A meeting of the Court was held on Tuesday 26 April 2011.

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

In Attendance: Vice-Principal Professor J Calderhead, Mr I Kennedy (President-elect, Students’ Association), University Secretary, Directors of Finance, Strategic Planning and External Relations, Mr R Isles and Clerk to Court

Apologies: Lord Provost Dr J Letford

44. MINUTES

The Court decided: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 21 February 2011.

45. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Statute 16 – Discipline, Dismissal & Removal from Office (Minute 19(2))

The Court received an update from the University Secretary on the case of two unnamed members of staff who had been dismissed following a Tribunal set up in accordance with Statute 16. The staff had indicated their intention to appeal against dismissal and Mr David Clapham had been appointed by the Court at its meeting on 13 December 2010 to hear the appeal. On the appointed day of the appeal hearing, however, the appeal was withdrawn. It was expected that the staff would not seek an Employment Tribunal, but the Secretary undertook to update the Court at its next meeting.

The Court decided: to note the outcome of the case.

(2) Renewal of Borrowing Facilities: Barclays Bank (Minute 35(2))

The Court decided: to note that the University Secretary and the Director of Finance had now concluded the renewal of the facility that the Court had approved at its meeting on 21 February 2011. The facility would provide up to £34m of borrowing.
Statute 17 – Retirement of Members of Staff (Minute 37(1))

The Court decided: to confirm its decision, taken at the meeting on 21 February 2011, to repeal Statute 17 with effect from 1 October 2011, noting that the Senatus Academicus had been consulted and had endorsed the proposal, but that the decision remained subject to the approval of, and the adoption of any requirements specified by, the Privy Council.

46. CHAIRMAN’S BUSINESS

(1) Appointment of External Auditors

The Court decided: to homologate action by the Chairman to approve the recommendation of the Audit Committee (Minute 51 refers) that:

i) PricewaterhouseCoopers be appointed as the University’s external auditors; and

ii) the Director of Finance be authorised to sign the relevant terms of engagement.

(2) Appeal under Statute 16

The Court decided: to homologate the Chairman’s approval of a substitution in the composition of a panel to hear an appeal against the decision of a Redundancy Committee, such that Mr David Burnside would replace Mr Sandy Meiklejohn (Minutes 62 and 84(2) of the Court meetings of 26 April and 14 June 2010, respectively, refer).

(3) Other Business

The Chairman reported that he was continuing to hold one-to-one meetings with individual members of Court and was hoping to have concluded all of these by the time of the Court meeting on 13 June 2011.

He made Court members aware of a letter which he, along with 12 other Chairs of Scottish Universities, had sent to The Times in response to the suggestions from the Cabinet Secretary for Education & Lifelong Learning, Mike Russell, that Principals might be confirmed in office as well as subject to recall by the academic community (Appendix 1 refers).

He reported that he had attended meetings of both the UK national and Scottish Committee of University Chairs (CUC). At both meetings there had been substantial discussion of the introduction of fees in England, and the UK national group had received a presentation from the Director of the Office for
Fair Access (OFFA), Sir Martin Harris, on the assessment process for English universities’ access and fee proposals.

The Chairman had recently attended the annual general meeting of the Graduates’ Council, which had seen a slightly improved attendance compared to the 2010 meeting. He noted that the Business Committee of the Council was addressing the issue of engagement among the Council’s members.

Finally, the Chair encouraged members to attend the Court supper which would be held after the final Court meeting of the year on 13 June 2011 as well as to attend one of the graduation ceremonies taking place on 22-24 June 2011.

47. **PRINCIPAL’S REPORT**

The Court considered a report from the Principal (Appendix 2). In presenting the report, the Principal brought the Court’s attention in particular to comments he had made in the media on the issue of higher education funding. It was vital that universities should hold politicians to account after the election to ensure that the funding gap opening up between English and Scottish HE sectors was properly and sustainably addressed. The Principal reported that he had recently met with the President-elect of the National Union of Students, Mr Liam Burns, alongside the Acting President of DUSA. Despite differences of opinion on tuition fees and graduate contributions, there had been agreement that students and universities should both act to force politicians to be clear about their funding plans.

The Principal congratulated three members of staff on their recent election as fellows of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Professors Jill Belch, Frank Sargent and Frank Sullivan. He also highlighted the recent award of two of the three major prizes at the recent 2010 Biotechnology & Biological Sciences Research Council’s (BBSRC) Impact Awards. The College of Life Sciences had won an award for the greatest delivery of impact and Professor Jason Swedlow had been named Innovator of the Year. The Principal noted that the Universities Minister, David Willetts, had been so impressed with the University of Dundee’s performance in the awards that he had requested a visit.

