UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE

UNIVERSITY COURT

A meeting of the Court was held on Monday 25 October 2010.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (in the Chair), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Mr M Arnott, Mr WI Ball, Mr C Browne (Deputy President, Students’ Association), Professor Emerita A Burchell, Mr R Burns, Mr J Elliot, Lord Provost Dr J Letford, Dr J Lowe, Dr LI McLellan, Dr H Marriage, Professor GJ Mires, Ms CA Potter, Mr KA Richmond, Dr AM Roger, Professor J Taylor, Mr IDM Wright

In Attendance: Rector Dr B Cox, Vice-Principal Professor J Calderhead, Deputy Principal Professor GLP Follett (Item 7), University Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Information Services & Deputy Secretary, Directors of Human Resources, External Relations & Strategic Planning, Director of Research & Innovation Services (Item 10), Mr R Isles and Clerk to Court

Apologies: Mr D Cathcart, Mr KAC Swinley

The Chairman welcomed the Rector to his first meeting of the Court.

1. **PRESIDENT, DUNDEE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION**

   The Court noted that Mr Kelly, President of Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA), had resigned from the position with effect from 1 October 2010. The President’s portfolio of duties had been spread amongst the remaining members of the DUSA Executive, and the Deputy President was taking on the role of Acting President as necessary. The Court noted that the resignation meant that student representation on the Court would effectively be reduced.

   **The Court decided:** to ask the University Secretary and Clerk to Court to investigate the means to ensure that student representation on the Court was maintained at a level commensurate with the current statutes.

2. **MINUTES**

   **The Court decided:** to approve the minutes of the meetings on 14 June 2010 and 3 September 2010.

3. **MATTERS ARISING**

   (1) **Senior Appointments (Minute 77)**

   The Court considered a proposed procedure for the appointment of Vice- Principals & Heads of College (**Appendix 1**). The procedure included a
mechanism whereby the Court could decide to restrict the competition to internal applicants only if, on the recommendation of the Principal following consultation with the College Board, there were one or more internal candidates of appropriate skills, experience and standing. However, the normal procedure would be to invite both internal and external applications. The Court made some suggestions for further clarifying the composition of the Appointing Committee, namely that the Court member be a lay member and the Vice-Principal not be from the same College as the post being filled.

The Court decided: to approve the procedure, subject to the minor amendments as noted above.

(2) Review of Previous Voluntary Severance Scheme (Minute 86)

The Court received a paper from the Director of Human Resources which presented a comparison of the number of staff employed by the University prior to the previous Voluntary Severance Scheme with that employed at the conclusion of the scheme. The data showed that staff numbers had broadly reduced in line with the savings expected through the scheme. It was noted that, during the course of the scheme, a number of originally externally-funded staff in the College of Life Sciences had reverted to core funding. This explained why the staff reductions in that College were not as would be anticipated by the numbers of staff leaving under the voluntary severance scheme.

On the whole, the Court was pleased to see that the previous scheme had delivered significant recurrent savings for the University. There followed a discussion on the merits and disadvantages of introducing an establishment-based approach to staffing across the institution, and it was agreed that the Human Resources Committee would consider this matter in more detail.

The Court decided: to remit the consideration of an establishment-based approach to staffing to the Human Resources Committee.

(3) Ordinance 58- Election of Member of Court by the Student Body (Minute 88(3))

The Court decided: (i) to confirm the decision, taken at its meeting on 3 September 2010, to approve the making of Ordinance 58 regulating the election of a matriculated student to serve on Court, noting that the Senate had endorsed the proposals at its meeting on 13 October 2010; and thereby

(ii) to confirm the membership on Court of the Deputy President of the Students’ Association until 31 July 2011.
4. **CHAIRMAN’S REPORT**

The Chairman encouraged members to attend the graduation ceremonies on 17 November 2010, at which the former Chairman, Mr John Milligan, would be awarded an honorary doctorate and the Rector would be formally installed.

The Chairman remarked on the outstanding quality of the exhibition showcasing the six shortlisted architectural designs for the V&A at Dundee project. He urged those members who had not yet had a chance to visit the exhibition to do so.

Since the last meeting of Court, the new Chairman had held meetings with Heads of Colleges and with Deans of Schools, and he had also begun a series of one-to-one meetings with individual Court members, which he hoped to have completed within the next few weeks.

Finally, the Chairman reported on a meeting of the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) that he had recently attended in London. The event had included discussion of a number of important issues for the higher education sector, not least the outcomes of Lord Browne’s Independent Review of Higher Education & Student Finance in England as well as the proposed changes to the Universities Superannuation Scheme and similar changes being made by a range of institutions to their own local pension schemes.

5. **PRINCIPAL’S REPORT**

The Court received a report from the Principal ([Appendix 2](#)). The Principal introduced his report with a review of the discussions he had had with other Principals, with politicians and with other stakeholders inside and outside the University on the issues affecting the sector, including funding reductions and those issues emanating from Lord Browne’s review.

The Court received an additional paper ([Appendix 3](#)) from the Director of Finance, which set out the possible consequences for Scotland and therefore for the Scottish HE sector of the Comprehensive Spending Review, which had been published very recently. The paper also summarised the main proposals contained in Lord Browne’s review.

The Court engaged in debate on the various issues presented, and in particular the Deputy President of the Students’ Association spoke against the introduction of both upfront fees and a graduate contribution. The Court discussed the means whereby
the Principal could express his own opinions openly in the media and, acknowledging that the Court could not always be advised in advance, accepted the Principal’s suggestion that Court members should use meetings to challenge, endorse or raise concerns about any opinions he might have expressed publicly. The Court noted the level of dialogue being conducted between the University and the Students’ Association.

Court was keen to engage in a debate on the notion of a graduate contribution, and the Principal undertook to initiate a discussion at both Court and Senate at an appropriate time given the likelihood that the Scottish Government’s Green Paper on higher education funding would be published before Christmas and would clearly form the basis for any such discussion. Ancillary issues for consideration in such a debate included: defining the cost of teaching at both UG and PG levels; introducing more flexibility and innovation into programme delivery; capital expenditure commitments; and recruitment and retention of world-class staff from home and overseas.

The Court decided:

(i) to request that at a future meeting, the Court engage in a discussion about higher education funding;

(ii) to suggest to the Principal that his report be further supplemented to include a digest of business transacted or discussed at meetings of the Senior Management Team.

6. FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meetings of the Committee on 30 August 2010 (Appendix 4) and 4 October 2010 (Appendix 5). The Court noted the decision of TMRI Ltd not to renew the lease on the Translational Medicine Research Collaboration (TMRC) laboratories at Ninewells, along with the decision by Pfizer to withdraw from the TMRC, and noted the consequences for the staff of the TMRC, where consultation was ongoing about their future.

The Court also noted that the Committee had received reports on Dundee Student Villages Ltd and its subsidiary, West Park Conference Centre Ltd. In relation to student accommodation, the Rector suggested a novel way of providing low cost accommodation to students in particular financial need that the City Council might wish to consider.

The Court decided:

(i) to approve the refurbishment of the Ninewells Lecture Theatres, at a cost of £3.5m, noting that this money would be raised in its entirety from external sources, and noting further that work would not begin until sufficient funds had been raised to complete discrete packages of work within the project; and

(ii) otherwise, to approve the report.
7. **V&A AT DUNDEE**

The Director of Strategic Planning, along with the Deputy Principal, presented a report detailing recent developments in the project, highlighting both the establishment of Design Dundee Ltd to take the project forward as well as the exhibition of the shortlisted architectural designs for the building to house the V&A at Dundee. The exhibition had already welcomed 11,000 visitors, outstripping expectations. The exhibition was then due to go on tour to the Scottish Parliament building and the Lighthouse in Glasgow before arriving at the Victoria & Albert Museum in London in 2011.

The Court discussed a number of aspects of the project, including projected visitor numbers for the V&A at Dundee once built; the project’s business plan in terms of expected income; the likelihood of securing private philanthropic funding to support the initiative; and the level of commitment from the University. On this last issue, it was made clear that the University was not currently making any direct financial contribution to the project although significant contributions in kind in the form of staff time were being made. Members were reassured that the level of these contributions was commensurate with the benefits that V&A would bring to the University (for example, in terms of its future attractiveness to students and staff) and was being accommodated alongside the University-related duties of the staff concerned. Once the management team of Design Dundee Ltd was in place these staffing contributions would reduce. In terms of the completed project, the University would have no ongoing capital or revenue commitments.

The Lord Provost expressed the City’s support for the V&A at Dundee in terms of its place within the wider regeneration of the Dundee Waterfront. The people of Dundee, he said, were fully behind the project.

The Court congratulated the Team behind the recent exhibition.

8. **STRATEGIC REVIEW**

The Court received an update on the development of the proposals of the Strategic Review (Appendix 6). The update provided a description of the major projects being taken forward and also included a table of the likely indicative savings in terms of staff posts by area of activity to emerge from the review. This information had been included to ensure that staff understood the strategic nature of the review and were in a position to make informed choices on the basis of the refocusing of disciplines that was being proposed. The indicative savings were in the range of 9-12% across the various Schools and central service Directorates of the University.

In answer to queries about the timescale of the review, the Principal confirmed that it had been envisaged at the start of the review that the projects were implementable and the savings achievable within a 3-4 year time period. However, this needed to be set against the current economic situation and the expectation of major funding reductions in the sector which could very well require the acceleration of savings through the review.

The Court discussed the scale of the savings and how this would affect current provision and the student experience. Since the review’s aims were to refocus
research on areas of excellence and to review teaching curricula to ensure provision was appropriate and of high quality, the impact on students was expected to be minimal, indeed it was intended that the student experience would be enhanced. Officers, however, noted the concerns of the Deputy President of the Students' Association, who said it was difficult for students to understand that the levels of savings anticipated would not impinge on students and teaching, and he advocated sustained consultation and communication with student representatives to ensure the review's aims were fully understood.

Court also considered the following areas: the timing of the release of the Court paper to members of staff; the nature of the savings in the Student & Academic Support Services and the process-driven approach to support reductions; and progress with the voluntary severance scheme, noting that a report on this matter would be brought to the next meeting of the Court.

The Court noted that a central team was being put together to provide support to and direct the projects being developed through the review, which would be led by an internally-seconded Director of Strategic Change & Project Management. The Director would help to oversee the review and would assist in taking projects forward to completion.

The Court decided:

(i) to note the progress made along with the identified indicative savings, and also that the Court would receive regular updates on the progress of the review;

(ii) to note the significant risks that exist in relation to the University's future funding, and that the Senior Management Team was engaged in a more fundamental review of the University's footprint and overall operations in line with the outcomes of the Court Retreat in September.

9. GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 4 October 2010 (Appendix 7).

The Court decided:

(i) to approve the recommendation that, following the resignation of the President of the Students' Association, the Deputy President be invited to join the Finance & Policy Committee with immediate effect;

(ii) to encourage members to forward nominations of appropriate candidates to fill the remaining vacancy in Court's membership to the Clerk to Court, noting that the Governance & Nominations Committee had determined that candidates were particularly to be sought who had experience in one or more of the following areas: human resources, international business and the creative arts; and
10. **STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK & AIMS 4 AND 5: RESEARCH, COLLABORATION & KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER**

The Director of Strategic Planning, along with the Director of Research & Innovation Services (RIS), presented a report which provided an update on progress towards meeting the requirements of the Strategic Framework with regard to research, collaboration and knowledge transfer. In presenting the data on commercialisation, the Director of RIS noted that the University had changed the focus of its activity in this area from one which laid greatest weight on achieving income gains from, for instance, licensing arrangements (which was unpredictable) to one which laid importance on economic development and the catalysis of promising commercial collaborations.

There followed a discussion on the mechanisms whereby the indirect costs of research were funded. The discussions compared the full economic costing formula of the Research Councils with the insistence of most charities on funding only the direct costs of research.

11. **ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL STATEMENT TO THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL ON INTERNAL SUBJECT REVIEW**

The Court received the University's annual statement to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) detailing the subject reviews that had been carried out over the past year. The report had been submitted to the SFC by its deadline of 30 September 2010. In discussion, officers were asked to consider whether large reports of this nature could be circulated early for consideration by the Court to ensure that members had a full opportunity to digest the information contained in it and were therefore in a position to come to an informed decision.

