular review. It will further ensure, where feasible and necessary, that a spread of service providers is used to avoid over reliance on one or a small

number of companies. Where services are subject to formal tender or re-tender arrangements, the University's Procurement Policy will always be observed.

Where external service providers are appointed with the responsibility for day-to-day treasury matters the University will retain full responsibility for the safeguarding of its funds and setting the treasury strategy.

13. BANKING ARRANGEMENTS

The University recognises the importance of ensuring effective control over its bank accounts. All funds due to the University are deposited in accounts with the University's main bank unless otherwise approved by the Director of Finance. Banking arrangements will be subject to periodic review.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY

1. RISK MANAGEMENT

1.1 CREDIT AND COUNTERPARTY LISTS

The University regards a prime objective of its treasury management activities to be the security of the principal sums it invests. Accordingly, it will ensure that its counterparty lists and limits reflect a prudent attitude towards organisations with whom funds may be deposited

The Director of Finance is responsible for monitoring the credit standing of approved counterparties. Where he/she has reason to believe that a counterparty's credit standing is or may become impaired he/she should apply lower limits than set out in this schedule or cease to use them. Any change to the counterparty list should be advised to the Finance and Policy Committee.

All counterparties must have a minimum short-term rating of F1 from Fitch and A1 from Standard & Poor's. These ratings will be reviewed at least quarterly for institutions in which funds are held and before any new funds are deposited. In addition to credit ratings, relevant information from financial advisors and the media will be taken into consideration.

With the exception of Royal London Cash Management, no deposits should be committed for a period in excess of 12 months.

As the Universities main facility is a rolling credit facility the policy is to minimise this facility whilst maintaining sufficient funds are always available to meet any short term liquidity needs. In the event that there are funds to deposit, the Director of Finance is authorised to deposit surplus funds of the institution with any of the organisations listed below to ensure achievement of the best net returns available.

The approved counterparty list is as follows:

<u>Counterparties</u>	<u>Limits</u>	<u>Account Type</u>	<u>Time Period</u>
University's main bankers – Royal Bank of Scotland	£20 million	Special interest bearing account	Overnight
		Fixed term deposits	Up to 12 months
University's main bankers – Barclays	£10 million	Fixed term deposits	Up to 12 months
Royal London Cash Management	£5 million	Certificates of deposit & interest bearing bank accounts	Up to 2 years

Royal London Cash Management (RLCM)

RLCM are permitted to invest in deposits and certificates of deposit with banks and building societies on an approved Credit List with a maximum limit of £1 million in any one name. RLCM may also invest an unlimited amount in UK Treasury Bills. The Credit List includes UK and non-UK Banks which must have a minimum Standard & Poor's short-term credit rating of A1. RLCM are permitted to invest up to £2 million for periods of up to 2 years; in practice, the majority of deposits are for 3 months.

RLCM acts as agent for the University. The Portfolio of investments is the property of the University and HSBC Bank acts as Custodian of the Portfolio holding all instruments or documents of title on behalf of the University. All cash transactions between the University and RLCM are credited or debited to Royal London Cash Management Client Trust Settlement Account with HSBC Bank on a same day basis. RLCM are not liable for any fraud or insolvency of the Custodian (HSBC) or our own Bankers therefore there is a low risk in respect of monies transferred to and from the Client Trust Settlement Account.

The University maintains a detailed list of RLCM transactions which is summarised for the Director of Finance as part of the weekly funds report.

The limits set out above may be amended only with approval of the University's Finance and Policy Committee.

1.2 LIQUIDITY

The University maintains an effective cash and cash flow forecasting and monitoring system which identifies the extent to which the University is exposed to the effects of potential cash flow variations and shortfalls on a daily basis.

The University currently has access to the following borrowing facilities.

Notice Period	Source	Funding Type	Facility Limit	Interest Rate	Review Date
2-Day Access	Barclays plc	Revolving Credit Facility	£25 million	Base + 0.22%	Jan 2012
Instant Access	Barclays plc	Overdraft	£9 million	Libor + 1.25%	Feb 2010
2-Day Access	Royal Bank of Scotland	TMRC Credit Facility	£8.5 million	Libor + 1.25%	Jun 2014

As the Universities main facility is a rolling credit facility the policy is to minimise this facility whilst maintaining sufficient funds are always available to meet any short term liquidity needs. This is need is met through holding funds within the current/overnight account with the University's main banker (Royal Bank of Scotland) and through the following Instant Access deposit facility.

Notice Period	Source	Funding Type	Minimum Total Deposit Level	Facility Limit
Instant Access	Royal London Cash Management	Certificates of Deposit	£1 million	Maximum deposits held: £5 million

1.3 EXCHANGE RATE EXPOSURE POLICY

The University's policy is to minimise exposure to exchange rate fluctuations. The University aims to conduct all transactions in GBP as its base currency and the currency which reflects the vast majority of its costs base. There will however be exceptions, such as EU research contracts, whereby the University will need to conduct transactions in other currencies.

In 2008/09, the University received the following in foreign currency:

Euros	£8.2 million
US Dollars	£0.8 million
Other currencies	£0.1 million

The University does not operate any currency hedging arrangements. This is primarily due to and the nature of many of these contracts that makes it difficult to predict the amount and timing of receipts with the necessary level of certainty. The University does maintain Euro and US Dollar accounts and where possible these will be used to match payments and receipts.

The main currency risk is within the area of research and commercial research contracts. The University has in place a policy (Schedule C) to monitor such contracts on an ongoing basis and thereby aim to minimise any adverse currency exposure.

Currency receipts, other than Euros and US Dollars, are converted into sterling upon receipt. Deposits of Euros and US Dollars are retained where appropriate to cover anticipated currency payments. The balances on these bank accounts are reviewed on a quarterly basis and any currency in excess of £500k plus known commitments is then translated into GBP.

The Director of Finance is authorised to buy and sell currencies with any of the organisations listed below.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Limits</u>
University's Bankers	\$10 million Euro 5 million
Other UK Clearing Banks and approved counterparties (see 1.1)	\$5 million Euro 3 million
Financial Brokers (Registered by the FSA)	\$5 million Euro 3 million

The limits set out above may be amended only with approval of the Finance and Policy Committee.

1.4 REFINANCING

In the event that the University need to either renew existing borrowing facilities or obtain new facilities, the Director of Finance will report to the Finance and Policy Committee to explain the basis of any such requirement. Once approved in principal the Director of Finance, along with the University's financial advisors, will conduct an appropriate process with potential funders to secure the best terms for the University. Any arrangements are subject to final review and approval by the Finance and Policy Committee as defined in the Schedule of Delegation.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY

ADMINISTRATION

1. TENDERING

The Director of Finance will review regularly the quality and cost of banking services and if deemed necessary will seek Finance and Policy Committee's approval for a tender exercise in respect of these services.

The tender process will be that normally followed by the University, contained within its Financial Regulations and Procurement Policy. The Finance and Policy Committee is responsible for the appointment of the service provider on the recommendation of the Director of Finance.

2. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

The benchmark for interest earned on self-managed funds will be:

Euros	Euro base-rate
US\$	US base-rate
£ - under £500k	UK base-rate less 0.5%
£ - over £500k	average 7 day LIBID

Performance reports will show funds held, interest earned and comparison to benchmarks.

3. ORGANISATION AND SEGREGATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE

- To agree to University's borrowing strategy.
- Approval of and consideration of amendments to the University's treasury management policy and practices.
- To review borrowing requirement and approve borrowing facilities.
- To receive and review the annual treasury report and any interim reports as deemed necessary.

The Director of Finance will provide an annual treasury report which will cover the following:

- Commentary on treasury operations for the year.
- Cash flow compared with budget and commentary on variances.
- Annual financial strategy for the next financial year.
- Proposed amendments to the treasury management policy statement.
- Matters in respect of which the treasury management policy statement has not been complied with.
- Analysis of currently outstanding loans, deposits and investments by instrument, counterparty, maturity and interest rollover period.

3.2 DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

The Director of Finance is authorised, subject to the provisions of the policy statement, to:

- Recommend the treasury management policy and practices for approval, reviewing the same regularly and monitoring compliance.
- Receive and review management information reports and to provide at least annually a treasury report to Finance and Policy Committee.
- Review the performance of the treasury management function and promote best value reviews.
- Ensure the adequacy of treasury management resources and skills, and the effective division of responsibilities within the treasury management function.
- Recommend the appointment of external service providers.
- Approve the deposit of surplus funds with counterparties other than overnight with the University's main bankers or Royal London Cash Management.

- Ensure the revolving credit facilities are operated within the limits agreed by the Finance and Policy Committee.
- Operate foreign bank accounts to the extent that they are necessary to facilitate the operational activities of the University.

3.3 FINANCIAL CONTROLLER

The Financial Controller will:

- Receive and review weekly fund reports.
- Manage treasury management resources and skills, and the effective division of responsibilities within the treasury management function.
- Supervise treasury management staff.
- Identify and recommend opportunities for improved practices.
- Authorise the execution of transactions in accordance with loan covenants and University payment policy procedures.
- Provide cover for the Treasury Manager.

3.4 TREASURY MANAGER

The Treasury Manager will:

- Execute transactions.
- Adhere to agreed policies and practices on a day-to-day basis.
- Maintain relationships with third parties and external service providers.
- Prepare and maintain systems documentation relating to the treasury function.
- Monitor cash flows on a daily basis.
- Submit management information reports to the Director of Finance as required.
- Prepare weekly fund reports

TREASURY MANAGEMENT POLICY

The Treatment of Currencies in Research Projects.

A number of research projects within the university are funded in foreign currencies – mainly Euros, but also US dollars, and the occasional other currency. These can be either grants or contracts.

In order to give PIs improved information, RCFO will produce budgets in sterling on the basis of the exchange rate prevailing at the date RCFO sets up a code for the project.

In order to make sure that PIs have up-to-date information about the remaining budget, budgets will be recalculated regularly to take into account movements in the exchange rate. This will be done at the then prevailing rate of exchange when either of the following happens:

- Invoice or grant claim prepared by RCFO
- Remittance received from funder

RCFO will also recalculate the budget at other times to make sure that it is restated at least once a quarter. The PI and his/her administrator(s) will be informed of any budget recalculations and will be responsible for staying within the recalculated budgets. Clearly currency movements are outwith the control of the PI or the University but, as the grant/contract is currency limited, we must remain within the total currency allowed. This will also ensure that claims are maximised in the event of positive movements.