The Principal noted also that he had had talks with the Principal of Dundee College, as well as with the Acting Principal of the University of Abertay Dundee, on opportunities for closer collaboration for mutual benefit.

Discussion focussed on the likely post-election funding landscape and how this would affect the University. There was also some preliminary discussion on the University’s collaboration with the Dasman Diabetes Institute in Kuwait, although members noted that a detailed paper would be presented to the meeting of Court on 13 June 2011.
48. **STRATEGIC REVIEW**

The Court received an update on the progress made to date on implementing the Strategic Review which also included a breakdown of the number and outcomes of the voluntary severance applications received (Appendix 3).

In presenting the paper, the Principal made clear that, while the £8.7m of savings identified via the Strategic Review so far was a significant achievement, there was nevertheless no cause for complacency and it was crucial that the University achieve its target of £10m and continue to apply the principles of excellence, focus and impact if it was to remain healthy through the current uncertainties in the funding environment.

He reported that the Senior Management Team had recently held an away day meeting at which it had been able to devote time to discussing the future strategic options of the University. This had provided a valuable opportunity to develop thinking on the University’s broader and longer term aims. It was clear that the four cross-institution themes that had emerged earlier in the session required some sharpening and also needed to show how the University of Dundee’s approach was distinctive. This would be the focus of further development over the coming months. Another outcome of the away day was the recognition of the success of the College structure and the intention therefore to maintain that structure for the future.

In discussion, Court members raised a number of issues. Firstly, there was concern that some areas of the University might not easily fit with the proposed themes. The Principal emphasised that the purpose of the themes was to help the University prioritise key projects and to provide a unifying focus in a number of interdisciplinary areas. Schools would certainly need to consider how they might align themselves to the themes, but that would not be exclusive, and the process of alignment would be gradual and evolutionary.

There was some concern about whether the savings being achieved through the Strategic Review would be sufficient; and it was acknowledged that the University would need to be responsive to external factors given continued economic uncertainties.

The Court also discussed the issue of employability, noting the level of engagement with employers and the contributions made by the Enterprise Gym, and in particular responding to the notion of an entrepreneurial graduate.

**The Court decided:** to note the current position and await further updates.

49. **FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE**

The Court received a report from a meeting of the Committee on 28 March 2011 (Appendix 4). In presenting the report, the Director of Finance brought Court members’ attention to the two pension schemes currently considering proposals for change. In relation to the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme, the Court noted that a period of consultation on proposed changes was currently underway; and in relation to the Universities Superannuation Scheme, the Court noted that
recent meetings of the Joint Negotiating Committee, charged with agreeing a set of proposals for change, had been inquorate and therefore unable to come to decision. A reconvened meeting had been scheduled for 10 May 2011.

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

50. **STATUTE 16 – ACADEMIC STAFF**

The Director of Human Resources provided the Court with a detailed explanation of the issues surrounding the proposed changes to Statute 16. This included an assessment of the scope of the current Statute; the rationale for change, including the fact that the Statute was not in line with current employment legislation or best practice; the process of consultation on the changes; a comparison with other Scottish universities; and an emphasis on the University’s commitment to ensuring the academic freedom of staff engaging in teaching and research.

Court members had received for consideration a copy of the current draft of the proposed new Statute which would cover all staff of the University. Under the new Statute the Court would be responsible for maintaining policies and procedures relating to disciplinary cases, grievances, dismissals and the avoidance of redundancy, as well as to appeals processes to support them. Work was ongoing with the campus unions on agreeing these new policies and procedures, and in doing so, the University had availed itself of advice from ACAS as well as existing best practice models.

The Director of Human Resources reported also that recent meetings with representatives of the University & College Union (UCU) had seen constructive discussion take place towards achieving a mutually agreeable draft Statute.

In discussion, Court members provided useful drafting suggestions, particularly around the definitions of ‘academic staff’ and ‘academic freedom’. Additionally, there was discussion about the potential need for a mechanism to determine cases in which a member of staff felt that his or her academic freedom had been adversely affected.

**The Court decided:**

(i) to note the positive progress being made in revising the Statute, and to support the approach being taken;

(ii) to note the contents of the letter received from the President of the local branch of UCU;

(iii) to ask officers to draft a new Ordinance setting out how disputes involving academic freedom might be determined;

(iv) to await final drafts of the Statute and the new Ordinance for consideration at its meeting on 13 June 2011.
51. **AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Court received a report from a meeting of the Committee on 8 March 2011 (Appendix 5).