**The Court decided:** to endorse the report.

12. **PENSION SCHEME UPDATE & UNIVERSITIES SUPERANNUATION SCHEME: CONSULTATION DOCUMENTATION**

The Court received an update on developments with the University's two main pension schemes. As part of the update, the Court received copies of the documentation that had been made available to members and eligible members of the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) in the consultation process on the proposed changes to USS agreed by the Trustees following the recommendations of a Joint Review Group.

In relation to the University's own scheme, the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme, the Court noted that proposed changes to the scheme were currently under discussion with the Trustees. Once agreed, the proposed changes would likewise be subject to a full statutory consultation.
The Court decided: to ask officers to circulate to Court members the counterproposals for the development of the USS which were put forward by the University & College Union.

13. SCHEDULE OF DELEGATION

The Court received a proposal to amend the Schedule of Delegation & Decision-making (the Schedule) to reflect changes in the School of Medicine following the establishment of the Tayside Medical Sciences Centre. The proposals related to the regulation of clinical trials and other clinical research studies.

The Court decided: to approve changes to the Schedule such that section 29 (Clinical Governance Committee) be deleted and replaced with the following:

Ø9. R&D Director, Tayside Medical Sciences Centre (TASC)

29.1 By means of the Sponsorship Committee, to receive and determine applications for the sponsorship of all Clinical Trials of Investigational Medicinal Products (CTIMP clinical trials), all regulated device trials and those clinical research studies which in the view of TASC Research Governance Managers present significant risk.

29.2 Approve contracts relating to the performance of CTIMP clinical trials, regulated device trials and all clinical research studies administered by TASC, or the amendment or cancellation of such contracts, excluding the approval of all grant funding applications, awards and associated contractual terms, which is undertaken by Research & Innovation Services.

29.3 Receive and determine applications for the sponsorship of all other clinical research studies.

14. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Senate on 13 October 2010 (Appendix 8). The Court noted the debate that had been had at the Senate on the matter of central timetabling and the Secretary explained that he had undertaken to write to staff and students apologising for the delays in producing the Semester One timetable. The issues that had been raised were being addressed in the composition of the Semester Two timetable. The Secretary also explained that he would be meeting with student representatives to hear their concerns.

The Rector and the Rector’s Assessor noted their disappointment that no recommendation had yet been put forward for the conferment of an honorary degree on the former Rector, Mr Craig Murray. The Students’ Association was invited to
submit a proposal for consideration by the Honorary Degrees Committee in the usual way if it wished to do so.

The Court decided:

(i) to endorse the establishment of two new Schools in the College of Arts & Social Sciences, viz.: the School of Business (comprising the former School of Accounting & Finance and the discipline of Economics from the former School of Social & Environmental Sciences) and the School of the Environment (comprising the former School of Architecture and the disciplines of Geography and Town & Regional Planning from the former School of Social & Environmental Sciences);

(ii) to approve the recommendations concerning conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus; and

(iii) otherwise, to note the report.

15. AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 5 October 2010 (Appendix 9).

The Court decided: to approve the report.

16. STAFF

Professorial and Other Grade 10 Appointments

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

Andrew Roberts  Personal Chair of Modern Literature  1 September 2010
APPENDIX 1

SENIOR APPOINTMENTS
VICE-PRINCIPALS & HEADS OF COLLEGE
(Minute 3(1))

At its meeting on 14 June 2010, the Court asked officers to devise a more clear and explicit process for appointments to the role of Vice-Principal and Head of College. The process needed to allow for early consideration of internal candidates of appropriate standing and needed to maintain openness and transparency.

Court is invited to consider and, if so minded, approve the process outlined below.

Process

1. There shall be a Vice-Principal & Head of College of each College who shall be appointed by Court. Normally appointments are made following open competition which invites applications from both internal and external sources. However, where the Principal decides, following consultation with the College Board, that there is/are one or more internal candidate(s) of appropriate skills, experience and standing s/he may seek Court approval for a process that invites internal applications only.

2. The University reserves the right to institute its own search committee or commission a specialist recruitment agency to identify suitable candidates.

3. Staff in the relevant College will be consulted for input into the components of the selection process. The Principal, in consultation with the Appointing Committee and appropriate senior colleagues, will decide upon the structure of the selection process. The selection process will invariably involve an interview and presentation by the candidates together with any other relevant assessments identified.

4. The Appointing Committee will comprise:
   - The Principal
   - Three members of the relevant College Board
   - A member of the University Court
   - A Vice-Principal
   - One or more external Assessors of Principal/Vice-Chancellor status according to the disciplinary composition of the College (avoiding Universities where the candidates are currently employed).

4. Prior to deciding to appoint a Vice-Principal & Head of College, the University will take appropriate steps to check the suitability of the prospective appointee in line with good employment practice and corporate governance.

5. The appointment of Vice-Principals & Heads of College is a Court appointment.

6. Typically, the appointment of Vice-Principals & Heads of College are made on a permanent basis but if circumstances deem it necessary the appointment will be made on a fixed-term basis.
APPENDIX 2

PRINCIPALS REPORT

A Time of Opportunity

As you will all no doubt be aware, Lord Browne published his long-awaited review of higher education funding and student finance in England on 12 October. His proposals include the removal of the current cap on fees, with the prospect that English universities could start to charge fees of around £7,000 and up to perhaps £12,000 and beyond. Students would not pay fees up front, but would begin to make contributions to pay off the fees once graduated and once earning at least £21,000 per annum. The UK Government has signalled its support for the outcomes of the review, although it remains to be seen whether Lord Browne’s proposals will be adopted in their entirety. The proposals are based on an assumption that Government funding for HE teaching in England will be dramatically reduced (some reports suggest by as much as £4.2bn); although, as I write, the outcomes of the Comprehensive Spending Review are still unknown. How all of this will affect Scotland is, as we have noted on several occasions, difficult to say.

The response from Scottish ministers to the Browne report has been unequivocal in restating their opposition to tuition fees, but Scotland urgently needs a solution to the question of adequate funding for higher education if we are to avoid jeopardising the quality and reputation of Scottish institutions. Universities are essential as a means of stimulating and building a knowledge-led economy for the benefit of Scotland and the world beyond.

On the whole, I think, universities now accept that they must shoulder a share of the cuts in public spending, but the time has come to recognise that maintaining the international competitiveness of Scottish institutions will not be possible without additional funds. My personal belief is that this should be achieved by the introduction of some form of graduate contribution to the cost of Scottish higher education. A graduate contribution should be set at a level to maintain competitiveness within the UK and internationally, but crucially it should be targeted to improving student learning and experience. The benefit to universities, however, must be immediate, whether through initial government investment or through investment by a financial consortium, securitised against the future contribution from graduates. For research we need a different approach, and I believe that the Scottish Government, through the Funding Council, should do all that it can to maintain support via the public purse for the infrastructure that underpins Scotland’s world-class research base.

Mike Russell, the Scottish Cabinet Secretary for Education & Lifelong Learning, has indicated that a green paper will be published in December which will set out plans for higher education in Scotland. The Scottish Principals, individually and through Universities Scotland, have been very vocal in ensuring their opinions are heard in this debate, and we all await with great interest what the SNP’s plans will be.

It doesn’t take a genius to understand that the sector stands before an era of great change, whatever the politicians finally conclude. It would be easy to see this as unsettling, as a time to put up our defences to weather the storm, but otherwise emerge unchanged. Or we could seize the opportunity that great change provides and shape our own future both to meet the imminent challenges and to create the potential for vigorous new growth. It is therefore appropriate perhaps at this juncture to take a brief pause to consider the stage we have reached in our own strategic development.

The University is already showing an appetite to grasp this opportunity, with impressive growth in recent years in a number of areas. Our taught postgraduate student numbers have grown significantly, and we have continued our success in winning research awards and thereby also in increasing our rate of research overhead recovery. There has also been impressive and beneficial investment in our campuses. Nevertheless, there are a number of areas that have shown themselves to be more stubborn to improvement when measuring them against the performance indicators set in the Strategic Framework to 2012: completion rates, employability, and entry qualifications; and work is ongoing to address these issues. There is also some concern that, even in those areas where we are performing well against target, there is evidence of having reached a plateau and of a limit to the pace of recent levels of growth.

Our recent placing at 140th in the world in the Times Higher Education rankings is testament to the excellence and input of our achievements in selected areas. Universities like Dundee, with a few high achieving centres, have fared better than institutions which are merely good across the board. This might promote greater specialisation amongst universities, and we will need to continue investing in our strengths if we are to stay ahead of the game. The implementation phase of the Strategic Review and its emphasis on the three pillars of focus, Impact and Excellence is bearing fruit, as the paper later on today’s agenda shows, but we need to ensure that we extract the greatest benefit that we can from these projects. As part of the review the Court, at its meeting on 3 September 2010, approved the establishment of a voluntary severance scheme as a means to aid the organisational changes resulting from the initiatives being developed under the review, and the paper we will consider later in the meeting sets out indicative savings for each School and for the support services as a result of the review projects. It is anticipated that these savings will be of the order of 10-12% across the University; but as the augurs of the Comprehensive Spending Review presage, the savings necessary as we go forward are likely to be even greater (NB: an additional paper dealing with this issue will be circulated to Court members electronically before the meeting on 25 October).
Against this backdrop, the Court took the first steps to beginning a broader dialogue on strategic development at its Retreat. Along with senior officers, I have been spending time discussing some of the issues and suggestions that were raised at the Retreat, with a view to shaping the future direction of the University. These discussions are at a very early stage, but it is clear that in thinking about what the University wants to be we will need to deliver:

(i) a robust, sustainable University able to withstand significant cuts;
(ii) distinctive provision that is attractive to students within and outwith the UK;
(iii) streamlined curricula focussed on creating graduates able to reach their potential in and contribute effectively to the global economy; and
(iv) clustered research themes that meet the needs of society through internationally leading knowledge generation and dissemination.

This is a challenging task. And we are not alone. But with a Court refreshed with new members, I am confident we can, over the coming months, develop a strong framework for excellence and to provide the platform for future growth.

**Finance**

You will have seen from the reports from the Finance & Policy Committee that we are expecting to be able to post an operating position of around £3m for the year ended 31 July 2010. This represents a particularly good result, especially when compared with the budgeted break-even position, and this gives us a sound starting point for 2010/11. Our performance so far in the current year, is more or less in line with budget, and in any event it is perhaps too early to discern any clear trends or divergence from this year's budget position. Having said this, changes in the distribution of core funding for knowledge transfer activity from the Scottish Funding Council have reduced our share of this funding stream, with the shortfall unlikely to be met by the replacement competitive bids. In addition, whilst the full picture for postgraduate recruitment will not be known until we welcome our January 2011 entrants, it appears that we, along with many other universities, are finding it challenging to meet our targets. The UKBA and the new visa requirements are not helping in this regard.

**V&A at Dundee**

I hope that many of you have been able to see the exhibition of the six shortlisted designs in the architectural competition for the V&A at Dundee, which opened in late September. The six hopefuls are imaginative and bold, and whichever is finally chosen, it is obvious that Dundee, its external perception and its status will all be changed as a result. The exhibition has already attracted enormous interest with articles in local and national newspapers, TV and radio coverage. Since opening to the public, hundreds of visitors a day have been expressing their views and choosing their favourite designs. I strongly encourage any of you who have not yet had a chance to visit the exhibition to do so, and moreover to encourage your colleagues and friends to do the same.

**Winter Graduation**

This year, for the first time, graduation will also take place in November. I understand that during the planning stages, it was unclear how popular such an event would be and how great the likely demand would be, but it appears to be outstripping all expectations; to the extent that it will be necessary to hold two ceremonies on 17th November. As ever, these will be held in the Caird Hall, and they will be followed in the evening by a reception and celebration on campus green. I am very much looking forward to the occasion and to cementing the event as a fixture within the University calendar. I hope to see many of you there, especially as we will be conferring an honorary doctorate on John Milligan.