There will be a recalculation at the point the final claim/invoice is prepared. The PI will be required to resolve any problems with over/under spends up to the sterling value of the final claim/invoice. It is recognised that the settlement of the final claim/invoice for some of these projects (especially European Commission funded projects) can be very late. So long as the project is within budget at the point the final claim/invoice is prepared, any subsequent exchange rate movement up until the date the final payment is received will be dealt with centrally.

The above will also apply to fixed price contracts which are priced at or above FEC. Where a fixed price has been set **below** FEC, the default position is that any positive currency movement will be used to off-set the FEC shortfall.

Where the PI is being asked to stay within a lower budget as a result of adverse movements, the overall principles should be the same as those relating to management of pay inflation constraints:

- Where possible, savings should be made from direct cost items to offset the reduced budget, for example staffing gaps during the period of the grant or an under-spend on non-pay budgets.
- If it is not possible to avoid exceeding the recalculated budget, then the College / School should review its other income sources to see if it possible to make up this shortfall elsewhere.
- If this is not possible, then the over-spend would need to be taken into the income and expenditure account of the College / School.

APPENDIX 3

REMUNERATION COMMITTEE (Minute 47)

A meeting of the Remuneration Committee was held on 1 February 2010.

Present: Mr Richard Burns (Convener), Mr John Milligan, Dr Janet Lowe.

In attendance: The Principal (for part of the meeting); other Officers also attended parts of the meeting to advise on specific items.

1. The Committee met to conduct a review of non-clinical Professorial and equivalently graded staff salaries.
2. Salary increases in addition to the nationally agreed settlement were agreed as follows:

<u>College</u>	<u>2009/10</u>
	£
Art, Science & Engineering	9,000
Arts & Social Sciences	5,000
Life Sciences	11,000
Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing (non-clinical)	2,000
Student & Academic Support Services	6,000
Principal and Vice-Chancellor's Office	9,000
Principal and Vice-Chancellor	-

3. A total of £42,000, (cf £41,800 in 2008) was distributed selectively to 20 individuals from the eligible group of 171 members of staff. In reaching decisions on this matter, the Remuneration Committee took note of the current economic climate and the restraint demonstrated by the Principal, Secretary and Heads of College in being very selective with the nominations coming forward to the Committee. In addition, relevant college and support services salaries over the last five years, issues of gender equity and University sector comparators were also taken into account. The Committee adopted a highly selective approach, also taking account of the level of pay increases resulting from national negotiations over recent years.
4. Approval was given for a number of 'in-year' decisions which had been taken with the authority of the Principal and, where appropriate, the Chair of Court or another Court member.
 - (i) One case of Voluntary Severance which required the approval of the Remuneration Committee was approved.
 - (ii) An enhanced salary level, of an additional £5,000, was agreed during the year for a member of staff in the College of Life Sciences in recognition of outstanding contribution made over the last year.
5. The Committee was reminded that under the 'Schedule of Delegation' as approved by the University Court, the Committee had the responsibility for reviewing honoraria payments made to Deans and other members of staff. Having considered this, the Committee agreed that it was not appropriate to increase these payments at this time but also agreed that these payments should continue to be reviewed by the Committee at future meetings.

APPENDIX 4

GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE
(Minute 48)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 2 February 2010.

Present: Mr JR Milligan (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Rector Mr CJ Murray, Professor RJ Abboud, Mr WI Ball, Mr R Burns, Dr J Lowe, Mr IDM Wright

In Attendance: University Secretary and Clerk to Court

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 12 October 2009.

2. MATTERS ARISING

Election of the Chairperson (Minute 7)

The Committee considered a draft notice of election for inclusion in the papers for the Court meeting on 22 February 2010. The Committee noted that, whilst official notification of the result of the election would be made known via Court papers, members would informally be made aware of the result immediately following the ballot count.

Resolved: to approve the draft notice, subject to clarification as above.

3. PROSPECTIVE COURT MEMBERS

(1) Immediate Vacancies

In respect of the two current vacancies (replacements for Drs Rolland and Goligher), the Committee considered the suggestions that had been made by Court members in accordance with the procedures approved at its meeting on 26 October 2009. A shortlist of preferred candidates had been compiled and three of these had been invited to the University to meet with the Principal, the Secretary and, in one case, also with the Chair of Court. The Committee received a report from the Secretary on the outcomes of these meetings. There was a robust discussion of the most appropriate means for considering candidates for these two vacancies.

- Resolved:**
- (i) unanimously to recommend to the Court that, subject to the candidate's agreement and in accordance with Statute 9(1)(l), Mr Ralph Adams be appointed as a co-opted lay member of Court for a period of four years from 1 March 2010 (see annex for CV);
 - (ii) to ask the Principal, Secretary and Chair of Court to meet with a second candidate, subject to the candidate's agreement;
 - (iii) to ask Dr Lowe and Mr Wright to meet with the same second candidate and with a third candidate, who had already met with the Principal, Secretary and Chair of Court, with a view to making a recommendation to the Committee on whether either would be suitable as a new Court member; and
 - (iv) to defer further consideration of two other preferred candidates to such time as the process for identifying candidates for forthcoming vacancies took place (Minute 3(2) below refers).

(2) Forthcoming Vacancies

The Committee briefly considered suggestions from members of staff and students of the University as well as early responses to an advertisement appearing in the local and national press.

- Resolved:**
- (i) to endorse two suggestions, in particular, for further consideration; but
 - (ii) to agree to revisit at a future meeting all suggestions and expressions of interest in the identification of suitable candidates for forthcoming vacancies; and
 - (iii) to endorse the recommendations from the University Secretary relating to the procedure to be adopted for forthcoming vacancies. This included full consideration of all suggestions and expressions of interest with a view to compiling a shortlist of preferred candidates to be invited to attend an information event at the University, followed by interviews, where appropriate.

4. **RECTOR**

The Committee discussed whether the incoming Rector, to be elected on 11 & 12 February 2010, should become a member of the Committee. It also considered what the procedure was for identifying the Rector's Assessor given the statute amendments relating to that post which were approved at the meeting of Court on 12 December 2009.

- Resolved:**
- (i) before recommending to the Court the membership of the Rector on any particular committee, to invite the incoming Rector to identify those committees on which he wished to serve; and
 - (ii) to ask officers to discuss the role of Rector's Assessor with the President of the Students' Association.

5. **CHANCELLOR'S ASSESSOR**

The Committee discussed the position and role of the Chancellor's Assessor.

- Resolved:**
- (i) to recommend to the Court that the post of Chancellor's Assessor should be reserved to a distinguished and long-serving senior existing member of the Court; and consequently
 - (ii) to recommend to the Court, subject to the concurrence of the Chancellor, that Dr Janet Lowe be immediately appointed to the position of Chancellor's Assessor.

6. **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST**

The Clerk to Court informed the Committee that the University had received a request for information relating to the expenses of individual Court members in exercise of their duties as Court members. Prior to disclosure, he would contact members to confirm the accuracy of expenses to be disclosed.

7. **NEXT MEETING**

- Resolved:** to meet on Monday 17 May 2010 at 11am, noting, however, that an additional meeting might be scheduled in the meantime.

APPENDIX 5

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS (Minute 52)

1. PRINCIPAL'S REPORT

In his introduction to the report the Principal drew particular attention to the development of the V&A at Dundee project, noting that there had been a recent, very successful press launch. A charitable company, Design Dundee Ltd, had been established to drive the project forward and an independent chairperson was being sought. The next event was to be a meeting with the Finance Minister at Holyrood to share the developing business plan.

On the items in the appendix to the report, attention was drawn, in particular, to the University's ranking (8th in the UK and 1st in Scotland) in the Times Higher student experience survey; to Roland Wolf's OBE and to Geoff Wood winning the best student project prize at the Green Energy awards. In the latter connection, the Principal noted that the University planned to reduce its carbon footprint by 20% over the next three years and that he would be communicating to staff and students on this issue in the near future.

The Senatus decided: to note the report.

2. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received a communication from the meeting of the University Court held on 14 December 2009.

The Senatus decided: (i) on paragraph 2 to endorse to the Court the amendments to Statute 9;

(ii) for the rest, to note the report.

3. STRATEGIC REVIEW

The Senatus received two papers and a cover note which had been presented to the last meeting of the Court setting out the academic and financial contexts to the Strategic Review. The paper on the academic context encapsulated the Principal's vision for the future development of the University and the paper on the financial context projected the likely implications for the University of the expected reduction in public spending via a series of possible scenarios ranging from the status quo to a 15% reduction in funding.

In his introduction to the papers the Principal emphasized the necessity for the University to work strategically from clear principles when facing these challenging financial circumstances. The main aim, at this meeting, was to enable Senate to express its views for the benefit of the Court when it came to make crucial decisions at a later date.

In the course of an extensive discussion a range of views were expressed and questions raised about the strategic review, its possible outcomes and the implementation of its recommendations:

- (1) whether, given the potential severity of the financial outlook, retaining the aim of achieving a 3% surplus was sensible;
- (2) that it was difficult to comment on the papers because they were largely thematic and, due to the stage the review was currently at, lacked detail and specific outcomes;
- (3) that there was some unease about the strategic planning process in the University and that there was a need to ensure that the uncertainties associated with the review did not lead to a hiatus in operational decision-making;
- (4) there was no indication of the specific mechanisms envisaged for the translation of the "themes" into actions;

- (5) in emphasising excellence in research and/or teaching is there a danger of uncoupling the synergistic relationship between these two activities and of not recognising the continued appropriateness of the teaching/research model of certain disciplines;
- (6) there was an acknowledgement that the financial scenarios, in particular at the upper extremes, were extremely challenging with the potential to seriously weaken the sector but that teaching quality should be protected;
- (7) the perception was expressed that the documents, in particular the academic context, was rather internally-focussed and should pay more attention to the external environment; they lacked analysis of the University's own particular niche in the sector: what sort of University were we and/or wished to be;
- (8) that it was crucial for the development of strategy for the underlying data to be sufficiently detailed and accurate;
- (9) whether the impact of the recent low pay award changed the financial projections positively;
- (10) that there were weaknesses in defining excellence in the context of teaching and in particular the criteria for judging quality?;
- (11) how can the University compete nationally with the 'big' players in future when a possible scenario may be that there are fewer and larger universities?;
- (12) if the University devolves the implementation of strategy down to a local school/discipline level, how do we deal with potentially differential outcomes?;
- (13) one of the University's defining characteristics is its breadth which is not necessarily a strength; devolution of decision making may encourage a 'silo' mentality rather than encouraging the drive towards greater interdisciplinarity and interdependence;
- (14) the fundamental issue is what is to happen to those areas not considered to be excellent and, in that context, the process of making decisions should be entirely open and transparent;
- (15) the current importance of interdependence was stressed and cutting off elements risked damage to the whole. The point was made that it was unrealistic to attempt to achieve the levels of cuts implied in the more extreme scenarios and that a more realistic alternative would be to abandon the notion of surplus, aim to break even and acknowledge the possibility of running some form of budget deficit.