**The Court decided:**

(i) to approve the University’s Anti-Bribery Policy Statement;

(ii) to approve the Institutional Risk Register as presented, noting that the register was likely to be significantly revised in light of the anticipated outcomes of an ongoing internal audit review of risk management arrangements; and

(iii) to request that a session be devoted to the issue of risk management and risk appetite at the Court Retreat on 2 September 2011.

52. **STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK: AIMS 1-3**

The Court received a report, prepared and introduced by the Director of Strategic Planning, which set out the University’s performance in addressing the first three aims of the *Strategic Framework to 2012*. These aims were: 1) to attract high-achieving students; 2) to provide the best student experience; and 3) to increase postgraduate activity. The Court noted improvements in two key performance indicators: undergraduate entry requirements, which appeared now to be on an upward trend following a less satisfactory year in 2008/9; and progression rates (Year 1-Year 2), which likewise indicated that retention rates were improving. Concern remained, however, in relation to the graduate employment prospects of the University’s students, although the Court acknowledged that other institutions were experiencing difficulties in this area and that the University of Dundee’s performance might be linked to University’s large number of students following professional courses in sectors where graduate recruitment had been reduced in the recent past.

**The Court decided:**

(i) to request greater clarity in the definitions linked to those tables dealing with graduate employability; and

(ii) to re-inforce the sentiment that employability activity would require continued institutional support in the face of reduced dedicated resource from the Scottish Funding Council.

53. **MEMBERSHIP OF COURT**

The Court received notification of the outcomes of elections to Court membership.

**The Court decided:**

(i) to congratulate Mr Wright on his re-election to Court as a Graduates’ Council Assessor for the period 1 August 2011 to 31 July 2015;
(ii) to congratulate Professor Mires on his election by the members of the Academic Council to serve on the Court for the period 1 August 2011 to 31 July 2015; and

(iii) to await with interest the outcomes of elections to appoint one professorial and one non-professorial member of the Senate to membership of the Court.

54. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Senate on 30 March 2011 (Appendix 6).

The Court decided: (i) to approve the changes to Statute 10 (The Senate) as set out in Appendix 6, subject to ratification at a subsequent meeting of Court and subject to the approval of, and to any further changes required by, the Privy Council;

(ii) to approve changes to Ordinance 18 (Election of Members of the Court and Senatus) as set out in Appendix 6, subject to ratification at a subsequent meeting of Court;

(iii) to approve the revocation of paragraph 11 of Ordinance 43 (Tuition and Other Fees), subject to ratification at a subsequent meeting of Court; and

(iv) to approve the academic calendar for 2011/12.

55. THE FINANCIAL HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY OF THE HE SECTOR - INTERIM REPORT OF THE NEW JNCHES SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES WORKING GROUP

The Court received the report of the New JNCHES (Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff) Sustainability Issues Working Group which provided an update on work being undertaken to assess the financial health of the HE sector and to consider what institutions would need to do to ensure sustainability for the future. Members noted in particular the clear exposition of the need for institutions to generate regularly surpluses of 3-5% in order to achieve long-term financial sustainability.

The Court decided: to note the report.
The Court received the NUS/CUC guide on the role of governing bodies in relation to Students’ Unions.

The Court decided: to note that the Governance & Nominations Committee would consider the impact of the guide and any necessary response in due course.

STAFF

Professorial and Other Grade 10 Staff

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

- Timothy Newman  Personal Chair of Biophysics  1 January 2011
- Terence Dawson  Chair of Global Environmental Change  17 January 2011
- Martyn Jones  Personal Chair of Healthcare Research  1 February 2011
- Robin Roslender  Chair in Accounting & Finance  1 April 2011
- Mark Hector  Dean of Dentistry & Chair of Oral Health of Children  1 August 2011
- Blair Smith  Chair of Population Science  1 August 2011

STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION REPORT

The Chair reported to the members that he had discussed with the Acting President of the Students’ Association the possibility of his presenting a report to Court at the meeting on 13 June 2011 highlighting the major achievements and activities of the association during the year.