Professor Pete Downes
Principal & Vice-Chancellor
Annex

Major Grants & Awards

- **£3.1m from the Wellcome Trust to Professor Angus Lamond** for Structure and Function of the Mammalian Cell Nucleus
- **£1.4m from Cancer Research UK to Professor Stephen Keyse** for Stress Response Laboratory Programme
- **£1m from the Wellcome Trust to Dr Jonathan Chubb** for Control of Noise in Eukaryotic Gene Expression (Senior Research Fellowship)
- **£1m from the Scottish Funding Council to Professor Sandy Cochran** for INSPIRE (SFC Spirit award)
- **£0.8m from the Engineering & Physical Sciences Research Council to Dr Amin Abdolvand** for Metal-Glass Nanocomposites through Nanoengineering to Application (Personal Fellowship)
- **£0.7m from Framework 7 People Programme to Dr Edik Rafailov** for Multifunctional Medical Diagnostic LASEr System (MEDI-LASE)
- **£0.5m from Cancer Research UK to Professor Julian Blow** for Analysis of Proteins Required for the Initiation of Chromosome Replication
- **£0.4m from the Scottish Government to Research & Innovation Services** for the Innovation Portal

People & Prizes

- Stuart Birse, recent computing graduate, has been awarded the Amor Group Prize or Software Engineering 2010 for the best undergraduate software project
- University was voted Europe’s ‘Best Place to Work in Academia’ in the 8th annual worldwide survey compiled by The Scientist magazine in June
- Elizabeth Humble, Alison Mehta and Pablo de la Peña, recent graduates from Duncan of Jordanstone, all won awards at the New Designers Exhibition in London
- Recent architecture graduate, Alan Keane, was awarded first place in the 3DReid Student Prize 2010, the UK’s most prestigious student architectural prize
- Former University Chancellor Sir James Black has been honoured on the Royal Mail’s newest First Class stamp
- A groundbreaking computing project to help profoundly disabled children communicate more effectively (‘How was school today?’) has been nominated in the ‘Community Project of the Year’ category of the BCS UK IT Industry Awards 2010
- Sir Philip Cohen has been named amongst the 100 most important people in British Science by The Times
APPENDIX 3

COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING REVIEW OVERVIEW
(Minute 5)

Introduction

1. As Court members will be aware the UK Government published its Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) on Wednesday. The purpose of this paper is to provide a brief overview of areas relevant to the University.

2. It should be noted that whilst the CSR was important in setting the overall context it will not be until the Scottish budget is published in mid November that we have a clear understanding of the implications for Higher Education (HE) in Scotland.

Scotland

3. The Scottish Settlement has been determined by the Barnett Formula, and is as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The revenue budget represents a cash increase of 2.5% over the 5 year period but a 6.8% real terms cut. The capital budget has been reduced by 38% in real terms. Clearly capital expenditure is the main loser.

5. The Government committed to the implementation of the Calman Commission Report, and will introduce a Scotland Bill in the current Parliamentary session. The Calman commission made many wide ranging recommendations which include:

- Cutting basic and higher rates of income tax levied by the Government in Scotland by 10p in the pound, with a corresponding reduction in the block grant, calculated using the Barnett formula.
- Giving Holyrood the power to set a Scottish income tax rate, applying to all bands. A 10p rate would replace the reduction in the block grant.
- Giving Scottish ministers additional borrowing powers to cover the cost of capital projects, or temporary shortfalls in their budget.

Research Funding

6. The core science budget will be maintained in cash terms over the Spending Review period at £4.6bn per year, but it does represent a 10% real terms cut. The sum does not include capital spending which is likely to decline. The MRC budget is to be protected in real terms which will mean the other 6 research councils face a cash reduction of about 3% between them. The Government has stated that there are to be efficiency savings in the science budget, saving £324 million a year by 2014-15. These efficiency savings will be reinvested in science. This is likely to impact on how the Research Councils operate. However it will not be until December / January before any detail emerges of how the Research Councils will implement the CSR.

7. It was stated that the Department of Health will increase spending on health research in real terms. Within this, additional funding will be made available to support the translation of research into practical applications, including the development of new medicines and therapies. We are not sure what the implications of this are for the Scotland NHS research budget as it is a devolved area.

8. The Government will provide £200 million a year by 2014-15 to support manufacturing and business development, with a focus on supporting potential high growth companies and the commercialisation of technologies, including funding for an elite network of Research and Development intensive technology and innovation centres. It will also investment of up to £1 billion in a commercial scale carbon capture and storage demonstration project, investing in wind turbine research and development, and upgrading offshore wind manufacturing facilities at ports sites. This may provide opportunities for the University.
Higher Education

9. The future funding for the HE sector arguably saw the most dramatic change of all areas when combined with the Brown Review (see below). The Government stated that there must be a shift away from public spending towards greater contributions from those that benefit and who can afford to pay.

10. Based on the recommendations of the Browne Review, from the 2012-13 academic year, universities in England will be able to increase graduate contributions. There will be loan support from Government but with an offsetting reduction in the teaching grant. This would see the funding of HE, excluding research, through HEFCE reduce from £7.1bn to £4.2bn, a cut of 40%.

11. In essence funding for teaching in England will shift from the state to the graduate, as well as the introduction of a much more market-led approach to student recruitment and numbers. This will have a dramatic effect on universities in England. However for this to happen requires the Brown proposals to be accepted which politically may not be straightforward.

12. The funding of the Scottish HE sector is a devolved responsibility and therefore neither the CSR nor Brown has any direct implication. It will however inform the debate and in particular the possible role of a graduate contribution within HE funding in Scotland given the reduced monies available.

Brown Review

13. Lord Browne's long-awaited review of England’s higher education system recommends sweeping changes to the university funding system. Some of the key proposals are listed below:

Tuition fees
- There should be no limit on fees charged by universities
- The government will fully underwrite fees charged up to £6,000
- Universities would be subject to a levy on all fees charged above £6,000, which is used to cover the cost to the government of providing students with upfront finance
- The university would get to keep a diminishing proportion of fees over £6,000 - 40% of the first £1,000, 45% of the second, 50% of the third etc
- The levy begins at £6,000, which may be less than needed in order to replace current public funding - this is to instil a focus on efficiency in the system
- Public investment should continue, at a level similar to the current one (£700m per year) to support certain courses, such as science and technology subjects, medicine, nursing and strategically important language courses

Student funding
- Students should not have to pay any tuition fees up front
- They would begin to repay the cost of their fees when their earnings reach £21,000 (currently £15,000)
- Until their earnings reach £21,000, the money graduates owe would rise in line with inflation - no interest would be charged
- When their earnings reach £21,000, graduates would begin to pay their loans back and interest would be charged at the cost of borrowing to the government (currently 2.2%) plus inflation
- Unpaid student debt would be written off after 30 years, rather than 25 years
- Part-time students would be eligible for loans for their fees

University system
- Four existing higher education bodies (Higher Education Funding Council for England, Quality Assurance Agency, Office for Fair Access, and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator) would be abolished and replaced by a single Higher Education Council
- All new academics with teaching responsibilities should undertake a teaching qualification
- Universities charging more than £7,000 a year would be subject to increased scrutiny over student access
- New providers will be allowed to offer higher education teaching
- Funding system will allow a 10% increase in university places over three years
- Government will set a minimum entry standard, in terms of UCAS points, each year, taking into account the demand for university places and the budget available to pay for them - students would not be eligible for financial support if their grades were below this level

14. The CSR, combined with the Brown report, if fully implemented, will result in a significantly different English HE landscape. The impact this will have on the Scottish sector will primarily depend upon how the Scottish Government implement the CSR and their future vision for the sector, including the so-called Scottish Solution in relation to graduate contributions, which is to be set out in a Green paper expected before Christmas 2010.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 30 August 2010.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (Acting Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Mr WI Ball, Professor J Calderhead, Mr C Kelly (President, Students Association), Dr J Lowe, Dr LI McLellan, Mr KA Richmond, Mr IDM Wright

In Attendance: Dr H Marriage, University Secretary, Director and Deputy Director of Finance, Director of Campus Services, Director of Strategic Planning and Clerk to Court

Apologies: Mr R Burns

In the absence of Mr Burns and with the agreement of the Committee, Mr Sanderson assumed the role of Acting Convener.

The Committee noted Dr Marriage’s attendance in his new role as Convener of the Audit Committee.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 17 May 2010.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Pension Update

[The following Trustees of the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme, who were present at the meeting, declared their interest in this item: Ms CA Blake, Professor J Calderhead, Dr J McGeorge and Mr G McKee.]

The Committee received a report from the Director of Finance which detailed developments to the two main pension schemes in operation at the University.

A Joint Review Group had been set up for the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) to examine the scheme and make recommendations on its future development. The Group comprised union and employer representatives and was convened by an independent chairman, Sir Andrew Cubie. At its final meeting, the Group reached agreement only with the casting vote of the Chairman. Proposed changes to the scheme include: introduction of a normal pension age of 65; employee contribution rate to increase to 7.5% for existing and 6.5% for new; introduction of a Career Average Revalued Earnings (CARE) benefits structure for new entrants; and pension increases to be linked to the Consumer Prices Index and capped at 5%. A full consultation process with members of the scheme would begin in October, with a view to implementation of the changes from 1 April 2011. The University & College Union (UCU) had signified its unhappiness with the proposals in a letter to Principals and Vice-Chancellors; it was therefore possible that the sector might become subject to industrial action on this matter.

In relation to the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme, the Director reported that there had been a number of meetings with the Trustees of the scheme to consider proposals for change to the scheme. The Trustees had made a formal response, and it was to be hoped that agreement could be reached on the changes so that a full consultation could take place. The Pensions Sub-Committee would be meeting later that day to discuss the current position.

Resolved: to note the position with regard to the two pension schemes.

(2) Funding Update

Previous meetings of the Committee had noted the degree of uncertainty in the future funding position of the University, and the Director of Finance now took the opportunity to provide an update. A number of important reports and reviews would be published in the coming months, notably the Browne Review into student funding in England, the UK Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review (due on 20 October 2010), and the draft Scottish Budget in November, following which the Scottish universities might have a clearer idea of the impact the expected spending cuts would have on the sector. There was much speculation about the level of funding reductions that the sector might face, with some reports suggesting a worst-case scenario of up to 20-25% cuts, although English universities were being warned to plan for even greater reductions in funding. It was not yet clear how the spending cuts would affect student numbers, although the Committee noted the prudence of: (a) anticipating reductions in controlled
subject areas; but (b) the likelihood that there would otherwise be pressure to maintain student places at the expense of reduced SFC units of resource.

3. **INTERIM MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 12**

The Director of Finance provided the Committee with an indication of the interim position for the year ended 31 July 2010. It was expected that the University would see an operating surplus for 2009/10 of around £3m, compared with a break even budget. The solid performance had been aided by rigorous vacancy management, lower than forecast interest payments as a result of a stronger cash position, and meeting targets for both tuition fees and research overhead recovery. In terms of the cash position, this had benefited from balanced working capital movements as research expenditure was matched by new research grant income and spillage on the capital programme. The interim results were of course still subject to audit and did not include the University’s share of Dundee Student Villages Ltd nor adjustments under accounting standard FRS17.

Members asked what latitude the University had to withdraw from capital projects that had already been approved, and noted that officers were currently revisiting capital funding commitments against strategic priorities. The University was looking to hold capital expenditure to the level provided for by anticipated external capital funding and had structured certain projects as coherent ‘packages of works’ that provided an element of flexibility to adjust spend to reflect changes in the availability of external funding.

4. **TRANSLATIONAL MEDICINE RESEARCH COLLABORATION (TMRC)**

[Mr Richmond declared an interest in this matter as a member of the Board of NHS Tayside.]

The Committee received a paper from the Director of Finance which provided historical background to the TMRC initiative and updated members on recent developments. The Committee noted the takeover by Pfizer of Wyeth, the major pharmaceutical partner at the heart of the collaboration and learnt of the recent decision by TMRI Ltd (the company set up to manage the collaboration on behalf of the industrial and university partners) not to renew the lease on the TMRC laboratory building. Unless another tenant could be found, the University would lose the rental income which was being used to cover the cost of the loan for the construction of the building. It was noted that there was a risk that some of the £1.75m ERDF grant funding which had been received might need to be repaid depending upon the use to which the building was put in the future. There would also be VAT implications as a result of the decision to opt to tax the building as the only way to recover VAT at the time. Members expressed concern at the developments, but were assured that the potential risks inherent in the collaboration were known and documented at the time of the original agreement; indeed the takeover of Wyeth by Pfizer could not have been foreseen at the time. Notwithstanding the potential financial implications of the recent developments, the Committee noted the positive scientific work and the ongoing academic partnerships that had evolved from the collaboration, which would continue but in different form.