In response to the issues raised the Principal reiterated his view that a surplus was a requirement for investment and for long-term academic and financial sustainability and that the 3% figure was an SFC recommendation. The financial position in general lacked clarity as a result of the upcoming elections in the UK and Scotland and that made action difficult but it was apparent that a reduction of 12.5% over three years for the English universities was unlikely to improve.

The thematic emphasis of the discussion papers was largely a result of the stage the Strategic Review had reached and, in any case, it was vital for decisions and recommendations to be made as low down the structure as possible where the Deans and their academic communities could take proper cognizance of external benchmarks and performance indicators as well as the context of particular disciplines.

On the concern about excellence in research or teaching, the fundamental issue was Dundee remaining one of the five research intensive universities in Scotland and continuing to deliver high quality teaching in a research intensive environment. In that context the Principal indicated that he expected to see greater differentiation between universities in future and that Dundee should make a virtue of its position outwith any particular grouping. Taking Edinburgh as a comparator, Dundee was 40% of its size but was capable of being as good or better in particular areas; Life Sciences here was half the size of Edinburgh's but earned twice the income per head. In order to deal with hard times it would be most helpful to share a common vision and purpose.

On the management of strategy, the Principal stressed the iterative nature of the process. The SMT sets the parameters and the thematic issues (top-down) and the Schools develop their interpretation of those issues in the context of their academic disciplines (bottom-up); those outcomes then became part of an iterative process leading to possible amendment of the SMT's parameters and issues.

Quite how quickly this process could move was acknowledged to be affected by the homogeneity or otherwise of response from Schools and the need to apply consistent scrutiny and challenges to those responses across and between Schools and Colleges.

The Principal also acknowledged that it was likely that there would have to be fewer staff: the level would be gauged from the recommendations of the Strategic Review which had yet to be reached. While such losses could be achieved through a range of means he could not, at this stage, rule out the possibility of redundancies. He also stated that in no circumstances would he countenance running deficits since that would result in the University losing control of the decision-making process and would run counter to the terms of the University's Financial Memorandum with the Funding Council.

While the future was challenging and difficult not everything was negative; interesting ideas were arising from schools and it was vital for staff to pull together since without that commitment little was achievable.

- The Senatus decided:**
- (i) to note the Principal thanks to members for their contribution to the discussion; and
 - (ii) to forward the views expressed to the Court.

4. NOVEMBER GRADUATION

The Senatus received a paper from Dr N Laker, Clerk to Court.

Summer 2010

The table below shows timings and School allocations for the graduation ceremonies in June 2010. In 2009 the volume of guests attending garden parties was particularly large, and given concerns about health & safety issues and the potential difficulties in obtaining requisite licences, it has become necessary to introduce an additional ceremony to create a more even spread and to reduce total graduands for any single day to around 700. The ceremonies will therefore begin on Tuesday 22 June 2010.

	Date and Time	Colleges	Schools	Estimated Nos
1	2.30pm Tuesday 22 June	CASS	Humanities Graduate School of NRLPM Law	471
2	10am Wednesday 23 June	CASS CASE CASS	Accounting and Finance Architecture Social & Environmental Sciences	376
3	2.30pm Wednesday 23 June	CASS	Education, Social Work & Community Education Psychology	308
4	10am Thursday 24 June	CASE CLS	Engineering Physics and Mathematics Life Sciences Teaching & Research	384
5	2.30pm Thursday 24 June	CASE	Computing DoJ College of Art & Design	309
6	10am Friday 25 June	CMDN	Dentistry Medicine	382
7	2.30pm Friday 25 June	CMDN	Nursing & Midwifery	440

Winter 2010

Following successful representation from a number of Schools and with the encouragement of Senate, it has been agreed that 2010 will see the first winter graduation ceremony. The intention is that this will provide the opportunity for masters and PhD graduands in particular as well as postgraduate diploma graduands to attend a ceremony. PG Diploma students, in contrast to UG Diploma students, have hitherto not been eligible to attend. It is anticipated that between 200 and 300 students would make use of the ceremony.

The ceremony will take place on Wednesday 17 November 2010 at 2.30pm in the Caird Hall, to be followed by a reception at DUSA. Precise details will be known nearer the time, but the ceremony will be similar to the summer graduations; it is hoped to be able to confer an honorary degree, too.

The Senatus decided: to approve the report.

5. **RECTORIAL ELECTION**

The Senatus noted: that at close of nominations there were three candidates:

Brian Cox
Robin Harper
Nikolai Zhelev

Note: Since the meeting of Senate on 10 February, Brian Cox has been elected to serve as Rector for 3 years with immediate effect.

APPENDIX 6

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE (Minute 53)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 2 February 2010.

Present: Dr J Lowe (Convener), Professor R Abboud, Professor A Anderson, Mr D Cathcart, Mr I Leith, Dr H Marriage, Dr A Rogers

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Human Resources, Deputy Director of Human Resources, Mr Wesley Rennison, Planning Officer (for Item 4), Mr Ajit Trivedi, Equality and Diversity Officer (for Item 7)

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to amend the minute to record that Dr Rogers was present at the last meeting of the HR Committee on 4 November 2009 and apologies were received from the University Secretary; otherwise to approve the minute.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Voluntary Severance Scheme (Minute 3)

The Committee noted the report that was circulated to Court providing final figures in respect of the Voluntary Severance Scheme.

Although as requested by Court, Impact Assessments had been carried out for all approved cases, data relating to all enquiries still had to be sourced. As this information had not been collected at the outset, individual files needed to be accessed and due to the numbers involved this was proving problematic.

The Committee considered that the most important impact assessment related to outcomes; given the resource implication to review all original enquiries it was satisfied that this information would be sufficient for Court.

Resolved: to note the report and that the Impact Assessment for approved cases only would be provided to Court.

(2) Model Statute (Minute 5(4))

The Director of Human Resources confirmed that work in reviewing the model statute would commence later in the year. It was recognised that some other Universities had already undertaken reform and that alternative models would be considered as part of the process. It was confirmed that appropriate discussions and consultation would take place over future proposals.

(3) Academic Terms and Conditions (Minute 5(5))

Work on revising elements of the academic terms and conditions would also be progressed later in the year; any proposed changes would be discussed and negotiated with DUCU.

(4) Redundancy Committee (Minute 5(6))

The Committee was advised that the establishment of a Redundancy Committee had been delayed to provide an opportunity for additional input by the full-time union official involved with the case. However, as no further information had been submitted, the Committee would be set up in accordance with standard procedure.

(5) Concordat (Minute 5(7))

Professor Anderson, Chair of the Concordat Steering Group was able to report that a lot of positive work was taking place in the Colleges and the importance of the role of the early career

researchers had been highlighted. The Steering Group had been considering issues ranging from governance, recruitment and selection practice, mentoring, appraisal and career development opportunities and also examples of good practice in other Universities. Clarification and guidelines on funding opportunities were identified as being important and it was noted that some Colleges had some formalised processes in place.

Resolved: to commend the Group on their work to date and for taking this important agenda forward.

3. STRATEGIC REVIEW AND FINANCIAL UPDATE

The University Secretary explained that the two papers *Strategic Review: Financial context* and *Strategic Review: Academic context* had already been considered at the December meeting of Court and at the recent Local Joint Committees; the two papers had now been submitted to the HR Committee for completeness. The 3 campus unions had been briefed on these prior to the meeting of Court and it was confirmed that regular meetings were continuing to take place with the unions outwith the Local Joint Committee framework. The importance of effective communication and consultation was highlighted and it was confirmed that appropriate informal and formal mechanisms were in place. There was some discussion about measuring the success of any communication and it was acknowledged that there would be an audit trail through processes associated with the formal structures of Court, Senate, College Board, School Board and the Local Joint Committees.

It was noted that it was now likely that formal recommendations regarding the Strategic Review would be made to the April meeting of Court and that an additional meeting of Senate may need to be arranged to coincide with this date.

Resolved: to note the position

4. STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK: Aim 6 & 7

The Committee welcomed Mr Wesley Rennison, Planning Officer to introduce this item. The Director of Human Resources reported on progress in embedding Performance Management and confirmed that Performance Management, (now Objective Setting and Review (OSAR)) was in its second cycle for Professorial and equivalent staff. Statistics were provided for the Professorial Reviews and the Committee was pleased to note the completion rates. A query was raised by one member regarding the CMDN statistics and it was agreed that these would be checked. OSAR was just about to be launched for all other staff and training for reviewers and reviewees was currently being organised. The official start date of the OSAR cycle was 1 March 2010.

Resolved: (i) to note the report and the timescales associated with OSAR;

(ii) to check the statistics reported for CMDN

5. HUMAN RESOURCES

(1) National Pay Negotiations

Formal confirmation had been received from UCEA that the 0.5% pay award was to be implemented, effective from 1 October 2009. The pay award had subsequently been implemented in January and backdated monies paid at this time.

(2) Performance Management

This was discussed under Item 4 (Strategic Framework: Aims 6 & 7).

(3) HERA Job Evaluation

(i) HERA Appeals

It was reported that further meetings had been scheduled to consider the formal appeals in February and March. 18 cases were still at informal appeal stage and contact had been made with staff in this position to seek confirmation on whether they were proceeding with an appeal or not. It was noted that the outstanding cases were

in SASS and additional assistance had been given by other HR Officers to try and progress these.

Resolved: to note the position.