The Court decided: to await the report with interest.
The Times
15 March 2011
The Task is Hard Enough – Without a Popularity Contest

We have serious concerns about the article, by Cabinet Secretary Mike Russell, which appeared in The Sunday Times on March 6th, suggesting that, in order to improve accountability, the Principals of Scottish Universities might be subject to ‘confirmation’ of their appointments by academic staff, and that they might be forced out of office by a ‘recall vote’ by the academic community which they lead. In our view this would risk ‘politicising’ Principals, whose independence is paramount.

Universities are complex, multimillion pound businesses and the governing bodies of universities are highly representative of the diverse range of communities they serve. As Chairs of the Courts of Scottish universities we bring considerable business and related experience to the role. We serve on the governing bodies because we recognise the value that universities have in our society, believing them to be critical to Scotland’s cultural, social and economic success. They are a force for change; they can dramatically improve an individual’s aspirations and capabilities; through their research they create new knowledge and new possibilities. In all this, their autonomy is critical.

At the same time, University Courts represent a diverse society, drawn from academic and non-academic staff, with many posts held by lay members, and they are strengthened by the role of the Senate, which provides the means to hold the Principal to account. The contribution from lay members is important because it ensures that universities are rooted in, not insulated from, the wider contexts in which they operate. In these circumstances it would be quite inappropriate that one particular section of these stakeholders should hold the power of veto over the appointments of Principals.

Universities are already thoroughly accountable for their performance and their use of public money and are subject to oversight and regulation by, among others, the Scottish Funding Council, the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator, Audit Scotland, the Quality Assurance Agency, the Scottish Public Service Ombudsman and others. That is fair given the importance of our role and the investment of public funds — but what we do not need are further proposals which inhibit governing bodies’ ability to secure their universities’ survival and success.

Ultimately, Court members are accountable for the long-term financial viability of the university — a role they are expected to undertake constructively and collectively, particularly in the present context, where governing bodies across Scotland are faced with the harsh reality of managing the significant funding cuts dealt out to universities in 2011-12. Governing bodies will have to ask Principals to take tough actions in the long-term interests of universities and their staff and students. Our ability to do so cannot be constrained by ‘politicising’ Principals and making them subject to a ‘popularity contest’ when they are pressing ahead with the implementation of difficult but necessary changes.

Signed by:

Keir Bloomer, Chair of Court, Queen Margaret University Edinburgh;
Professor George Borthwick, Chair of Court, Edinburgh Napier University;
Ewan Brown, Senior Governor, University of St Andrews;
G Martin Cheyne, Chair of Court, Glasgow Caledonian University;
Dr Fraser Livingston, Convenor of Court, University of Strathclyde;
Sir Moir Lockhead, Senior Governor, University of Aberdeen;
John Markland, Vice Convener, University of Edinburgh;
Matthew McIver, Chair of Court, University of the Highlands and Islands;
Lord Penrose, Chair of Court, Heriot-Watt University;
Philip Rodney, Chair of Governors, Glasgow School of Art;
David Ross, Convenor of the Court, University of Glasgow;
Mike Salter, Chair of Court, Robert Gordon University;
Eric Sanderson, Chair of Court, University of Dundee.
Higher Education Funding in Scotland

At several Court meetings over the past year I have made no secret of my views on tuition fees, graduate contributions and on the Scottish political parties’ positions on both. Some of you therefore will not have been surprised, perhaps, to catch recent comments of mine which were reported widely in the press, online and on the BBC. In light of comments from other Scottish Principals, from Mike Russell on the governance and management of Scottish universities and from the political parties on the size of the potential funding gap with England as a result of the increase in tuition fees, it seemed to me that someone needed to inject a degree of realism into the debate. I should perhaps say at the outset that the aim of my interjections was to cement the commitment of politicians to ensuring the future competitiveness of Scotland’s universities.

For those of you who did not see my comments, they amounted to my repeated support for a form of graduate contribution, noting that undergraduate education was not a universal benefit in the way that schools and the NHS are. We all enjoy the benefits of the NHS, whether we went to University or not. University education undoubtedly benefits society as a whole, but there is also a recognised benefit to the individual graduate, and on that basis, I do not feel it is unreasonable for graduates to make some form of contribution once they have obtained employment with a significant salary. I also provided some commentary on the politicking currently underway in the run up to the election.

At the last Court meeting, the Senior Management Team provided an assessment of the Scottish Government’s higher education Green Paper, and recently, the technical working group set up in the wake of the Green paper reported that it had assessed the likely funding gap with England potentially to be as large as £200m by 2014/15. You will have seen that politicians from the SNP, Labour and the Liberal Democrats have all come out officially against the introduction of tuition fees in Scotland, whilst at the same time pledging to fill any funding gap that opens up between the English and Scottish HE sectors.