Resolved: to note the developments and await further updates from the Director of Finance.

5. **ESTATES BUSINESS**

(1) **Estates Update**

The Director of Campus Services provided an oral update on a number of estates issues of interest to the Committee including: ongoing maintenance and infrastructure improvements on campus, the work of the Carbon Management Board, and plans to reduce the size of the estate. He also set out how he saw the Committee’s role in addressing estates business. Following discussions with the University Secretary and the Director of Finance it had been agreed that each Committee meeting would include standing items on general estates business and progress with capital works. In addition, specific strategic items of estates business would be presented as stand-alone items from time to time.
(2) **Capital Progress Report**

The Director outlined progress being made on five current projects: the Duncan of Jordanstone, Scrymgeour and Fulton refurbishments, the Centre for Anatomy & Human Identification and the work to develop the Ninewells library and teaching accommodation.

The Committee noted preparatory investigatory work on the proposals to construct a Centre for Transitional & Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR) adjacent to the Sir James Black Centre. The project had been successful in securing funding from a joint Wellcome/Wolfson competition, and would be subject to a detailed capital project proposal for consideration by the Committee and thereafter by the Court.

6. **WEST PARK UPDATE**

The Committee received a report from the Director of Finance outlining recent developments with West Park Conference Centre (WPCC) Ltd, a subsidiary of Dundee Student Villages (DSV) Ltd run and managed by Sanctuary Management Services. The Committee learnt of a number of changes to the senior staff of WPCC and also of the last minute cancellation of a summer school and the consequent loss of £170k of business. The Committee noted the risk that this posed for the University, given the possibility that the University might be obliged to buy back WPCC in the event that DSV decided to wind it up, should WPCC prove to be unsustainable. The University was working closely with its partners on DSV to mitigate the risk by increasing the sustainability of WPCC.

Resolved: to note the position and await a fuller report at the next meeting.

7. **FINANCIAL YEAR-END TIMETABLE**

The Deputy Director of Finance noted that work to finalise the accounts for the year ended 31 July 2010 were progressing according to schedule. Draft accounts would be sent to the auditors by the third week in September and the accounts would be presented to the December meeting of Court for formal approval.

8. **ENDOWMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report from the meeting of the Sub-Committee on 17 May 2010. The Acting Convener noted that he was currently the Convener of the Endowments Sub-Committee although it had been usual for the Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee also to convene the Sub-Committee. He undertook to discuss this matter with the Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee and in the meantime to appoint the Convener as a member of the Sub-Committee.

Resolved: to note the report and to appoint the Convener to the Sub-Committee.

9. **CAR PARKING REGULATIONS AND CHARGES**

Resolved: to note the revised charges and amended regulations approved at the Emergency Committee of Court meeting on 5 August 2010.

10. **DATES OF MEETINGS IN 2010/11**

Resolved: to note the dates for the rest of the session, subject to confirmation by the Clerk to Court that 22 August 2011 was not a bank holiday.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 4 October 2010.

Present: Mr R Burns (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Mr WI Ball, Professor J Calderhead, Dr J Lowe, Dr LI McLellan, Mr KA Richmond, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: Dr H Marriage, University Secretary, Director and Deputy Director of Finance, Director of Campus Services and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Mr EF Sanderson.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 30 August 2010.

2. MATTERS ARISING

Pensions Update (Minute 2(1))

The Director of Finance reported that a process of consultation with members of the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) would begin within the next two to three weeks.

In respect of the local scheme (University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme), the Director reported that final proposals had been presented to the Trustees and that thereafter a similar consultation exercise to that for the USS would follow later in the semester.

Resolved: to note the position in relation to the two pension schemes.

3. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 1

The Director of Finance presented the accounts, noting that it was still early in the session to be able to identify any particular trends. The accounts did, however, show an adverse variance of £0.4m against budget, which reflected the confirmation from the Funding Council of a reduction in core formula-driven Knowledge Transfer Grant. The remainder would be allocated followed a competitive bidding process, to which the University had made a number of strong submissions. The accounts also contained a provision of £2m to cover the current estimated costs of the voluntary severance scheme. In terms of tuition fees, it was still too early in the session to be completely clear about student numbers, and of course there would also be an intake in January. Early indications suggested, however, that the target for overseas taught postgraduate students would not be met, although the intake would at least match the intake in 2009. The Committee noted that this appeared to be a trend seen across the sector at other Scottish and UK institutions. Research funding on the other hand was still strong. The Committee also considered the presentation of the data contained in the table relating to capital projects.

Resolved: to ask officers to review the presentation of data in the table dealing with capital funding to make clear those projects which had full approval.

4. CAPITAL PLAN UPDATE

The Committee received a written update on current capital projects in progress across the City and Ninewells campuses. The update also looked forward to two proposed projects: the Centre for Translational and Interdisciplinary Research (CTIR) and the development of the Ninewells campus. The CTIR had been the subject of a successful bid to a Wellcome Trust/Wolfson call for capital funding, and the University had been awarded £4.9m as a result. However, in a difficult funding environment and with little indication of what public funding would be available for capital projects, the University would need to think carefully and strategically about the project and how it would link with translational and biomedical research going on across the University. Discussions were already underway between the Medical School and the College of Life Sciences on a rationalised way forward to the provision of appropriate laboratory space and associated infrastructure both at Ninewells and on the City Campus. These discussions included opportunities to decant laboratory research from ageing and costly NHS accommodation, the future use of the TMRC building in view of the news that TMRI Ltd would now not renew its lease on the building, as well as the best use to be made of a new build on the city campus, as represented by the CTIR project. Following conclusion of these discussions, capital project applications would be developed and presented to a future meeting of the Committee.
The Committee also considered a capital project application for the refurbishment of three lecture theatres in the Medical School. This project would be completely funded from external sources through a concerted fundraising campaign; and there would therefore be no call on University capital resources, either from the Funding Council or generated within the institution.

In conclusion, the Committee was clear that the probable exigencies of the higher education funding settlement in Scotland would force the institution to re-examine all capital projects, even those that had already been fully approved, in order for the maximum benefit to be extracted from available sources of income.

Resolved: to recommend to Court approval of the refurbishment of the Ninewells Lecture Theatres, at a cost of £3.5m, to be raised in its entirety from external sources, noting that work would not begin until sufficient funds had been raised to complete discrete packages of work within the project (annex refers).

5. DUNDEE STUDENT VILLAGES

The Committee received a routine report on the position of Dundee Student Villages (DSV) and its subsidiary, West Park Conference Centre (WPCC).

DSV had performed well in 2009/10: with occupancy levels at 100%, increased income and with a cashflow position which was better than projected by the business model. The forecast for 2010/11 was equally strong, with occupancy likewise projected to be at 100%. The report included a comparison of similar accommodation at other Scottish institutions, and DSV was broadly in line with these for the type of room being offered. The University’s lease of the Taymills flats, not part of DSV, was due to end in 2011, and discussions were ongoing to ensure a smooth transition.

WPCC had experienced a poorer year than forecast, although this was in large part due to the loss of income associated with a summer school which had been cancelled at short notice. The Director of Finance reported that Sanctuary Management Services, who manage WPCC, were carrying out a full review of WPCC and its activities. Members noted that, whilst WPCC presented a risk to the University, particularly should circumstances force the University to buy it back, it was hoped that the forthcoming review and new management structure would lead to an improved performance on the part of WPCC.

Resolved: to note with interest the performance of DSV and, in particular, of WPCC.

6. TUITION FEES 2011/12 METHODOLOGY AND RATIONALE

The Committee received a report outlining the means by which the Schools and Colleges had determined appropriate tuition fees for 2011/12. At its meeting on 22 September 2010, the Senior Management Team (SMT) had approved the fees, which had been proposed by the Colleges in consultation with the Schools who themselves had taken account of guidance provided by the Director of Admissions & Student Recruitment. Some Committee members had a lingering concern that some Schools had not implemented a differentiated enough approach to fee-setting and officers undertook to feed this back through the next cycle. The Committee understood the role that appropriate tuition fees played in attracting high quality applicants and in promoting and enhancing the quality of provision.

Resolved: to note that fees had been set and approved by the SMT on the basis of a consistent methodology and that this process would be repeated in subsequent years.

7. TREASURY ANNUAL REPORT

The Committee received a report from the Deputy Director of Finance setting out the current treasury position, a summary of operations for 2009/10 and highlighting particular issues for noting by the Committee. In particular the Deputy Director drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that the University’s current revolving credit facility of £25m would expire in January 2012; and that the volume of business conducted in Euros had increased significantly, but that the nature of the transactions, resulting for the most part from EU research grants, meant that the University was exposed to a degree of unhedgeable currency risk. The Committee agreed that this latter issue was one to monitor closely in future.

Resolved: to ask officers to consider the possibility of smaller, but potentially more lucrative, deposits with other deposit-takers beyond those hitherto used as part of the existing policy.
ANNEX

PROPOSED EDUCATIONAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME: NINEWELLS HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE

The School of Medicine at the University of Dundee has a high reputation for Undergraduate Teaching; in 2009 the School is consistently among the top ten Medical Schools in the United Kingdom in a range of surveys. In particular, it is very highly rated internationally for the quality of its teaching and its innovative approach to undergraduate medical education; the development of clinical skills teaching, novel forms of assessments, and integration of the course over a five year period are models that have been closely copied by other medical schools in this country and overseas. The curriculum and the excellence of the teaching were highly commended during the recent GMC external assessment of the Medical School. The School of Medicine wishes to retain and build on its high reputation in key areas of excellence, to ensure that it continues to be at the forefront, internationally and nationally, in the next decades. However, a key concern in developing and maintaining this profile is the poor state of much of the fabric that supports teaching activity within the School. It is noteworthy that this is now substantially poorer than in other Scottish schools (all of which have enjoyed substantial new investment in teaching accommodation over the last 10 years), making Dundee a less attractive environment for potential students. It is likely that this will be reflected, in future years, in our ranking in league tables that take account of infrastructure.

Current accommodation problems: the current teaching space on levels 7 & 8 of the hospital is shared with Postgraduate Medical Education (led by NES Scotland); this close integration of undergraduate and postgraduate activity is valuable and needs to be retained. Significant problems include:

- The Centre for Medical Education (which should be the driver for Educational Research in Medicine) is located off-site in outdated accommodation (Taypark House). The Centre needs to be brought into the main teaching area to facilitate the engagement of educational research with teaching delivery.
- There are four lecture theatres which are significantly dilapidated and require major updating for future use.
- A range of seminar rooms is available within this area, of variable quality. Some of these rooms have recently been upgraded but a significant number remain of poor standard.
- IT facilities and e-learning facilities are inadequate for current teaching purposes and require substantial investment.
- The Clinical Skills area is of reasonable quality and will be extended and upgraded as part of the initial part of our Capital Redevelopment Plan.
- The Medical School administration and Assessment Offices are not located near the teaching area. This results in a lack of common identity for students and staff.

Educational Capital Developments currently underway: A staged Educational Capital Development programme is already underway and is funded from a range of sources (described below).

Phase 1 included upgrading a small number of seminar rooms to provide small group teaching accommodation; this was completed in 2009. Work on the second part of Phase 1 will commenced at the beginning of July 2010 and involves extension and upgrading of the Clinical Skills Centre. This development has been supported, specifically, by the Dow Trust.

The next phase (phase 2–3) of the development of the teaching area will include significant refurbishment of teaching accommodation on level 7 and level 8 in Ninewells, with a small element of new build. This will allow accommodation to be developed for the Centre for Medical Education (currently based in Taypark House). It will include upgrading small group teaching areas, and new provision of e-learning and IT support. As part of this development, the Medical School administrative hub will move to within the teaching area providing an integrated focus for all Medical School undergraduate activity. Finally, the current postgraduate Medical Education offices and base will remain (but relocated) within this teaching environment so that the School retains a fully integrated resource for undergraduate and postgraduate education and educational research.