(ii) HERA Maintenance Procedure

The Committee was asked to consider the procedure (annex a) by which the grading of posts would be reviewed now the implementation phase of HERA was reaching a conclusion. It was confirmed that representatives from each of the 3 campus unions, as members of the HERA working group, had met to develop and agree the Maintenance procedure and this had been submitted to the Local Joint Committees for final approval. UNITE and UNISON had agreed the procedure subject to one or two minor amendments, but DUCU had raised more substantive issues and had not agreed the procedure in its current format. Disappointment had been expressed at this position given that discussion and consultation had taken place with DUCU's representative on the Working Group and it was agreed that in the future it was critical that the union ensured that representatives on any working group fully represented the views of the union.

The Committee was advised that the issues raised by DUCU included: the grading review process allowed for applicants to be downgraded as well as upgraded; the lack of clarity in how the process operated for academic staff and for academic-related staff; lack of opportunity for applicants to self-refer; the procedure appeared not to recognise professional standing and contribution to the role.

In response to these specific concerns the Director of HR confirmed that, just as with the original HERA exercise, there was a possibility that grades could go down as well as up and it was important that as such this was stated. In terms of the lack of clarity as to how the process related to academic and academic related staff, it was confirmed that academic staff continued to be considered under the annual review process, as agreed with DUCU; a process which was underpinned by HERA but included an element of peer review. All other staff would be considered on an annual basis through the Maintenance procedure, with each case being considered by an evaluation panel. Concerns that DUCU had raised about the lack of opportunity to self-refer were unfounded as this option was clearly stated in the procedure, and the lack of opportunity to recognise professional standing were also felt to be unfounded as HERA was developed to recognise all categories of staff in HEIs including professional staff. In terms of not recognising contribution to the role, it had always been made very clear that contribution and performance would have to be considered by separate procedures as they were not related to the 'size' of a role as determined by job evaluation.

The Director of HR confirmed that there was significant pressure to commence the Maintenance procedure and as such it was proposed that the HERA Maintenance procedure should be implemented for Clerical, Technical and Manual staff while DUCU consulted with their members on the new procedure.

The Committee was surprised at DUCU's position as what was outlined in the Maintenance procedure was no different from what had been agreed to under the Framework Agreement, with associated policies (including pay protection) remaining in place. It was hoped that further discussion with DUCU would provide the necessary reassurance required to enable it to approve the procedure but in the meantime the Committee agreed to approve the procedure for clerical, technical and manual staff.

Resolved: to approve the implementation of the HERA Maintenance Procedure for Clerical, Technical and Manual staff and delegate authority to the Chair to approve implementation for other staff subject to satisfactory resolution of outstanding issues by management in discussion with DUCU.

(4) E-recruitment

An update relating to the implementation of e-recruitment was provided. The company, Stepstone, who had been selected to provide the system was recognised as being a market leader in this area and it was noted a number of other Universities, including Glasgow, had already implemented their e-recruitment system. Business processing and specification meetings were currently taking place to map out the requirements for the system and in addition to HR involvement input was also being provided from different levels of the organisation. It was recognised that the introduction of e-recruitment would mean that the recruitment function would be provided in different ways and further communication and consultation would take place regarding what was being proposed. The move to e-recruitment was supported by the Committee and it was recognised that reducing the reliance on a paper based process was compatible with one of the Principal's aims to reduce the University's carbon footprint.

Resolved: to note progress with e-recruitment.

(5) Review of SASS

The University Secretary confirmed that as part of the review of SASS, services provided to students were being considered. This included reviewing allocation of resources between the centre and School/Unit level, establishing whether there was duplication in work activities taking place in different areas and also ensuring that the activity was being carried out in the most appropriate place. Various processes taking place in different areas of SASS were also being considered and certain processes were being prioritised for review. In addition, individual Directorates were to be reviewed every 5 years to ensure that services were still being provided in the most appropriate and effective way. As a priority consideration was being given to the structure of the key student facing services, where it was noted that three blocks of activities were being carried out in 3 separate Directorates. Discussions and consultation was currently taking place regarding the most effective way to provide a more coherent set of services to students. The Committee was advised that a new post, Director of Student Operations was being created to take overall responsibility in this area in addition to being appointed as Deputy Secretary.

The Committee agreed that in addition to benchmarking information provided by the Strategic Framework on the efficiency of services, it would be useful to also have some qualitative indicators.

(6) Pensions

It was reported that Court had established a sub-committee to review the future options for the development of the University's pension scheme and that KPMG had been appointed as advisors. A number of meetings had taken place and recommendations would be made to Court for consultation with the appropriate Unions and Trustees in due course.

Resolved: to note the position and the interest of Mr Cathcart and the University Secretary in this matter as Trustees of the Pension Scheme.

6. **EARLY DISPUTE RESOLUTION/MEDIATION**

A report from Fiona O'Donnell, the Convenor of the edr group was received. The Committee recognised Ms O'Donnell's excellent work in this area and acknowledged that she was gaining a UK wide reputation for her work. The University Secretary commented that recent communication from SFC had mentioned Dundee as a beacon of best practice in early dispute resolution/mediation.

Resolved: to commend Fiona O'Donnell for her work in edr.

7. **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY**

Mr Ajit Trivedi, Equality and Diversity Officer was thanked for joining the Committee and was invited to present his report. Mr Trivedi apologised for tabling the data in connection with the mandatory training and explained that the information had only recently been received from Marshalls. It was noted that the reports tabled were a summary of the full reports provided by Marshall. The full reports

did provide details of who had completed specific modules and this information would now allow certificates to be issued to all staff that had completed the required set of modules.

It was highlighted that the summary reports showed that completion rates of individual modules was quite high but completion of the full set of modules remained disappointing. The statistics showed that there were very significant gaps in some areas. It was also noted that support staff had been more successful in completing the modules compared to staff in academic and senior management roles.

A reminder had been issued to all staff on 14 December regarding the modules and this had resulted in another 300 people logging into the system and a number of staff finishing the required set. The Committee was keen that further communication went out to staff to encourage them to complete the modules and to highlight the benefits of the mandatory training. The Committee also requested that the Director of HR remind senior staff to complete the required set of modules as this would then make it easier to encourage more junior colleagues to complete the training.

Dignity at Work and Study (Harassment and Bullying) Statistics were considered by the Committee. It was reported that the total number of complaints recorded and dealt with during the year highlighted a slight increase in both formal and informal complaints. Mr Trivedi spoke of his involvement in trying to resolve matters at an informal stage and it was noted that the majority of the cases were resolved with positive outcomes for the individuals concerned. A total of 5 complaints were dealt with through the formal process; with 2 of these cases, the complainants had appealed the final decision and were currently waiting for their appeals to be heard.

Mr Trivedi stressed that every complaint of bullying and harassment was taken very seriously and every opportunity was taken to resolve these through due process. In terms of improvements to the system it was suggested that the pool of investigating officers could be enlarged, and recognised that in most cases the investigations are extremely complex and often require a significant allocation of time to complete. It was also suggested that if any recommendations or principles emerged following a formal complaint a summary of these should be submitted to the HR Committee. The Committee requested that the statistics provided to the Committee should be aligned to the College Structure to allow appropriate monitoring to take place.

Mr Trivedi concluded by highlighting key Equality and Diversity priorities for 2010. These included Equality and Diversity training and awareness raising, ensuring compliance with all current relevant anti-discrimination legislation and being prepared for other requirements that would come under the new Equality Act. Equality Impact Assessments was a key priority and it was suggested that Mr Trivedi discussed any difficulties with regard to obtaining data required for monitoring purposes with Ms Alison Cougthrie, Programme Manager for the Information Management Strategy.

- Resolved:**
- (i) request that further a communication is sent out to encourage all staff to complete the mandatory training modules and that senior staff are reminded to lead by example.
 - (ii) to thank Mr Trivedi for his report and for providing the Committee with an opportunity to discuss Equality and Diversity issues. The complexity of the work that was carried out was acknowledged and the Committee were supportive of the work and initiatives that were being carried out.

8. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- (1) A report from the Director of Management and Personal Development Service was received.

It was noted that the training programme that was to be provided by the Leadership Foundation for Senior Managers and support staff down to Dean level had been postponed following feedback after the first session that it lacked the focus that the University required at this point in time. Discussions were ongoing with the Leadership Foundation regarding a revised programme.

- (2) A report on Academic Professional Development from the Assistant Director (Educational Development) LLC was received.

The Committee acknowledged that a huge amount of work was taking place in the Academic Professional Development area, as detailed in a very full report.

- (3) A report from the Head of Generic Skills was received.

The Committee acknowledged a very detailed and comprehensive report and was pleased to note that work on Early Career Researchers Career Tracking Project had been initiated.

9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

A report from the Head of Safety Services and minutes from the Health and Safety Sub-Committee were received.

Resolved: to approve the following new and revised Safety Policy Arrangements:

- (i) Student Work Experience (annex b)
- (ii) Staff Working Overseas (annex c) (subject to clarification of the risk assessment approval process and comment by the University's Legal Adviser).

10. **LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

- (1) University/UNITE Local Joint Committee

Draft minutes of the meeting held on the 17 January 2010 were tabled. The Committee noted that these had still to be agreed.

- (2) University/UNISON Local Joint Committee

Draft minutes of the meeting held on the 17 January 2010 were tabled. The Committee noted that these had still to be agreed.

- (3) University/DUCU Local Joint Committee

Draft minutes of the meetings held on 18 January 2010 were tabled. The Committee noted that these had still to be agreed.

11. **ANNUAL REVIEW**

Minutes from CMDN Annual Review held on 10 December 2009 were received (annex d).

HERA JOB EVALUATION SYSTEM

Maintenance Procedure - Process of Grading Review

Introduction

HERA (Higher Education Role Analysis) is the system of job evaluation used at the University of Dundee. The Maintenance Procedure, is the procedure post implementation of HERA by which staff and Deans of School/Heads of Unit can request the grade of a role to be reviewed.

Policy and Procedure

1. The HERA Grading Review Policy and Procedures applies to all posts. However for Academic posts, the HERA role outline form will be part of the submission to Academic Annual Review (web link) and considered by the College Annual Review Group. All other grading review submissions will be subject to evaluation by a Job Evaluation panel.
2. There are two routes for submitting an application for a grading review:
 - i. **Changes in role at management request** – a Dean of School/Head of Unit may submit an application for a grading review. The case should include a rationale detailing the reasons for the request. The proposed change to the role should be discussed and agreed between the line manager, Dean of School/Head of Unit and the individual.
 - ii. **Personal submission** – members of staff may make an application for grading review. Any individual who believes their current grade no longer reflects the duties of the job may request a grading review.
3. Normally posts will only be reviewed due to changes in job content if the following conditions apply:
 - i. Normally posts will not be reviewed again if the post was critically evaluated within the previous 12 month period. The change(s) must be significant and permanent.
 - ii. Minor changes in procedures and any special arrangements to cope with temporary situations do not constitute grounds for review and may more appropriately be dealt with by a non-consolidated payment (Framework Agreement, Appendix 8) (<http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/framework/updates/latestframeworkproposals.pdf>)
 - iii. Changes must be substantive in nature.
4. For all grading review submissions, it is the responsibility of the line manager and Dean of School/Head of Unit to verify the information provided to ensure it is an accurate reflection of the duties and responsibilities of the job and consistent with the role the School/Unit and University require to be carried out. Further information on the role of the verifier can be found in the HERA Guide for Verifiers. <http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/hera/lib/docs/verifiersguide07.pdf>
5. The original HERA role outline form should be submitted with the changes that have occurred since the last review clearly highlighted on the form (these should be noted in bold or italics at the end of each section). Details about the impact such changes have on the rest of the post i.e. duties which should be deleted/substituted should also be included. If a HERA role outline form has not been completed previously this should be submitted along with a copy of the original job description for the role. An organisational chart should be provided in all cases illustrating the working relationships and reporting lines with colleagues within the School/Unit.
 - 5.1 Completion of the role outline form for regrading should be an active partnership between the line manager and the role holder, involving discussion and agreement about how the role has changed. If the Dean of School/Head of Unit does not support a case for regrading, they should explain clearly in writing to the individual the reasons for this.
 - 5.2 If a case for regrading is supported, the line manager should complete the relevant section (section 2) on the Regrading proforma (web link). This should detail how the role has changed in size, responsibility and complexity as well as provide any further information to clarify the

- details of the role and the significant change(s). It should not be a statement on the candidate's abilities and performance.
- 5.3 The Dean of School/Head of Unit (or nominee) must also complete a supporting statement on the Regrading proforma (Section 3), providing details of how the role fits in with the overall School/Unit plans. The Dean of School/Head of Unit will then sign off the role outline form. Once completed the form should be sent to Human Resources.
 - 5.4 The Dean of School/Head of Unit will highlight if this role is held by other role holders (ie a generic role outline form describes the role) and if so, the number of others that will be affected by the HERA outcome.
- 6 It will be the responsibility of the Job Evaluation panel to determine the evaluation outcome, having considered the Job Evaluation document and comments from the line manager and Dean of School/Head of Unit. The Job Evaluation panel will be chaired by a senior member of staff and will include three other trained HERA analysts.
 - 6.1 The Job Evaluation panel will carry out a role matching exercise to consider the regrading case, using the details supplied on the role outline form, and clarified by information provided by the Line Manager and Dean of School/Head of Unit (i.e. a summary of the main changes to the role since the role was assigned its current grade; reference to the current and proposed new organisational structure, details of any relevant changes and how the role fits in to the organisation chart and to the overall structure of the School/Unit). In the case of the major re-organisation of Units/Schools, normally the relevant unions would be consulted.
 - 6.2 The Job Evaluation panel will be able to seek clarification of any detail on the role outline form from the Line Manager or Dean of School/Head of Unit if appropriate.
 - 6.3 The Chair will ensure the process is carried out in a consistent and fair manner and that all the members of the panel have an opportunity to fully understand the role before asking the panel to complete the role matching exercise.
 - 6.4 The Job Evaluation panel should reach a majority decision regarding the role matching process. Where possible the role will be matched to an existing role in the University. In all other cases the role will be scored.
 - 6.5 Impact assessments will be carried out, normally by Human Resources, to ensure fairness and consistency of the process and regular reports will be provided to the campus unions and the Human Resources Committee on the outcomes.
 - 7 Grading Reviews will take place on an annual basis and any change in grade will be effective from the 1st day of the month following the Grading Review meeting. It should be noted that changes to roles that occur as a result of an organisational change may be considered out with the annual cycle to allow new roles to be established in a revised structure.
 - 8 There are three possible outcomes when considering a grading submission:
 - a. **The role is evaluated at a higher level.**
In these circumstances if the role holder's current salary is below the minimum salary point of the new evaluated grade, the current salary will be uplifted to the minimum salary point of the new grade.

If the current salary is within the minimum and maximum salary points of their new evaluated grade, the current salary, will be moved on to the next nearest highest point. http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/hera/policies/green_circling.pdf
 - b. **The role is evaluated at the same grade.**
In these circumstances there is no change to the role holder's salary.
 - c. **The role is evaluated at a lower grade.**
In these circumstances if the role holder's current salary is higher than the maximum salary point of their new evaluated grade, pay protection arrangements will apply. http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/hera/policies/red_circling.pdf

In cases where the individual or manager is dissatisfied with the outcome, there will be a right to request a review of the decision under the pre-appeal procedure (see Appeal procedure).
<http://www.dundee.ac.uk/hr/hera/appeals/appealsprocedure.pdf>

Proposed Timetable for 2009/10

November – HERA Maintenance Procedure agreed by HERA Working Group
January - HERA Maintenance Procedure submitted to LJs and HRC
End Jan/February – information to staff and managers
March -submissions into HR
End of March/April - Evaluation panel meet
Date of any regradings - 1st day of month following regrading Review Meeting

For information:

Grading of New posts

The Dean of School/Unit will prepare a detailed job description which will be forwarded to Human Resources with a request to evaluate the post.

The job description will be matched to one of the generic role profiles and the grade of the post will be confirmed. If a match can not be established, the role will be scored.

Vacant posts

If there have been changes in the content of vacant posts then a similar procedure to that for new posts will be followed.

Generic Role Profiles

Role profiles exist where identifiable groups of staff undertake similar duties.

Role profiles have been developed as part of the HERA job evaluation process to avoid the need to evaluate each role individually.

The profiles identify different levels of role content, scope, responsibility etc against each of the 14 HERA competencies and should allow roles to be matched against them.

The profiles do not go into the detail of job content and activities which will vary from job to job. However, they do capture the level and scope which will be common across a cluster of jobs.

HERA trained analysts match job duties to job profiles on the basis of best fit. Some individuals will be undertaking tasks or operating at a level of responsibility which is in some aspects above or below the job profile, but overall the job is considered to sufficiently match the job profile to form a match. If it is not possible to match a profile the role outline will be fully evaluated/scored.

Profiles are purely illustrative for the purpose of allowing managers and staff to understand what is expected at different grades. They give broad illustration of the competencies and experience required at different levels. A member of staff may not be expected to carry out all of the aspects of a profile at any one time. The HERA Role Outline form will provide more specific information relating to the requirements of the role.

Each level within the role profiles subsumes the competencies of any lower levels. This preamble along with the profiles tries to set out the general qualifications and expertise needed for entry into a particular level and the generic competences and responsibilities expected of role holders at each level. It is unlikely that any single member of staff will be applying all these competencies at any one time but he or she would be expected to display most of them over a period of time.

Differences between elements from grade to grade in non-academic roles may be quite subtle and in determining a grade for a role the overall content of that role will be considered against the HERA competencies and may require the role to be fully evaluated/scored rather than matched to a profile. Therefore, managers and staff are

encouraged to contact their HR Officer or the Deputy Director of Human Resources for advice about specific roles or where they have any questions concerning grades.

<p>UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE</p> <p>HERA JOB EVALUATION - MAINTENANCE PROCEDURE</p> <p>REQUEST FOR GRADING REVIEW</p>

Name:

College:

School/Unit:

Request of Grading Review by

(i) Dean of School/Head of Unit	()
(ii) Roleholder	()

Changes to role must be significant and permanent

Appropriate documentary evidence should be provided.
This must include:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| (1) a copy of current role outline form | () |
| (2) changes to role clearly highlighted on role outline form (ie tracked or in bold) or detailed on a separate sheet with specific changes indicated under the relevant section (see guidance notes – web link) | () |
| (3) a current organisational structure showing reporting lines (and detailing grade of posts, if possible). | () |
| (4) form signed by Roleholder | () |
| Line manager/verifier | () |
| Dean of School/Head of Unit | () |

Section 1 (Roleholder)

Please detail any supplementary information you have provided in addition to the required documents to support your grading review.

Role Holder's signature:

Date:

Section 2 (Line manager/verifier)

Please sign to confirm that you have read the request for grading review and that the information is an accurate reflection of the duties and responsibilities of the role. You should detail from your perspective how the role has changed in size, responsibility and complexity.

If there is any area with which you disagree, you should discuss this with the roleholder and state the item and the reasons for any disagreement.

Line manager/Verifier's signature:

Date:

Section 3 (Dean of School/Head of Unit)

Please detail how the role fits in with the overall School/Unit's aims and confirm that the development of the role is consistent with the role the School/Unit and University require to be carried out.

Dean of School/Head of Unit's signature:

Date:

Safety Policy Arrangement- Student Work Experience

Statement

The University of Dundee acknowledges that work experience has an essential role in the education and development of students. However, the University recognises the health and safety risks arising primarily from the inexperience of students and so is committed to reducing these risks through a comprehensive risk management programme. This programme is fully integrated into the overarching Student Placements- Policy which is part of the Quality Assurance Framework.

Arrangements

The Student Placements-Policy at <http://www.dundee.ac.uk/qaf/studentplacements.htm> outlines the arrangements for establishing and approving appropriate placements, and for their management.

Placement Managers are responsible for carrying out risk assessments that consider work factors, travel and transportation, general/ environmental health factors, location and/or region, individual student factors and insurance limitations. They should involve students in the risk assessment process, so that both parties can make an informed decision about the suitability of the placement. The level of the student's involvement will depend upon the level of risk, ie straightforward low risk work experience minimal discussion; high risk considerable discussion and participation in risk assessment process. These assessments should be reviewed after reported injuries or ill health, and annually taking into account feedback from students and the placement provider. Guidance on risk assessments is given below

Students must ensure Placement Managers are made aware of any health or other issues relevant to the risk assessment. They should participate openly and honestly in the risk assessment process and should comply with the measures outlined in the risk assessment. They must report any concerns to the placement provider, and unresolved concerns to the Placement Manager.

Safety Services can provide advice and training in risk assessments.

Guidance on risk assessment

This guidance is based upon UCEA Health and Safety Guidance for the placement of higher education students: http://www.ucea.ac.uk/en/Publications/index.cfm?obj_id=FB5CBC4E-BF77-44F4-95106283D5643BF2&page=1.