The final component of the proposed upgrading of the teaching resource (phase 4) requires significant investment in lecture theatres. At present there are three main lecture theatres within the teaching area, all of which are in very poor state and one additional lecture theatre located elsewhere on the Ninewells campus (Wolfson Theatre). As part of the development plan the number of lecture theatres in use should be reduced from four to three with development of new high quality accommodation fit for modern teaching purposes. The move of CME from Taypark House, and consolidation of the number of Lecture Theatres will improve utilisation figures. It is also suggested that the Lecture Theatre accommodation becomes available for other university use via central bookings, and that use for external conference activity is evaluated for out of term times.

Funding: The current capital plans for the teaching developments include money that has been donated by the Dow Trust (£0.5M), funding from the NHS through its ACT allocation (£2.7M) and allocation of capital resource by the University of Dundee (£4.3M). The present total resource, therefore, committed for these developments is £7.5M. The cost of
refurbishment of the lecture theatres will depend on the extent of the work and the timing of the development. However, current estimates suggest that this may add an additional £3.5M to the total budget.

In summary, planned redevelopment in a staged manner is already underway. Full realisation of this will provide the University with high quality and modern teaching accommodation for its medical school and which will reflect the investment made in medical education and excellence in undergraduate medical teaching. The final phase (redevelopment of lecture theatres) is the only component that is not yet funded (see below) and approval to seek external funding support is now requested. It should be stressed that no additional University funds are requested at present, and that upgrading of lecture theatres will only proceed when funds are available. The nature of the project allows the development to be managed so that the extent (1, 2 or 3 theatres) will be determined by the amount of funding raised. The end result, however would be that a programme of refurbishment of the Medical School that cost £11M will have been achieved with a contribution from the University of £4.3M. As a benchmark, the new medical school build at the University of Aberdeen cost ~ £20M for a footprint only modestly larger than proposed in the Ninewells proposals.

Meeting the Funding Gap: To achieve the refurbishment of lecture theatres will require raising an additional £3.5M. It is acknowledged that identification of this new funding may be difficult at present. However, the vision outlined above is for a five year programme and it is proposed that developments will proceed only when funding becomes available. It is important, however, to view the educational project as a single entity in order that the all of the elements of teaching excellence are strongly supported. A number of major funding bodies will be approached at an early stage to identify possible contributions. These include the Scottish Government and NHS Scotland; NHS Tayside; major trusts such as the Wolfson Trust and Garfield Weston Trust; and local bodies including the Dow Trust, and the Mathew Trust. Finally, it is recognised that any development such as this needs to involve fundraising from Alumni and public campaigns, as well as appeals to local major donors (informal approaches suggest that an integrated approach to develop a state of the art Medical School is likely to be viewed sympathetically in this regard). Initial discussions with External Relations have been of value in identifying a possible fundraising strategy, and the Medical School is willing to invest resource in working with External relations to develop this rapidly if approval is granted by Court.
APPENDIX 6

STRATEGIC REVIEW
(Minute 8)

Introduction

1. The purpose of this paper is to provide an update to Court on the Strategic Review proposals. It also provides more detail on where the savings are expected to be achieved.

2. This stage of the strategic review essentially comprises proposals on a College/School and Student & Academic Services basis that will deliver the vision of Excellence, Impact and Focus across the University.

3. It was agreed at the June Court meeting, and subsequently discussed at the Court away day, that there is a need to develop an updated overarching Strategic Framework for the University which would be the basis for the future branding / positioning of the University. It was also agreed at the Court away day that there should be a review of current academic footprint of the University and of the key research themes that should underpin this. This review is ongoing and initial thoughts will be presented for discussion to the December Court meeting which should coincide with more clarity around the scale of the funding cuts the Scottish HE sector are likely to face in the short / medium term.

Development of Projects

4. Throughout the summer all areas of the University have continued to develop their strategic review projects. The following sections provide an update for each area.

5. The projects are of varying nature in terms of complexity and timescales for implementation. Each project will be brought forward through the appropriate University decision-making process in accordance with the University’s Schedule of Delegation and general governance framework.

College of Arts and Social Sciences

6. The College has identified its key areas of development which emerged after consultation with staff; a few projects initially proposed in the SR have been dropped, others tailored to further enhance the proposals, and some remain unchanged.

7. The period following consultation with College staff has been productive. Project outlines have been produced for each of the key areas and implementation plans have been drafted for some of the shorter term objectives set by the College. Specific projects to be taken forward in the short term include:

   - The creation of a School of the Environment (working title), merging the Schools of Architecture with Geography and Town & Regional Planning from the School of Social & Environmental Sciences
   - The creation of a School of Business (working title) comprising the School of Accounting & Finance and Economics from the School of Social & Environmental Sciences
   - Rationalising community outreach activity, relating to non-core activities

5. In addition to the above the College is reviewing its TPG provision to ensure high quality programmes which meet market demand and can attract high quality students and premium fees. It will also improve the structure of programmes to ensure they are delivered efficiently. At the same time there is an ongoing audit of current UG programmes and module provision, with a view to rationalising the portfolio by reducing modules to an optimal level and removing duplication. This will free up staff time through operating efficiently across the portfolio and at the same time improving the student experience.

6. Working with colleagues across the University will be vital in developing a standard approach to portfolio analysis, with a view to rationalising the programme offerings across and between Colleges and Schools in line with excellence and market demand.

7. The College remains focused on pursuing only the highest quality research and building on areas of strength. This has been informed by two RAEs, a strategic review of CASS research in 2009, and a series of research reviews in 2010 which have included input from external subject experts. Only research of the highest quality will be supported, with resources concentrated in the highest-achieving disciplines as measured by quality and impact. The threshold for research which is to be supported is the *rising 2**. The aim is to increase the proportion of outputs achieving 3* and 4* ratings, although exceptions will be made in the case of early career researchers.
8. Greater efficiencies will be achieved through the implementation of a workload model that allows transparency and re-allocates academic staff time away from unfunded research that does not meet the standards outlined in 7 above.

**College of Art, Science & Engineering**

9. CASE has undertaken a period of extensive and very positive consultation involving College-wide and School-specific meetings. As a result, the College identified individual projects to progress the Strategic Review. Each project has a Project Manager identified to ensure that appropriate and extensive consultation culminates in proposals which align with the objectives of the Strategic Review within the College namely:

- To focus both research themes and taught provision on those areas evidenced to be truly excellent or with a short term trajectory to be excellent;
- To revise taught provision resulting in a revitalised and focused portfolio of UG and TPG programmes that is evidenced to be student and industry demand led;
- To increase the proportion of research active staff with 3 /4* outputs by reducing unfunded research time and investing in strategic appointments and collaborations;
- To withdraw from activities which do not meet the excellence criteria and which do not align with the strategic focus of the College;
- To enhance the excellence reputation of the College and its Schools maintaining the focus on quality of research and student experience.

**Review of UG & TPG Provision:**

10. EPM: The School will be completing extensive consultation and market research to inform the potential for a common 1st to 3rd year programme for Electrical Engineering, Renewable Energy and Physics and possibly Mechanical Engineering. This will be followed with two further years of electives at levels four and five allowing flexible routes for either MEng or MSci graduation. Review of the EPM TPG portfolio has identified that some programmes, although currently attractive to students, do not align with the research strengths of the School and will be developed into new areas that can continue not only to attract students internationally but be supported and informed by the investments in leading edge research.

11. DOJ & Computing: Much exciting discussion and exploration of strengths, possible improvements and efficiencies have been reported. In DOJ, the original proposal to offer a reduction to 4 new programmes remains the central new development in undergraduate teaching. The current DOJ Peer-Review of Research and Scholarship is contributing to the identification of how and where teaching resource is and should be targeted.

12. In Computing, it is planned that new degree programmes will be introduced to the undergraduate portfolio which are more relevant to patterns of student demand such as a BSc Hons Business Computing replacing e-Commerce Computing.

13. A review of TPG provision is well underway with a view to invest in a small but potentially growing number of successful, sustainable programmes based on proven recruiting strategies and internal strengths, instead of unrestricted numbers of tentative programmes.

**Research Themes & Quality Reviews:**

14. Research in the School of Architecture comprises a single Architectural Research Group (ARG), whose focus is creative practice led research in sustainability and design and critical theory both of which will contribute effectively to the research portfolio of the new School of the Environment (see paragraph 4 above). The ARG continues to be focused through the Geddes Institute around the overarching theme of sustainability.

15. In EPM it has been agreed to adopt the following two research themes.

- Bio-Interfaces
- Environment, Infrastructure and Renewable Energy

16. The Bio-Interfaces area maps on to the EPSRC and BBSRC Strategic Research priority areas. The Environment, Infrastructure and Renewable Energy grouping is based on the established research strengths in Civil Engineering and Phonics. Both areas map on to EPSRC Priority Research Areas of Living with Environmental Change, Global Uncertainties and Energy.

17. In DOJ there is a wide-spread consensus for the following strategically re-focused themes:

- Digital Economy
- Interdisciplinary Exploration
- Contemporary Practices
18. Research outputs of all staff are being qualitatively reviewed by a Peer Review Panel from DOJ Research Committee. The full compliment of DOJ staff will have had their duties individually re-balanced by early October 2010. This has already resulted in a significant review of focus, distribution and application of teaching resource across UG and PGT, and of DOJ research strategy.

19. In Computing, discussions have informed the original proposed research themes for the School to be amended from the current four themes to three:
   - Inclusive Design
   - Intelligent Systems Lab
   - Space Technology Centre

20. All Deans and their project teams are committed to progressing proposals. The College Management Team will continue to monitor progress towards implementation and the required reporting to Senate and Court.

**College of Life Sciences**

21. CLS has made significant progress in moving forward their strategic review proposals. The College has conducted a research and teaching review, to ensure the focus remains on the highest quality research and developing the curriculum to deliver world class UG and TPG degrees.

**Research School**

22. CLS have reviewed PIs against 3*/4* RAE quality thresholds and anticipated REF criteria as well as their ability to financially sustain their research programmes. The review committee considered research outputs, research funding and esteem factors of the academic staff in the Research School. A small number of academic staff were identified through this Strategic Review as not directly fitting the strategy of the School of Research. These members of staff have been informed and will now be supported on an alternative and equitable career path in other identified academic roles in the College of Life Sciences.

23. This is supported by a robust review process for recently appointed staff and to tenure only those staff with 3*/4* and rising 2* outputs.

24. CLS have significantly rationalized space to allow expansion of the Medical Research Council Protein Phosphorylation Unit and Scottish Institute for Cell Signalling. Given their capacity to generate research overheads, the continued success of these Units is important to the long term sustainability of the College and will influence the future of the DSTT (a large industrial collaboration with leading pharmaceutical companies). This rationalisation of space will result in all existing space within the MSI/WTB/JBC research complex being fully utilised.

**School of Learning and Teaching and CAHID**

25. The degrees will be aligned with research activity: making best use of the resource available in both CLS and CMDN for delivering world class UG and TPG degrees. A key plan is to include an integrated Masters year resembling an MRes rather than an MSc, with opportunities for the best students to progress to a PhD. This new strategy fosters improved links between the Schools of Research and Teaching, improves the quality of students and provides common goals across the College.

26. CAHID continues to be an innovative area of the College and regularly reviews existing activity alongside new opportunities.

27. There have been significant staff changes in SLT/CAHID over the past six months with realignment and increased teaching duties from the Research School. There will be savings associated with increased efficiencies in terms of future teaching delivery. A formal Degree Programme Review of the proposed new Life Sciences teaching curriculum and degree structure, involving external assessors, is scheduled for completion in December 2010. A change plan will then be initiated to adjust resources according to the knowledge, expertise and staffing levels required to deliver the new courses.

28. CLS staff also make a considerable teaching contribution to the Medicine and Dentistry degree programmes and deliver a significant number of modules for Psychology, Geography and Environmental Studies. The Dean of the School of Learning and Teaching and the Head of CAHID are currently involved in working groups looking at the future structure and delivery of these programmes.

**College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing**

29. CMDN have identified key projects across the College centred on research themes and quality, undergraduate teaching, development of PGT activity and review of space.
30. The research strategy focuses on key themes in translational medicine as follows:

- Medicine: Cancer; Diabetes; Molecular Dermatology; Neuroscience and population science
- Nursing & Midwifery: Cancer care and improving the delivery of care
- Dentistry: Improving oral and dental health.

31. The implementation will see the application of stretching criteria for research excellence. To achieve this a detailed review of research performance has been undertaken across the School at an individual level. The review has been based on 3*/4* RAE quality thresholds and anticipated REF criteria as well as their ability to financially sustain research taking into consideration research outputs, research funding and esteem factors.

32. The UG curriculum has been subject to a full review across the College. In Medicine & Dentistry there is a particular emphasis on the areas of basic science teaching and anatomy. This should produce efficiencies especially around the delivery of the early years of the core curricula. In Nursing all undergraduate programmes will be transferred to degree exit by 2011 and the School will move to a single annual undergraduate intake each September. Alongside a planned reduction in modules and programmes this will lead to a consequent reduction in the level of teaching input required. In addition as the new CLS portfolio is established further significant rationalisation will be possible in the delivery of core non-clinical biomedical teaching across CLS and CMDN.

33. A key strategy is the expansion of number and scope of TPG courses. At the same time all existing provision in both TPG and CPD courses are being reviewed both for academic quality and financial sustainability. The majority of the planned expansion will be managed within existing resource by making more effective use of staff time.

34. There has also been a review of space within the College and in particular at Ninewells where the space is inflexible and expensive. A revised estates plan is being produced.

Student & Academic Support Services

35. A number of proposals have been developed within central services with the overall aim of improving the effectiveness of operations such that they are fit for purpose and cost effective in terms of their delivery to students and staff. The main projects centre on:

- Process Improvements: these include e-recruitment, procurement to pay, library self-service, research processes and student administration. These projects will improve delivery whilst at the same time reducing the resources required (staff & space). These projects will lead to more standardisation across the University and generate efficiencies both with central services and College / School support.
- Income generating activities: such as botanic gardens, ISE, elements of ARMMS, print unit, campus catering & residences will be reviewed to minimize University subsidy and where possible make a net contribution.
- Structural: a number of changes are proposed to improve delivery and the student / staff experience, whilst at the same time reducing costs. The main changes are the consolidation of student operations into one directorate and the merger of the Principal’s Office and Academic Affairs.
- Space: we have introduced a pragmatic space reduction programme to target properties on the periphery of the main campus with the aim of reducing the overall footprint and so delivering savings in maintenance and running costs. In addition to this facilities management costs will be targeted to generate further efficiencies.

Savings

36. The strategic review has its focus upon improving excellence in teaching and research across the University, whilst at the same time aiming to deliver savings of between 10% and 12%. Proposals have been developed and the indicative savings are as outlined below. It is hoped that these savings can be achieved primarily through turnover / vacancies, retirement and voluntary severance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>FTE Saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Physics &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Finance / Economics (School of Business)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Social Work &amp; Community Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental Sciences / Architecture (School of the Environment)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. This equates to 10.5% of core staff in the Colleges and Central Services and annual savings of £8M. In addition to this savings of £1.5M have been targeted in non-pay spend particularly within Central services with a focus on reducing subsidies to income generating activities and space costs.

38. As discussed at previous Court meetings it is likely that the sector will be subject to funding reductions in excess of this. Although it will not be until late November when we will have the first real indication of the scale and timing of the cuts, it is widely expected that they are likely to be in the region of 25% plus, and front-end-loaded. If core SFC recurrent funding were to be cut by 25% this would equate to £18M. It is also expected that the research councils will be subject to significant reductions that will impact on our capacity to delivery against research income and overhead targets.

39. It remains important that we deliver on the savings identified through the strategic review but Court must also recognise that more significant savings are likely to be required to meet the scale of the cuts the sector will be facing in the near future.

Recommendation

40. Court is asked to note the progress made and the identified savings. As Court has already agreed, the implementation of the proposals will follow the appropriate approval processes as defined in the schedule of delegation and Court will continue to be apprised of progress in achieving savings targets at each of its meetings.

41. Court is also asked to note the significant risks that exist in relation to the University's future funding and that the Senior Management Team, following on from the discussions at the Court away day, is presently undertaking a more fundamental review of the University's footprint and overall operations in the context of a range of possible future funding scenarios.

42. An additional paper, providing a provisional analysis of the likely effects of the Comprehensive Spending Review and the factors the University will need to address in order to respond to it, is being prepared and will be circulated electronically ahead of the meeting on 25 October.
APPENDIX 7

GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

(Minute 9)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 4 October 2010.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Mr WI Ball, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr R Burns, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: University Secretary and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Dr J Lowe.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meetings on 17 May and 2 June 2010.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Committee Membership 2010/11 (Minute 2, 2 June 2010)

The Committee noted the final memberships for Committees for 2010/11, including the full membership of the Ethical Review Committee (annex a refers).

(2) Statute 9 The Court (Minute 4(1), 2 June 2010)

The Committee noted that the University had received a sealed resolution from the Privy Council approving amendments to Statute 9 and that the revised Statute had come into effect on 1 August 2010.

(3) President of the Students’ Association

The Committee noted the recent resignation of the Students’ Association President, Craig Kelly, and considered how, in response, student representation on Court and its Committees could be maintained.

Resolved: to recommend that the Deputy President of the Students’ Association be invited to become a member of the Finance & Policy Committee, noting that, subject to confirmation at the Court meeting on 25 October 2010, he would also become a full Court member in terms of Statute 9(1)(k).

3. LAY VACANCIES

(1) Court

The Committee considered the skills background desirable in any candidate for the remaining co-opted lay vacancy on Court, and also considered the means by which such a candidate could be identified.

Resolved: to invite members to nominate potential candidates for further exploration and interview where appropriate, and in particular to consider nominees in the fields of human resources, international business and the arts.

(2) Audit Committee

The Committee considered the means by which it would identify a suitable successor to Miss J Thomson, whose term of office on the Audit Committee would end on 31 July 2011, noting that the Audit Committee needed to ensure it included a qualified chartered accountant within its membership.

Resolved: to invite the Director and Deputy Director of Finance to bring forward suggestions for consideration by the Committee, that failing to invite Miss Thomson herself to provide suggestions.

4. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: CORPORATE GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

The Committee considered the draft corporate governance statement, including the table of Court and Committee membership and attendance, for inclusion in the Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2010. It discussed the representation in the statement of the relevant responsibilities of the Court in relation to its obligations under the
Funding Council's Financial Memorandum and other external codes, including the Financial Reporting Council's Combined Code on Corporate Governance. It also considered such issues as: the introduction of private meetings of the Chairperson with the non-executive Court members and of a meeting of Court members without the presence of the Chairperson; the relative definitions of lay in a University context and independent in a more business-oriented context; and the possible inclusion in the Financial Statements of a foreword by the Chairperson.

Resolved: (i) to ask the Convener & Chairperson of Court to consider the matter of private meetings with the non-executive Court members and of a meeting of the Court members in the absence of the Chairperson, and to report back to the Committee;

(ii) to ask the Clerk to Court to ensure that all Court members were individually content that the information on attendance and Committee membership that would be published in the Financial Statements was accurate;

(iii) to allow the Chairperson of Court to explore the inclusion of a general foreword to the Financial Statements; and

(iv) otherwise, to approve the statement, subject to minor amendments.

5. REGISTER OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

The Committee received a report summarising in tabular form individual Court members’ disclosures relating to potential conflicts of interest, and noted that in accordance with the Court’s decision of 26 October 2009, these details would be published on the University’s webpages.

Resolved: (i) to ask the Clerk to Court to continue his efforts to collect submissions from all Court members; and

(ii) otherwise, to note the report, recommending the publication of its contents as detailed, but subject to minor amendment.

6. CHARTER AND STATUTES WORKING GROUP

The Committee received a report from the working group which it had established at its meeting on 17 May 2010 for the purpose of carrying out a wide-ranging review of the Charter and Statutes (annex b refers). The Committee welcomed the report and was content to endorse its preliminary findings and suggestions for further consultation with relevant stakeholder groups, including but not limited to, the Senate, Academic Council, Graduates’ Council, campus unions and other Court Committees as appropriate.

Resolved: (i) to endorse an invitation to the Senate to review Statute 10 – The Senate;

(ii) to endorse invitations to both the Academic Council and the Graduates’ Council to review Statutes 15 and 20 respectively as well as to review in particular their effectiveness, powers and functions, noting that the Graduates’ Council had already undertaken, following a decision taken at its recent Business Committee meeting, to carry out such a review; and

(iii) to ask the University Secretary, the Academic Secretary (on the Senate’s behalf) and Clerk to Court (on the Court’s behalf) to carry forward this work in conjunction with the working group, with a view to drafting proposals for presentation to the Court and Senate in early 2011.
MEMBERSHIP OF COURT COMMITTEES 2010-11

Note: The Secretary of the University is responsible for ensuring that each Committee is provided with secretarial services by a member of the University's administrative staff. In addition other officers may attend for all or part of a meeting to provide information and/or to contribute to discussion. No officer, however, shall have voting rights on any Committee unless identified in this list as a member.

1. Audit Committee

Members
Dr Howard Marriage (Convener)
Mr John Barnett
Emeritus Professor Ann Burchell
Mr Jo Elliot
Mr Keith Swinley
Ms Jacqui Thomson

Officers normally in attendance
Convener of Finance & Policy Committee
University Secretary
Director of Finance
Clerk to Court (Secretary)
Other officers at the discretion of the Director of Finance

2. Ethical Review Committee

Members (note: most of the membership comprises a pool, from which members are drawn for each meeting)
Professor John McEwen (Convener)
Dr Simon Arthur
Professor David Balfour
Dr Delia Belelli
Professor Julian Blow
Professor Mark Chaplain
Rev Dr Fiona Douglas
Dr Jodi-Ann George
Dr Colin Henderson
Mr Ian Hunter
Professor Aleksandar Jovanovic
Dr Alasdair Maclean
Mr John MacLeod
Mrs Lorraine Malone
Mr Andrew Newman
Dr Luke Newman
Dr Kevin Read
Dr Angela Roger
Mr Gordon Tennant
Professor Julie Taylor
Professor Colin Watts
Professor Eric Wright (until 31/10/2010)
Deputy Secretary (Mr P D Evans)
Director of Biological Services

Officer normally in attendance
Ms Edna Finnie (Secretary)

3. Finance & Policy Committee

Members
Mr Richard Burns (Convener)
Principal
Vice Principal (Professor James Calderhead)
Mr Ian Ball
Dr Janet Lowe
Dr Lesley McEllian
Mr Andrew Richmond
Mr Eric Sanderson
Mr Iain Wright
President of the Students' Association
Craig Kelly

Officer normally in attendance
Convener of Audit Committee
University Secretary
Director of Finance
Deputy Director of Finance
Director of Campus Services
Director of Information Services
Director of Strategic Planning
Clerk to Court (Secretary)

4. Governance & Nominations Committee

Members
Mr Eric Sanderson (Convener)
Principal
Professor RJ Abboud
Mr Ian Ball
Professor Ann Burchell
Mr Richard Burns
Dr Janet Lowe
Mr Iain Wright

Officers normally in attendance
University Secretary
Clerk to Court (Secretary)

5. Human Resources Committee

Members
Dr Janet Lowe (Convener)
Vice Principal (Professor Christopher Whatley)
Professor Rami Abboud
Mr Donald Cathcart
Mr Ian Leith
Professor Gary Mires
Dr Howard Marriage
Ms Christina Potter
Dr Angela Roger

Officers normally in attendance
University Secretary
Director of Human Resources
Deputy Director of Human Resources (Secretary)
Other officers at the discretion of the Director of Human Resources

6. Remuneration Committee

Members
Mr Richard Burns (Convener)
Mr Jo Eliot
Dr Janet Lowe
Mr Eric Sanderson

Officers normally in attendance
Principal (as required)
University Secretary (as required)
Director of Human Resources (as required)

7. Senior Management Team

Members
Principal (Convener)
Vice-Principals
University Secretary
Director of Finance

Officers normally in attendance
Director of Human Resources
Director of Strategic Planning
Other Directors of Student & Academic Support Services (at the discretion of the University Secretary)
Clerk to Court (Secretary)
CHARTER & STATUTES WORKING GROUP

Report of its meeting on 30 August 2010

Introduction

1. At its meeting on 17 May 2010, the Committee approved the establishment of a working group to carry out a review of the Charter and Statutes. The group’s membership comprises: Mr EF Sanderson, Mr WI Ball, Mr IDM Wright, the University Secretary and the Clerk to Court.