For the majority of placements in a reputable organisation in the UK fulfilling the requirements of the Student Placements-Policy will ensure the risks are managed, ie there is no need to complete a specific risk assessment. A specific risk assessment will always be required:

1. for work overseas
2. when there is uncertainty over insurance arrangements
3. when there is concern over a students suitability for the placement
4. for work in small organisations when there is uncertainty over the robustness of their risk management system

In addition, when a student has disclosed a disability then an inclusive risk assessment must be carried out. Guidance on undertaking inclusive risk assessments and arranging work placements for disabled students can be found at

<http://www.dundee.ac.uk/student-services/disability-services/staff-resources/web-workplacements.htm>.

Specific risk assessments must consider work factors, travel and transportation, location and/or region, general/ environmental health factors, individual student factors and insurance limitations.

Work factors should be addressed by confirming with the Placement Provider that the student's prior competency is satisfactory, and that appropriate training and supervision will be provided throughout. In rare cases a pre-placement site visit may be required, and H&S checks made by visiting staff eg tutors, placement managers.

Travel and transportation factors should be addressed by using reputable travel organisations whenever possible, and by careful planning of journeys. If the placement involves the student driving then their licenses, insurances, and knowledge of local driving rules should be checked.

Location and/or regional factors should be addressed by checking the Foreign and Commonwealth Office website for advice and information about travel restrictions (www.fco.gov.uk/travel). The student's knowledge of local laws, customs, unacceptable behaviours and language should be checked. A briefing with someone with

experience of working in that location should be arranged. A local tutor should be appointed to provide instruction on arrival in local procedures for fire, and other emergencies such as illness or accident, and local advice on personal security, as well as on-going support. A reliable means of communication with the University, relatives and friends should be available and the frequency of contact agreed. Arrangements for an emergency should be agreed with the student eg use of University emergency number, contact details of next of kin.

General/ environmental health factors should be addressed by checking the Department of Health's website for general medical advice for travellers:

<http://www.dh.gov.uk/PolicyAndGuidance/HealthAdviceForTravellers/fs/en>). An appointment should be made with GP or travel clinic several months in advance so that necessary immunisations and prophylactic drugs can be given. Further information can be found at:

<http://www.dundee.ac.uk/studentsservices/healthservice/ourservices.htm>. For some locations you may be advised to carry an emergency medical kit. For unavoidable work in extreme climate conditions appropriate clothing should be available, and for hot climates sun block and drinking water readily available though avoiding having to work in these conditions is the preferred option.

Individual student factors such as physical and mental health issues, pregnancy, linguistic or cultural factors should be discussed in detail with the student and if appropriate the placement provider so that appropriate adjustments can be made. Disability Support Services and University Health Service can be contacted for advice.

Insurance limitations should be addressed by contacting Finance Manager (Assets and Insurances) to ensure necessary insurances are in place.

Contact Safety Services for advice on risk assessments. Appendix 1 gives a typical risk assessment for working overseas. Appendix 2 gives a checklist of some risks when working overseas. Appendix 3 gives checklists for overseas trips, food hygiene, accommodation and personal safety. These checklists may be helpful in briefing students, and checking their knowledge and preparations. A student information leaflet 'Passport to a Trouble Free Placement Abroad' is available at (web address).

Appendix 4 gives a suitable risk assessment form, and Appendix 5 a risk management form provided by UCEA.

Appendix 1: Typical Risk Assessment for Students Working Overseas

Risk	Action Taken	Residual Risk	Additional measures- and justification if not applied
1. Work Factors			
Causing harm to others	Agreed with placement provider that student's prior competency is satisfactory, and that appropriate training and supervision will be provided throughout.	Low	
Students suffers ill health or injury	Risk assessments and standard operating procedures for work activities carried out by placement provider, and discussed with student.		
2. Location / Regional Factors			
Unable to communicate with University, relatives and friends	Internet available	Low	
	E-mail available		
	Mobile phone and network coverage available		
	Weekly contact made by tutor		
Theft, physical assault, loss of personal possessions, civil disorder.	Students briefed on personal security before departure – see checklist	Medium	Benefits of work experience in this location outweigh risk.
	Local tutor briefed student on 'no go' areas, local issues and customs.		
	Student advised to take a trusted friend or colleague when going out and to act responsibly		
	FCO web site checked for travel advice		
	Copies of important documents and originals kept in different locations		
3. General/environmental health factors			
Suffer ill health	Attend travel clinic before departure to get health advice, vaccinations and prophylactic drugs	Low	
	Students briefed before departure (see Appendix 3: Checklists for Oversea Travel).		
	Attend dentist before departure		
	Knowledge of local hospitals and procedures		
	Follow up interview on return (eg asking about any health or other problems)		

Risk	Action Taken	Residual Risk	Additional measures- and justification if not applied
Suffer fracture/dislocation/bruising/injury in accident	Students briefed in emergency arrangements ie how to summon help, and what level of response can be expected (ie 999 equivalence)	Low	
	Mobile phone carried		
	Students report in daily to local tutor, and inform tutor of periods of absence and whereabouts		
	Accident reporting and investigation procedures in place		
4. Travel and transportation factors			
suffer ill health or problems during long distance air travel	Reputable air line used	Low	
	Students advised to drink soft drinks and not alcohol on flight, and to 'stretch' their legs occasionally		
	Limited time change so jet lag should not be an issue		
Road traffic accidents.	Students briefed before departure on care in taking transport/lifts, wear seatbelts, planning journeys carefully, use public transport, don't travel if unsure, fit to drive and importance of regular breaks.	Medium	Use of vehicles unavoidable.
5. Individual factors			
unable to cope physically and mentally with challenge of working overseas	Select students who have demonstrated interest, flexibility, maturity and resilience	Low	
	Student demonstrates knowledge of local conditions, customs & taboos and some knowledge of language		
	Adequate funds and supply of local currency		
	Brief students before departure (see Appendix3: : Checklist for Overseas Trips)		
	Appoint a local contact and deputy for the student who can both speak English to provide support, and to check well-being. Their phone numbers and other contact details will be given to the student before or on arrival		
	Allocate a tutor to the student who can assist (in addition to academic matters) in special needs, language difficulties and personal problems		
	Allocate tutor who will provide instruction on arrival in local procedures for fire, and other emergencies such as illness or accident, and local advice on personal security		
	Social support available either from other students or others in the expat community		

Risk	Action Taken	Residual Risk	Additional measures- and justification if not applied
6. Insurance limitations	Discuss with Finance Manager (Assets and Insurances). Ensure that level of cover is sufficient. Brief students on policy, restrictions, exclusions and arrangements.	Low	

Appendix 2: Some risks when working overseas.

- Infection/ill health
- Physical assault/ crime/ loss of personal possessions
- Availability of Accident & Emergency Services, and other medical and dental services
- Unable to communicate with University, relatives and friends in the UK
- Travel restrictions for non UK passport holders, are there any additional travel restrictions or issues to be considered
- Climatic Extremes - Dry/ Desert (high humidity, hypothermia), monsoon/storms, oxygen deficiency/rarified air, sunburn/skin cancer, tidal and other water conditions, unusual winds (eg tornado, hurricane)
- Contact with animals (wild or domestic) - Allergies, asthma (bites and other physical contact, dermatitis, rabies, stings)
- Contact with insects – Bites, stings (Lyme’s disease, TBE, malaria, yellow fever, other)
- Contact with reptiles (poisoning, snakes, scorpions etc, remoteness, shock) – Availability of antidotes/medical back up.
- Contaminated food – allergies (food poisoning, Hepatitis A)
- Contaminated water for washing/bathing– diarrhoea, legionella, leptospirosis
- Contaminated drinking water – cholera, polio, typhoid, other
- Electricity – compatibility of equipment and supply, different safety standards
- Environment (local) – culture (customs, dress, religion)
- Crowds and crowd control, crowded transport systems
- Taboos, unacceptable behaviours
- Spotting risky situations, tourist attractions
- Legal differences – local codes/guidance
- Variable attention to health and safety issues in different countries
- Natural phenomenon – avalanche, earthquake, volcano, other, including rapid water level rises in some situations
- Needles (contaminated)/sexual contact – HIV, Hepatitis B
- Places where discarded used needles may be found – awareness of accidental contact
- Transportation - competent drivers, hazardous terrain, properly maintained vehicles, suitable transport
- Stress – accommodation problems, civil unrest, crime, vandalism and violence, extremes of heat/cold, fatigue, language/communication problems, lack of support (family/peers), workloads/expectations excessive, loneliness/remoteness, sickness, unfriendly environment
- Kidnap and terrorist activity
- Civil disorder / unrest

Appendix 3 : Checklists for Overseas Trips**General**

1.	Have you checked the FCO website (www.fco.gov.uk/travel) for travel advice?	
2.	Are there any travel restrictions?	
3.	How do you contact the local British Embassy, High Commission or Consulate?	
4.	How do you contact local emergency services?	
5.	What is the address of the nearest hospital?	
6.	Is your passport valid for at least six months after date of return, and have you necessary visas?	
7.	Who holds copies of passports, insurance policies, 24hour emergency contact numbers and ticket details?	
8.	Give details of travel and health insurances that cover all activities?	
9.	Have you checked the Department of Health's website (http://www.dh.gov.uk/PolicyAndGuidance/HealthAdviceForTravellers/fs/en) for general medical advice for travellers?	
10.	What vaccinations/prophylactic drugs are needed?	
11.	What would you do if you suffer diarrhoea?	
12.	What first aid materials are being taken?	
13.	Have you a pre-existing medical condition?	
14.	How will you carry any necessary medications?	
15.	What minimum daily budget has been set?	
16.	What forms of money are being taken eg travellers cheques, cash, credit cards?	
17.	How will you get help in an emergency?	
18.	How did you find out about local laws, customs and language?	
19.	Can you say hello, goodbye, please and thank you, and other pleasantries in local language?	
20.	What travel arrangements have been made?	
21.	What accommodation will be used?	
22.	What special clothing or equipment is required?	

Personal Safety

1.	Behave reasonably at all times by respecting other people and their property	
2.	Observe local customs	
3.	Avoid situations that make you feel uncomfortable	
4.	Keep alert at all times, unless you are with trusted friends	
5.	Do not go out alone, take a friend	
6.	Wear comfortable and practical clothing and footwear for the climate and conditions	
7.	Keep doors locked-do not let strangers in unless you are sure of their identity	
8.	Keep money and documents in as safe a place as possible at all times. Beware of pickpockets in busy places	
9.	Do not flaunt personal possessions such as expensive watches, jewellery, cameras, mobile phones and portable electrical equipment	
10.	Keep to larger, more public roads rather than risking short cuts through less well populated streets	
11.	Keep to well lit and populated places	
12.	Learn where you are going from a map before you set off so that you do not have to consult it much on your way	
13.	Use reputable (licensed) taxi, bus and rail firms	

Overseas Accommodation

1.	Can doors be locked securely	
2.	Can windows at ground level be locked securely	
3.	Is there outside lighting that covers entrances and footpaths	
4.	Are there security patrols, or a janitorial presence	
5.	Is there evidence of 'squatters' or other undesirables sleeping in corridors/doorways etc	
6.	Is there a fire alarm system and two independent means of getting out of buildings	
7.	Is there adequate ventilation	

8. Are the toilet facilities clean, and in good repair	
9. Is there a supply of potable water. If not how will water be treated (eg boiling, filtration, chemical treatment)	
10. Is the kitchen area (if provided) clean, and in good repair. Is a fridge (and freezer) available	
11. Are meals provided-if so do the kitchens look clean and in good repair, with hand wash facilities, fridges and freezers, no sign of flies or vermin (eg mouse droppings), food being left uncovered, and clear segregation between cooked and uncooked food. Do the kitchen staff look professional (ie good personal hygiene, wearing clean uniform)	
12. Are electrical sockets, switches and cabling free from visible faults. Are adapters available.	
13. Are power failures a frequent occurrence. If so are torches or other forms of lighting available	

Food Safety and Hygiene when Travelling Overseas

1. Ensure your hands are scrupulously clean and dry when handling food	
2. Boil water, or filter or chemically treat.	
3. Do not drink untreated water (eg ice cubes, ices)	
4. Protect food from flies	
5. Only eat food you know is freshly prepared and cooked (eg omelette and chips)	
6. Cooked food should be placed in a sealed container, and placed in a fridge if not eaten straight away	
7. Do not eat meat that is undercooked (ie red)	
8. Do not eat shellfish	
9. Fruit and vegetables should be freshly cooked or peeled. If this is not possible then wash thoroughly with clean soapy water, and then rinse with treated water	
10. Do not eat unpasteurised milk or milk products (eg ice-cream, yogurt, cheese).	
11. Beware of hospitality: if the food is not safe, refuse it politely. If unavoidable, eat a very small amount.	
12. Select food from menu that is likely to be safe-not what you think will taste good	
13. Do not take chances-if unsure at all miss the meal	

Appendix 4: Risk Assessment Form

Risk	Action taken	Residual risk (High, Medium or Low)	Additional measures, and justification if not applied
1. Work factors			
2. Location / Regional Factors			
3. General/environmental health factors			
4. Travel and transportation factors			
5. Individual factors			
6. Insurance limitations			

If residual risk is High then additional measures must be taken; if Medium consideration must be given to additional measures. Contact Safety Services for advice.

Appendix 5: UCEA Risk Management Form

Placement provider	Student or student group	Start and end dates
--------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

Company:

Location:

1. General control measures	Action necessary?	Action completed?
-----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Has the placement provider confirmed receipt and acceptance of your written communication?	Yes/No	
--	--------	--

Has this placement provider been used before and been reviewed with regard to health and safety?	Yes/No	
--	--------	--

If 'Yes', do any concerns remain unresolved?	Yes/No	
--	--------	--

Does the placement provider have a H&S advisor?	Yes/No	
---	--------	--

Has the student received sufficient briefing?	Yes/No	
---	--------	--

2. Risk assessment and further specific actions necessary	Risk profile (high, medium or low)	Action necessary?	Action completed?
---	------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Work factors

Travel and transportation factors

Location and/or regional factors

General/environmental health factors

Individual student factors

Insurance limitations

3. Conclusions	Action necessary?	Action completed?
----------------	-------------------	-------------------

Is a site safety visit required before placement is approved?	Yes/No	
---	--------	--

Are the risks tolerable such that the placement can be approved?	Yes/No	
--	--------	--

Prepared by:

Date:

Have the above actions been completed?

Yes / No

I (print name:

) approve this placement.

Signed:

Safety Policy Arrangement: Working Overseas

Statement

The University of Dundee acknowledges the risks to staff, and to students under their duty of care, when travelling and working overseas. The University manages these risks by ensuring a Working Overseas Risk Assessment is completed before the work starts, and that all reasonable measures are implemented to minimise risk. In exceptional circumstances the risks may be unacceptable and in these cases staff may not travel overseas, or may have to return home.

Arrangements

The Overseas Travel Policy at <http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/policy/overseastravel.htm> outlines the arrangements for work related travel.

Senior Managers ie Dean/Director/Vice-Principal/University Secretary/Principal must ensure a risk assessment is completed by staff planning low risk work overseas for a short period in North America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or a European Union country eg attending a Conference, recruiting activities, meeting a collaborator. For this work when travel is by a scheduled air-line to a recognised public airport then a generic risk assessment that includes the following will suffice.

Each member of staff must:

- Notify the Secretary of their School or Department of dates, destination and purpose of trip, and contact details of host organisation, accommodation, next of kin and emergency arrangements. This information may be made available to other relevant parties such as Head of International Development.
- Notify travel and discuss insurance arrangements with Finance Manager (Assets and Insurance) to ensure cover is adequate
- Read and follow the guidance in the University's Work-Related Travel booklet
- Contact the Occupational Health Service if they have any concerns about their health or fitness for travel

For work outwith these countries, or for working overseas for more than a month, or for higher risk work eg working in a laboratory, in a clinical environment or field work then staff must complete a more detailed and specific risk assessment. This will include the following:

- Identify risks and actions taken to prevent or minimise them, and obtain approval for travel and stay overseas from the appropriate Senior Manager. In exceptional circumstances the risks may be unacceptable and in these rare cases the Senior Manager will not give approval, or may require the staff member to return home if they have already travelled.
- Read and follow the guidance found in the Work-Related Travel booklet
- Complete checklists in Guidance below to confirm risks are being effectively managed
- Notify the Secretary of their School or Department of dates, destination and purpose of trip, and contact details of host organisation, accommodation, next of kin and emergency arrangements. This information may be made available to other relevant parties such as Head of International Development.
- Notify travel and discuss insurance arrangements with the Finance Manager (Assets and Insurance) to ensure cover is adequate
- Register travel itinerary and contact details with Foreign & Commonwealth Office using LOCATE, see <http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travel-and-living-abroad/staying-safe/Locate/>
- Contact their General Practitioner for appropriate advice and any immunisations/prophylactic drugs that are recommended
- Contact the Occupational Health Service if they have any concerns about their health or fitness for travel

Where staff are working abroad by taking students on an organised event they must also:

- Carry out a risk assessment that considers additional risks to students from travelling and working overseas as well as risks arising from the activities which the students will undertake abroad
- Ensure that they have fully briefed the students in the standard of behaviour expected of them, and how to contact them in an emergency
- Review the trip on return and report to their Dean any significant health and safety issues which arose with recommendations for avoiding these in future

Where staff are travelling abroad with students on an event organised by students they must exercise their professional judgement to:

- Bring any shortcoming in arrangements to the organisers' attention immediately
- Take any action they consider necessary to prevent injury or ill health
- Report concerns to the University as soon as possible

All staff must take reasonable care of themselves and others when working in an unfamiliar environment overseas and should act as ambassadors for the University. They should notify their line manager of injuries or ill health as soon as possible, and report any H&S concerns upon their return so that risk assessments can be reviewed and updated if necessary.

Specific and detailed risk assessments must be kept for 5 years after the work overseas has finished. Outline risk assessments can be found in Guidance below.

Contact Safety Services for advice on risk assessments.

Guidance on Specific Working Overseas Risk Assessments

Staff working overseas must carry out a risk assessment for the risks that arise from travelling or working overseas, as well as activity specific risks as detailed in Policy above. An outline risk assessment for working overseas is given in Appendix 1, and for taking students on an organised event overseas in Appendix 2. Further information about activity specific risks is available in the University's Code of Practice for Fieldwork Activities.

Appendix 3 lists other risks that should be considered in the working overseas risk assessment.

To support the University's policy on Working Overseas a Work-Related Travel booklet and a student leaflet, Passport to a Trouble-Free Placement, giving detailed advice on common problems that can arise when travelling abroad are available at (web address).

Appendix 1: Outline Risk Assessment for Staff Working Overseas

Risk	Action Taken	Residual risk
1. Unable to cope physically and mentally with challenge of working overseas	Recruit and select staff with appropriate knowledge, experience and attributes. Read Work-Related Travel booklet	Low
	Discussed concerns with line manager and/or OH Service	
	Read about local conditions, customs & taboos and some knowledge of language	
	Adequate funds and supply of local currency	
	Means of contacting family, friends, line manager and colleagues established.	
	Itinerary planned carefully, with adequate rest periods	
	For each host organisation suitable point of contact and their contact details identified.	
2. Suffer ill health or problems during travel	Reputable air lines and carriers used	Low
	Contacted OH Service or University Health Service or GP for advice	
	On long flights drink soft drinks and not alcohol, and take regular walks up and down aisle	
	Advice on jet-lag in Work-Related Travel booklet followed	
3. Stress-loss of personal possessions	Copies of important documents and originals kept in different locations	Low
	Advice in Work-Related Travel booklet followed	
4. Physical assault	Host asked for advice on 'No-Go' Areas	Low
	Advice in Work-Related Travel booklet followed	
5. Suffer ill health	Attend GP before departure to get health advice, vaccinations and prophylactic drugs for higher risk destinations	Low
	Advice in Work-Related Travel booklet followed	
6. Suffer fracture/dislocation or other injury in accident	Knowledge of local emergency procedures e.g. "999" equivalent in country of visit	Low
	Mobile phone carried and network coverage available	
	Advice in Work-Related Travel booklet followed	
7. Unable to communicate with UK	Access to phones and mobile phone-knowledge of dialling codes	Low
	Internet access available	
	Satellite phone available	
8. Road Traffic Accident	Use reputable public transport if possible	Medium
	Well maintained vehicle used from reputable supplier	

Risk	Action Taken	Residual risk
	Knowledge of local driving rules ie Highway Code equivalent	
	'Defensive' driving practised at all times-speed limits adhered to.	
	Fit to drive- ie not jet-lagged or overly tired, under the influence of alcohol or drugs	
	Regular breaks taken every two hours or when feeling tired or losing concentration	
	Route planned in advance- notes available or Satellite Navigation used	
	Wear a seatbelt at all times	
	Mobile phone not used	
	Breakdown service available	
8. Lack of preparation	Staff have completed Working Overseas checklists given in Appendix 4.	Low
9. Not covered by University's insurance policies	Discussed insurance cover with Finance Manager (Assets and Insurances). Aware of insurance restrictions/limitations. Specialist insurance policy purchased.	Low
10. Poor accommodation, eg fire arrangements, carbon monoxide poisoning, security	Use reputable hotels. Keep doors/windows locked. Familiarity with fire exits and procedures.	Low
11. Other risks from Appendix 3 including kidnap and terrorist activity.		
12. Other risks including activity specific eg work with hazardous substances, ionising radiation, field work, patients		

If residual risk is High then additional measures must be taken; if Medium consideration must be given to additional measures. Contact Safety Services for advice.