2. The Working Group held its first meeting on 30 August 2010, at which it considered draft proposals, prepared by the Clerk to Court, for those areas of the Charter and Statutes that should or could be revised as part of the review. This paper summarises the outcomes of that meeting and suggests next steps in the review process.

Charter

3. The group considered a number of potential revisions to the Royal Charter. A draft of the proposed changes to the Charter was considered and the following paragraphs explain the rationale behind these suggestions and any investigatory work being undertaken as a result.

Powers of the University

4. Article 3 of the Charter lists the powers of the University. Under these powers is listed the following (d):

   To admit any graduate of another University to a degree of equal or similar rank in the University.

The group felt that this power should be deleted from the Charter, since it related to an era when mutual recognition of institutions’ degrees was not implicit. It was therefore now redundant.

5. Under the same powers of Article 3 there is at (m) a statement about the University’s power to collaborate with other institutions and public or private bodies. At the end of the clause specific reference is made to the desirability of co-operation with the University of St Andrews, viz:

   …and in particular to cooperate by means of joint boards or otherwise with the University of St Andrews for the extension of university teaching and influence in academic matters, and for such other purposes as the Court of the University may from time to time determine.

It was the group’s view that this clause, as a relic of our history, should be deleted from the Charter. There is no reciprocal clause in any of the University of St Andrews Acts, Ordinances or Resolutions, and the clause runs counter to any university’s strategy to seek out collaborations and partnerships wherever they might be found. The relationship with St Andrews does not operate in the way suggested by the clause and given the lack of a similar clause in St Andrews’ governance instruments it is arguably inequitable. Informal discussions with the University of St Andrews suggest at this stage that they would be relaxed about such a change, although some confirmation of this would be required before submitting proposals to the Privy Council.

Principal

6. Article 6 deals with the office of the Principal, its powers and functions and the identification of successor Principals. It is proposed that 6.1a be amended to reflect the fact that the Principal does not chair the Court, which would in any case today be poor governance practice. Additionally, the provision in 6.1(e) about acts during vacancies in the post of Principal could be moved to Statute 5 – The Principal.

Academic Council

7. Article 12 deals with the Academic Council. It is proposed that 12.1 be amended to take out the word full-time and to add explicit reference to administrators as members of the Council by virtue of their academic-related contracts, and in accordance with Senate longstanding decision to designate all members of the academic-related staff as members of Academic Council. Alternatively the membership of the Council could be defined in Statute or, perhaps preferably, in Ordinance, and this sub-article could be reduced to:

   There shall be an Academic Council of the University, whose membership shall be as prescribed in the Statutes or Ordinances.

This would be in line with article 11, relating to the Graduates’ Council.
8. It is also proposed, see below Statute 15, that the Academic Council carry out a review of its powers and functions to determine its relevance and effectiveness. The outcome of such a review might have further implications for the wording of the Charter.

Bribery and Corruption

9. Article 13 attempts to prevent corrupt practices within the University. The article is unclear as currently written although mirrors similar articles in other institutions' charters. Nevertheless given the likely coming into force in April 2011 of the Bribery Act 2010, the University Solicitor advises that this article should be revised. A draft article will be brought forward in due course.

Equality

10. Article 14 is a now rather outdated attempt to address various forms of potential discrimination. It is clearly now out of line with equality legislation and requires to be revised. A draft rewording has been proposed, although discussions are also ongoing with the University's Equality & Diversity Officer to devise a more generic yet comprehensive wording for a revised article.

Resolutions

11. Articles 15 through to 20 deal with the mechanisms for making, amending or repealing Ordinances or Statutes or for amending the Charter. All changes to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances must be approved at one meeting of Court and confirmed by a second meeting no less than one month and no longer than three months after the original decision. It is proposed that this system of ‘double approval’ be removed from the Charter, allowing the Court to approve changes at one meeting after or subject to consultation with the Senatus. Special Resolutions (to amend the Charter or make, amend or repeal Statutes) will still require a three-fourths majority of those present and voting. The Privy Council has shown it would be agreeable to such a change in its approval of similar arrangements at a number of other institutions.

Charter: Next Steps

12. The Committee is invited to comment on the proposed amendments as they currently stand.

Statutes

13. The group also considered proposals relating to the Statutes as set out in the paragraphs below. Work on revising the Statutes will inevitably require wider input and more detailed drafting, since proposals to remove sections of the Statutes will require new Ordinances or regulations to be drawn up in compensation. It is therefore proposed that the Committee be asked to provide feedback on the general changes suggested for the Statutes, and for detailed work to be undertaken by the Secretary, Clerk to Court and Academic Secretary to draft new instruments. All amendments will require input from the Senatus, indeed some Statutes will require the Senatus to take the lead in their review. Individual Statutes will require specialist advice or will require consultation with the relevant body (e.g. Academic Council, Graduates’ Council).


15. Statute 1 Definitions

a. General tidying up of the definitions, and in particular removal of ‘College’ in the sense of ‘Queen’s College’

b. Removal of the clause relating to gender language and to the inclusion of the feminine in the masculine, with the corollary that the remainder of the Statutes should therefore be so written to include both genders or that both genders be made explicit.
16. Statute 2 – Members of the University
   a. Membership of the University, in accordance with the Cabinet Secretary’s advice on deregulation, can be taken out of Privy Council control, and it is therefore proposed that this Statute be reduced to an enabling clause, with University membership defined in a new Ordinance.

17. Statute 3 – The Chancellor
   a. It is proposed that a term of office be specified for the Chancellor of 5 years, with the possibility of renewal for a further 5 years, but that any change would not apply to Lord Patel;
   b. It is proposed that the appointment by Court of the Chancellor be effected via a Joint Committee of the Court and Senatus.
   c. It is proposed that the Chancellor, if wishing to resign, should write to the University Secretary, rather than to the Court direct.

18. Statute 4 – The Rector
   a. It is proposed that those paragraphs dealing with the eligibility, nomination and election of the Rector should be moved to the Ordinances, but that the term of office of the Rector, ie the gap between elections, should be maintained in Statute, in the same way as the terms of office for other office-holders and Court members.

19. Statute 5 – The Principal
   a. It is proposed that the appointment by the Court of the Principal be effected via a Joint Committee of the Court and Senatus; and further that the appointment be confirmed at a special meeting of Court.
   b. Other paragraphs to remain in Statute, but with rephrasing of paragraph 2 in line with changes to Statute 16 (see below).
   c. Paragraph 4 relates to the power of the Principal to exclude persons from the campus. This will be reviewed in tandem both with Statutes 16 and 18 and Ordinance 40 (Student Discipline); and in particular the footnote noting appeals to the Chairperson of Court should, if this provision is retained, be included in the main body of the Statute.

20. Statute 6 – The Secretary
   a. Largely unchanged but for rephrasing in line with changes to Statute 16.

21. Statute 7 – The Librarian
   a. It is proposed that this Statute be repealed. The development of the Library & Learning Centre and its organisational location within Information Services make the retention of a Statute relating to a traditional Librarian less relevant; it also arguably prevents the University from organising and administering its library and digital resources in the most appropriate manner.

22. Statute 8 – The Auditors
   a. It is proposed that the second paragraph be reworded to remove reference to recognition of auditors’ affiliation to bodies approved by the Board of Trade under the Companies Act. The proposed amended wording is as follows:

   [New wording]

   Every such Auditor shall be a member of an appropriate professional body

23. Statute 9 – The Court
   a. Paragraphs 1-4 of the Statute should remain as recently amended and approved by Privy Council (they deal with membership, terms of office and eligibility).
   b. Paragraphs 5 and 6 should be reviewed, with a view to reduction in the number of powers by merging sub-paragraphs and also with a view to clarifying the respective governance roles of the Court and Senatus. Proposals for change will be brought forward to the working group in due course, following discussion with the Academic Secretary and where appropriate consultation with the Senatus.
   c. Sub-paragraph 5(g) should be deleted, since representatives of both the General Medical and General Dental Councils are no longer selected in this way. The sub-paragraph is redundant.

24. Statute 10 – The Senatus
   a. It is recommended that the Senatus, either as part of its effectiveness review or separately, be invited to review this Statute, and in particular to review the powers listed in paragraph 4 in line with the working group’s review of similar paragraphs in Statute 9 – The Court. The intention is that both Statutes 9 and 10 will be reduced in length, be made more precise, and that the respective powers of Senatus and Court be clarified.
25. **Statute 13: Acts during Vacancies**
   a. Under the Cabinet Secretary’s de-regulation guidance, this Statute could be removed to Ordinance; but since it is uncontroversial and a desirable principle, it is proposed that it should remain.

26. **Statute 14: Academic Ceremonies**
   a. Under the Cabinet Secretary’s de-regulation guidance, this Statute could be removed to Ordinance; the working group was happy to see it move to Ordinance but, given that it is uncontroversial, and provides no hostages to fortune, perhaps it is simpler to leave it in Statute.

27. **Statute 15: Academic Council**
   a. It is proposed that this Statute be replaced by an enabling clause, and the contents be moved to Ordinance;
   b. It is also suggested that Council should carry out a review of its powers and functions, which review might have further implications for the wording of such a new Ordinance (see also Charter above, paragraph 8)

28. **Statute 16: Academic Staff**
   a. Statute 16 is currently subject to separate discussions on revising its content. These discussions incorporate consultation with the campus unions and the input of the Human Resources Committee. Once the Statute has been revised there will be a number of consequent changes to other Statutes (e.g. 5 – The Principal, 6 – The Secretary, etc.)

29. **Statute 17: Retirement of Members of Staff**
   a. Subject to consultation with the HRC, it is proposed that this Statute be repealed since it is not in line with current employment and equality legislation.

30. **Statute 18: Discipline**
   a. It is proposed that this should be reviewed with the University Solicitor and Academic Secretary, to ensure no overlap with Ordinance 40 (Student Discipline), Statute 5, or Statute 19; and with a view to ensuring that all discipline-related instruments are consistent and in line with best practice.

31. **Statute 19: Students’ Association**
   a. It is proposed that this is reviewed formally with the Executive of the Students Association, to ensure fitness of purpose, consistency and relevance. In particular paragraph 2 (relating to the right to petition Senate and Court), should be reviewed to ensure it is consistent with the relative powers of Court and Senate in Statutes 9 and 10, respectively, and indeed with the last paragraph of Statute 18, which talks of petitions to Senate.

32. **Statute 20: Graduates’ Council**
   a. As with Statute 15, it is proposed that this Statute be replaced by an enabling clause, and the contents be moved to Ordinance;
   b. It might be appropriate also for the Graduates’ Council likewise to be invited to carry out a review of its effectiveness, powers and functions.
**Statutes: Next Steps**

33. The Committee is invited to comment on the proposed changes as set out above, noting the requirements to consult with the Academic Secretary, the University Solicitor, the Human Resources Committee, the Academic Council and the Graduates’ Council.

34. It is proposed that draft Statutes, taking into account comments from the Committee and from the other officers/bodies named above, be brought to a further meeting of the working group for discussion.

**Ordinances**

35. Draft Ordinances will be compiled in light of the proposed changes to the Statutes, and in consultation with the relevant officers and bodies.

36. It is hoped that full draft Statutes and Ordinances will be complete by early in 2011, when it may be necessary to convene another meeting of the Committee, before proposals are put formally to the Senatus and the Court.

**Summary & Action**

37. The Committee is invited:
   
   a. To comment on the draft Charter;
   b. To comment on the proposals for amendments to the Statutes as set out above;
   c. To note further consultation on amendments to Charter and Statutes with relevant officers and bodies;
   d. To endorse the invitation to the Senatus to review Statute 10;
   e. To endorse the invitations to the Academic Council and the Graduates’ Council to review Statutes 15 and 20 respectively as well as to review in particular their effectiveness, powers and functions;
   f. To note the ongoing work to draft revised Statutes and Ordinances;
   g. To note the possible requirement for an additional meeting of the Committee early in 2011 to approve draft Charter, Statutes and Ordinances for recommendation to the Senatus and the Court.
APPENDIX 8

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS
(Minute 14)

1. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

The Principal drew members’ attention in particular to the University’s outstanding performance in the Times Higher Education World University Rankings noting that significant changes in the methodology concerning research impact and the student experience had been the major contributing factors in our being placed 140th in the world. Those factors were key elements in the Strategic Review and our ranking would be particularly important for international student recruitment and partnerships.

On Lord Browne’s review of higher education and student finance in England, the Principal indicated that the published proposals were at the extreme end of what had been predicted. Their implementation could have a major impact on the competitiveness of Scottish universities depending on the Scottish Government’s decisions about cuts to University funding. Ahead of the Scottish Government’s green paper due to be published in December, Universities Scotland had been lobbying the Minister and others about the importance of introducing some form of graduate contribution in Scotland. In that connection, it seemed that NUS (Scotland) and Universities Scotland might hold sufficiently similar views that they would have an important influence on the content of the Green Paper. DUSA’s perspective was one of opposition to up-front tuition fees and of no agreement to a graduate contribution without seeing detailed proposals.

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

2. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received a communication from the meeting of the University Court held on 14 June and the Court Retreat on 3 September 2010.

The Senatus decided: for its part, to approve the report.

3. FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE

The Senatus received the Minutes of meetings of the Finance and Policy Committee held on 17 May and 30 August 2010 for information.

The Senatus decided: (i) on paragraph 2(1), to note that the process of consultation with individual members of USS on the proposed pension changes would begin within the next few days;

(ii) for the rest, and for its part, to approve the reports.

4. HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

The Senatus received the Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 29 September 2010 (annex).

The Senatus decided: to approve the report.

5. LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE

The Senatus received a report of a meeting of the Committee held on 30 September 2010.

On paragraph 2(3), Centralised Timetabling, the Senatus also considered a paper from Dr Morelli and tabled comments upon that paper from the Director of Registry.

The Vice Principal (Educational Development) introduced the issue providing a summary of how the project had developed in the University over the last five years or so from an initial strategy to improve room utilisation and raise the standard of teaching accommodation, through the establishment of on-line room bookings to the recent production of a central teaching timetable. He pointed out that there were strong arguments in favour of this move concerned with improving the efficiency of the timetabling process and increasing student options, as well as developing a sustainable core of high quality teaching facilities. In the current context, there were also strong financial drivers in improving space utilisation, given the high costs of maintaining the University estate and the fact that the University fell some way behind the SFC benchmark.
He explained that the introduction of central timetabling involved a transition from a very devolved system where information about teaching activities was held locally, and Schools constructed their own timetables, to a system where all relevant information was systematically recorded centrally, enabling the timetable to be set on a university-wide basis. The required timetabling software relied on 3 principal sources of data relating to student options; teaching activities, room requirements and staffing availability; and specifications of the teaching rooms. In some cases assembling the relevant data proved to take longer than had been anticipated, and also in constructing the timetable, the timetabling team discovered a large number of errors and omissions. The late discovery of this created considerable pressure in producing a timetable for the beginning of semester 1. When this became apparent, meetings were held with representatives from each School to identify what needed to be done. Whilst at this stage some Schools preferred the option of reverting to last year’s timetable, it was apparent that for many Schools this would involve as much and in some cases much more effort than correcting the central data. As a result, during August, a considerable effort was required of both academic and support staff working with the timetabling team to create the Semester 1 timetable. This resulted in a timetable being produced much later than usual and whilst the final timetable was workable it was not ideal.

The Vice Principal acknowledged that the experience had resulted in considerable inconvenience to staff and students. In mid August, a Hermes email had been sent to all postgraduate and undergraduate students explaining the situation and apologising for the inconvenience that this might cause, particularly to those who might have to make child care or part-time work arrangements. A similar message had also been sent to all staff a few days later.

In constructing the timetable, emphasis had been placed on Semester 1 and preparations for Semester 2 are still ongoing. However, the timetabling team are now able to use actual student choices, rather than historical ones, room specification data has been corrected, and Schools have been checking their own data. As a result there was every reason to have confidence that the Semester 2 timetabling will be much more successful. In addition, the Registry has been meeting with representatives from the Schools to identify how the process might be improved in the future.

In the course of discussion, members commended the central timetabling team for their efforts and agreed with the potential benefits of central timetabling. However, it was maintained that the lateness of the timetable had generated considerable stress for some staff and had also shaken staff confidence in the process. Some members also felt that their views and concerns at an earlier stage had not been adequately addressed, that communication generally could have been improved and that in parts of the University there was an unwillingness to admit that mistakes had been made. It was also suggested that student dissatisfaction with the timetable was being widely voiced across the University and that the DUSA SCR would be meeting with the University Secretary about this.

The Principal commented that it was important to acknowledge when mistakes were made and to learn lessons as a result. He reiterated his belief in the vital importance of relationships between the University Centre and Schools and noted how the staff involved had responded positively and constructively to a very difficult situation. He would consider how to respond to the University community to reflect both the efforts of those involved in constructing the timetable and the apologies due to those who had been seriously affected by these difficulties.

The Senatus decided:

(i) to continue with the implementation of central timetabling taking lessons from the process thus far;

(ii) for the rest, to approve the report;

6. NEW ORDINANCE 58 ELECTION OF MEMBER OF COURT BY THE STUDENT BODY

The Senatus received a paper from the Court.

The Senatus decided: to endorse the proposed new Ordinance 58 to the Court.
7. COURT REVIEW OF CHARTER & STATUTES

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

The Senatus decided: to note the paper as a first stage in a consultation process.

8. PROFESSORES EMERITI

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

Professor P Davies
Professor P Gregor
Professor A Werritty

9. STUDENTS' ASSESSOR

To note that Mr Stuart Cross will continue as Students' Assessor for a further three year period from 1 December 2010.
HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Committee was held on 29 September 2010.

Present: The Principal (Convener), Professor R Duck, Professor A Fairlamb, Professor P Ferguson, Professor G Gadd, Professor I Leigh, Professor M Rose, Professor E Shemilt and Mr W Wilson (vice Mr C Lovatt).

In Attendance: The Secretary, the Academic Secretary and Miss J Barnard.

1. MINUTES

The Committee received the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2009 and subsequently approved by Senate.

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(1) Honorary Degrees: June 2010 (Minute 3(i))

Resolved: (i) that no further approaches would be made to Annie Leibowitz and Jools Holland;

(ii) to note that the following potential candidates held over from 2009 will be approached for 2010:

Professor Sir John Bell
Professor Doug Hanahan
Nick Lydon
Eddie Mair
Professor James Murray
Dolly Parton
Professor Ann-Marie Rafferty
Queen Rania of Jordan
Albie Sachs

3. CONFERMENT OF HONORARY DEGREES

The Committee received and considered 18 nominations for honorary degrees.

Resolved: (i) to recommend that the following be approached with regard to conferment of the degree of LLD honoris causa at academic ceremonies in 2011/12:

His Serene Highness Prince Albert II of Monaco
Dr Kazem Behbehani
John Byrne
Sylvain Chomet
Professor Sir David Lane
Martin Mackay
Murray McLachlan
Jim McLean
John Milligan
Dr Andom Ogbamariam
Dr Bernard Péonul
Janet Street-Porter

(ii) to be considered for a future ceremony:

Professor Stephen O’Rahilly

4. FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

The Committee discussed improvements which might be made to the nomination process for honorary graduands and to the development of fruitful, future relationships with the graduates. It was felt that a more developmental
approach was necessary with a strategy being developed which might include nominations being open for all staff, a standard format for proposals, a methodology for approaching candidates in the first instance and for the treatment of graduands during their visit to Dundee, as well as ideas for securing beneficial longer-term relationships.

**Resolved:** to invite the Director of External Relations to develop a strategy for the management of Honorary Degrees for consideration by the Committee and, subsequently, the Senatus.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 5 October 2010.

Present: Dr H Marriage (Convener), Mr JE Barnett, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr J Eliot, Mr KAC Swinley, Miss J Thomson.

In Attendance: Mr R Burns, University Secretary, Director and Deputy Director of Finance, Mr D Barnes & Mr S Vallely (Grant Thornton), Mr S Reid & Ms A Taylor (KPMG), University Records Manager (Item 2) and Clerk to Court.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 26 May 2010.

2. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The Committee received a report from the University's Records Manager detailing the volume, frequency and types of information requests received by the University in 2009. The report had previously been discussed at the Library & Information Services Committee in spring 2010. He highlighted in particular the fact that although the University received a higher number of requests than the Scottish average, the number was commensurate with the size of institution and was comparable to other Scottish institutions of a similar composition. Also, when compared with five years ago, the requests were now taking much less time to answer, despite the fact that the requests were becoming more sophisticated and complex. To date, no University of Dundee cases had been referred to the Scottish Information Commissioner, based in St Andrews. The Records Manager confirmed that where the release of information might provide a health & safety risk, then that information was generally not released, in accordance with appropriate exemptions allowed under the legislation.

Resolved: to note the report.

3. INTERNAL AUDIT

(1) Follow-up Report on Prior Year Recommendations (PricewaterhouseCoopers)

The Director of Finance presented a report, prepared by the previous internal auditors, setting out progress in implementing recommendations emanating from internal audit work over the last four years. On the whole the majority of recommendations had either been implemented or become obsolete. A remaining high risk recommendation relating to the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme would be addressed at the January meeting of the Scheme’s trustees. Two other recommendations relating to accounts payable had been delayed until the implementation of the purchase-to-pay system, PECOS, was itself implemented and evaluated.

(2) Internal Audit Plan (KPMG)

The auditors presented the plan for audit work over the next three years, focussing primarily on the work to be carried out in the current session. The plan had been developed following discussions with the external auditors, with senior officers of the University, the Convener of the Committee, and after a detailed mapping exercise of the University’s risk register to proposed audit work. Alongside routine reports on aspects of financial and budgetary control, some focus would be placed on the effects of the strategic review, and there would be individual reports on, inter alia, the central timetable, contracting arrangements, fraud and human resources. The scope and precise terms of reference for all reports would be developed individually in discussion with relevant officers. The Committee found the proposed plan refreshingly broad and appropriate to the current position and aspirations of the University. The Committee discussed value for money, and how this was assessed through the internal audit process, and given that value for money aspects permeated many of the reports, it was suggested that this could be explicitly addressed in the internal auditors’ annual report.

There was discussion also of risk appetite. The University had a comprehensive institutional risk register, but the University had not quantified its appetite for risk, which some members felt to be a fundamental factor in generating a meaningful risk register. The Committee agreed to await the outcomes of the internal audit report into risk management before considering the best way to tackle this issue.
Resolved: to request an update, possibly through the Steering Group of the Tayside Academic Health Sciences Centre, on preparations for the follow-up inspection of clinical trials by the Medicines & Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA); and

(ii) to approve the plan for internal audit work for session 2010/11.

4. EXTERNAL AUDIT

The external auditors provided an oral update on progress with the annual audit. Work was progressing according to plan, and at this stage there were no matters requiring to be brought to the Committee’s attention.

5. HEALTH & SAFETY SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report of the Sub-Committee’s meeting on 20 September 2010. The Committee was dismayed to learn that, at the time of the Sub-Committee’s meeting, a number of risk assessments had remained outstanding in the Biomedical Research Institute, despite the Committee’s raising concerns at its meeting on 26 May 2010, and requested that the seriousness of the situation be conveyed to relevant staff. The Secretary pointed out that work was now ongoing, with the help of the College Secretary, to ensure completion of all outstanding assessment by the end of October 2010.

Resolved: to ask the University Secretary to contact relevant officers in the School of Medicine, to ensure timeous completion of risk assessments in that area and to advise the School of the consequences of not doing so; and

(ii) otherwise, to note the report.

6. LEGAL MATTERS

The Committee received a routine report detailing the current legal cases involving the University, including updates since the last meeting of the Committee.

7. EXTERNAL AUDIT TENDER

The Committee considered a paper from the Deputy Director of Finance and the Clerk to Court setting out proposals for the conduct of a tender exercise for the provision of external audit services.

Resolved: to approve the proposed timetable for the tender exercise, to be published in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) in accordance with EU legislation;

(ii) to approve the establishment of a sub-committee, composition yet to be determined, for the purpose of short-listing candidates and making the final selection; and

(iii) to charge the convener, Deputy Director of Finance and Clerk to Court with taking the matter forward accordingly.