Appendix 2: Outline risk assessment for staff taking students overseas

Risk	Action Taken	Residual risk
Poor planning	Trip and activity commensurate with students' competence and number of supervisory staff. Low risk destination and reputable travel company selected.	Low
Unacceptable student behaviour	Brief students on expected standard. Send home if persistent and serious.	Low
Student becomes ill from drugs/alcohol or other cause.	Students complete health questionnaire before departure. Students given many opportunities to disclose disability. Monitor regularly. Take to local hospital. Notify next of kin	Low
Student goes missing	Regular head counts made. Mobile phone numbers carried. Students briefed on itinerary.	Low
Communication	List of student contact details held, including next of kin. Students issued with staff contact details, and University contact number. Check Mobile phones network coverage.	Low
Ill health, accident	Discussed insurance cover with Finance Manager (Assets and Insurances). Students briefed on exclusions. Students briefed on local emergency numbers.	Low
Physical assault/ personal safety	Students advised to: 1. behave reasonably at all times by respecting other people and their property; 2. observe local customs; 3. avoid 'no go' areas, and to leave areas where they feel uncomfortable; 4. avoid going out alone; 5. keep to open, well lit, populated places; 6. keep valuables safe- don't flaunt valuables such as mobile phones, MP3 players, cameras etc; 7. use licensed taxis and buses.	Low
Activity specific risks		
Other risks		

If residual risk is High then additional measures must be taken; if Medium consideration must be given to additional measures. Contact Safety Services for advice.

Appendix 3: Other Risks to be considered in the Travel Risk Assessment

- Travel restrictions for non UK passport holders, are there any additional travel restrictions or issues to be considered
- Climatic Extremes - Dry/ Desert (high humidity, hypothermia), monsoon/storms, oxygen deficiency/rarified air, sunburn/skin cancer, tidal and other water conditions, unusual winds (eg tornado, hurricane)
- Contact with animals (wild or domestic) - Allergies, asthma (bites and other physical contact, dermatitis, rabies, stings)
- Contact with insects – Bites, stings (Lyme’s disease, TBE, malaria, yellow fever, other)
- Contact with reptiles (poisoning, snakes, scorpions etc, remoteness, shock) – Availability of antidotes/medical back up.
- Contaminated food – allergies (food poisoning, Hepatitis A)
- Contaminated water for washing/bathing– diarrhoea, legionella, leptospirosis
- Contaminated drinking water – cholera, polio, typhoid, other
- Electricity – compatibility of equipment and supply, different safety standards
- Environment (local) – culture (customs, dress, religion)
- Crowds and crowd control, crowded transport systems
- Taboos, unacceptable behaviours
- Spotting risky situations, tourist attractions
- Legal differences – local codes/guidance
- Variable attention to health and safety issues in different countries
- Natural phenomenon – avalanche, earthquake, volcano, other, including rapid water level rises in some situations
- Needles (contaminated)/sexual contact – HIV, Hepatitis B
- Places where discarded used needles may be found – awareness of accidental contact
- Transportation - competent drivers, hazardous terrain, properly maintained vehicles, suitable transport
- Stress – accommodation problems, civil unrest, crime, vandalism and violence, extremes of heat/cold, fatigue, language/communication problems, lack of support (family/peers), workloads/expectations excessive, loneliness/remoteness, sickness, unfriendly environment
- Kidnap, terrorist activity and civil unrest.

Appendix 4: Checklists for Overseas Trips**General**

1. Have you checked the FCO website (www.fco.gov.uk/travel) for travel advice?	
2. Are there any travel restrictions?	
3. For non UK passport holders are there any additional travel restrictions or issues to be considered?	
4. How do you contact the local British Embassy, High Commission or Consulate (or for non UK passport holders their Embassy)?	
5. How do you contact local emergency services?	
6. What is the address of the nearest hospital?	
7. Is your passport valid for at least six months after date of return, and have you necessary visas?	
8. Who holds copies of passports, insurance policies, 24hour emergency contact numbers and ticket details?	
9. Give details of travel and health insurances that cover all activities?	
10. Have you checked the Department of Health's website (http://www.dh.gov.uk/PolicyAndGuidance/HealthAdviceForTravellers/fs/en) for general medical advice for travellers?	
11. What vaccinations/prophylactic drugs are needed?	
12. What would you do if you suffer diarrhoea?	
13. What first aid materials are being taken?	
14. Have you a pre-existing medical condition?	
15. How will you carry any necessary medications?	
16. What minimum daily budget has been set?	
17. What forms of money are being taken eg travellers cheques, cash, credit cards?	
18. How will you get help in an emergency?	
19. How did you find out about local laws, customs and language?	
20. Can you say hello, goodbye, please and thank you, and other pleasantries in local language?	
21. What travel arrangements have been made?	
22. What accommodation will be used?	
23. What special clothing or equipment is required?	

Personal Safety

1. Behave reasonably at all times by respecting other people and their property	
2. Observe local customs	
3. Avoid situations that make you feel uncomfortable	
4. Keep alert at all times, unless you are with trusted friends	
5. Avoid going out alone, take a friend	
6. Wear comfortable and practical clothing and footwear for the climate and conditions	
7. Keep doors locked-do not let strangers in unless you are sure of their identity	
8. Keep money and documents in as safe a place as possible at all times. Beware of pickpockets in busy places	
9. Do not flaunt personal possessions such as expensive watches, jewellery, cameras, mobile phones and portable electrical equipment	
10. Keep to larger, more public roads rather than risking short cuts through less well populated streets	
11. Keep to well lit and populated places	
12. Learn where you are going from a map before you set off so that you do not have to consult it much on your way	
13. Use reputable (licensed) taxi, bus and rail firms	

Overseas Accommodation

1. Can doors be locked securely	
2. Can windows at ground level be locked securely	
3. Is there outside lighting that covers entrances and footpaths	
4. Are there security patrols, or a janitorial presence	

5. Is there evidence of 'squatters' or other undesirables sleeping in corridors/doorways etc	
6. Is there a fire alarm system and two independent means of getting out of buildings	
7. Is there adequate ventilation	
8. Are the toilet facilities clean, and in good repair	
9. Is there a supply of potable water. If not how will water be treated (eg boiling, filtration, chemical treatment)	
10. Is the kitchen area (if provided) clean, and in good repair. Is a fridge (and freezer) available	
11. Are meals provided-if so do the kitchens look clean and in good repair, with hand wash facilities, fridges and freezers, no sign of flies or vermin (eg mouse droppings), food being left uncovered, and clear segregation between cooked and uncooked food. Do the kitchen staff look professional (ie good personal hygiene, wearing clean uniform)	
12. Are electrical sockets, switches and cabling free from visible faults. Are adapters available.	
13. Are power failures a frequent occurrence. If so are torches or other forms of lighting available	

Food Safety and Hygiene

1. Ensure your hands are scrupulously clean and dry when handling food	
2. Boil water, or filter or chemically treat.	
3. Do not drink untreated water (eg ice cubes, ices)	
4. Protect food from flies	
5. Only eat food you know is freshly prepared and cooked (eg omelette and chips)	
6. Cooked food should be placed in a sealed container, and placed in a fridge if not eaten straight away	
7. Do not eat meat that is undercooked (ie red)	
8. Do not eat shellfish	
9. Fruit and vegetables should be freshly cooked or peeled. If this is not possible then wash thoroughly with clean soapy water, and then rinse with treated water	
10. Do not eat unpasteurised milk or milk products (eg ice-cream, yogurt, cheese).	
11. Beware of hospitality: if the food is not safe, refuse it politely. If unavoidable, eat a very small amount.	
12. Select food from menu that is likely to be safe-not what you think will taste good	
13. Do not take chances-if unsure at all miss the meal	

ACADEMIC STAFF ANNUAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, DENTISTRY & NURSING**

A meeting of the Committee was held on 10 December 2009

Present: Professor IM Leigh, Vice Principal and Head of College (Chair)
Professor JM Connell, Dean, School of Medicine
Professor WP Saunders, Dean, School of Dentistry
Professor MC Smith, Dean, School of Nursing & Midwifery
Professor AC Page, External College Representative
Mrs Gillian Boyd, College Human Resources Officer

ANNUAL REPORTS

Resolved: (i) to note annual reports for 9 permanent lecturers.
(ii) to note annual reports for 14 fixed-term lecturers.
(iii) to note annual reports for 3 fixed-term Teaching Fellows.
(iv) to approve early confirmation of appointment of 2 Teaching Fellows.

ELIGIBLE FOR CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT AT 1 OCTOBER 2010

Resolved: to note the annual report for 3 permanent Lecturers.

CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENTS 2009

Resolved: (i) to approve confirmation of appointment for 2 permanent Lecturers.
(ii) to extend the probationary period by one year for 2 permanent Lecturers.

PROMOTION FROM GRADE 8 TO GRADE 9

Resolved: (i) to approve promotion to Senior Lecturer for one existing Lecturer.
(ii) to decline to promote 8 Lecturers who had self-nominated.

REQUEST FOR CONTRIBUTION RELATED POINTS AWARD

Resolved: to decline a request for the award of Contribution Related Points.

REQUEST FOR SALARY REVIEW

Resolved: to decline a request for a salary review.

REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Resolved: to award a management supplement of £2,000 to one individual
to award a management supplement of £1,000 to 5 individuals.