My views on this, aired in the press, are that this has the potential to appear disingenuous and may very well lead to the winning party or parties having to break commitments after the May Holyrood elections, either by not funding the gap in full or by returning to a graduate contribution as the only affordable solution. Whilst I have no ideological issue against a commitment to no fees, it seems to me that without a credible alternative and without a realisation that Scottish universities will therefore require to be adequately funded from the public purse, the politicians are threatening the future quality and competitive capacity of Scottish institutions.

My comments in the press were an attempt to bring the debate back to the facts and suggest, by way of a graduate contribution, a reasonable alternative that could ensure Scottish universities do not become the also-rans of the UK, let alone the rest of the world.

In the run-up to the elections on 5 May, we have a duty, I believe, to challenge ministers, politicians and parties to be clear about their funding intentions for higher education.

Strategic Review

You will see later on the agenda a paper setting out in detail the progress being made with the strategic review. A number of organisational change proposals are being implemented across the University in Schools and support services, all aimed at creating greater efficiency. The evaluation of applications to the voluntary severance scheme, which closed at the end of February, is reaching its conclusion, and you will see at Paper C the effects that the scheme has had across the University in contributing to the savings required. We will need to maximise as far as possible the potential benefits to the institution that arise from the opportunities created by those applications approved by the Senior Management Team. In many areas these applications have provided the momentum to reassess how teaching is provided, research is organised and services are delivered, and we need to make the most of these opportunities, whilst at the same time ever mindful of maintaining our high levels of student experience, teaching quality and research excellence.

And of course the strategic review is a key factor in shaping the budget for 2011/12. The first round of budget meetings with support services and the Colleges has now taken place; and these have been a very positive experience, increasing confidence that we will be able to set out a break-even budget for 2011/12. The budget will
not, of course, be finalised until May, to be presented to the Court in June, but the signs are promising that we can avoid a deficit in the next session.

In terms of the Senior Management Team’s thinking on the future direction of the University, I am pleased to report that the SMT spent a fruitful day in early April considering the overarching principles that should steer our thinking; the types of action necessary to ensure that the University can live up to those principles, which will be developed into an action plan over coming months; and the effects that this might have on the structure of the University. A brief overview of the outcomes of this session is provided in Paper C and I shall expand on our thinking later on in the agenda.

**Book & Paper Conservation Studio**

There are two items that I wish to update the Court on.

The first of these is a report on developments concerning the Book & Paper Conservation Studio. Members will remember that concern was raised at a previous meeting of the Court about the future of the studio. The studio has for some time suffered from the substantial decline in commercial activity within the conservation sector, and units such as ours, which specialise in the highest quality of work, have found their operations challenging to sustain.

Recently four staff have taken the opportunities offered through the University voluntary severance scheme and the number of staff remaining after July 2011 will be two. This will mean that the studio is no longer operationally viable. The Studio is therefore now entering a period of wind-down, completing existing and committed work, but no longer seeking new contracts. Institutional clients have been informed of the closure which has also been communicated within the UK and international conservation field.

The studio will close for external work on the 1 June, and will cease operations by the 31 July. The two staff remaining will be redeployed within the Library & Learning Centre to areas of work supporting students and staff that are facing significant demands. Each member of staff will receive training for these new roles, and they will both retain a small element of their job roles for internal conservation work. A small studio facility will be retained within the LLC.

**Dasman Diabetes Institute, Kuwait**

The second is to bring Court up to date on work with the Dasman Institute in Kuwait. Court may remember that, at its meeting on 14 December 2009, it noted that the University intended to develop a number of focused collaborations with specific partners in Kuwait, amongst which was the Dasman Institute. As you know, diabetes research is one of the major planks of translational medicine research at Dundee and we have been working with the Dasman Institute in Kuwait (director Dr Kazem Bebrehani, previously deputy director WHO) to assist in several key areas to improve care and prevention measures for people with chronic diseases in Kuwait. We are doing this in a number of ways: i) building local capacity; ii) promoting the effective and safe treatment of patients through real-time integration of clinical and administrative information services; and iii) engaging in scientific debate with the international research community.

To facilitate capacity building we are developing taught postgraduate courses and specialist MSc courses in diabetes care and cardiovascular management using both distance learning and e-learning methodologies, in addition to staging local seminars and symposia.

On the information support front, Dundee has an international reputation in health informatics and chronic disease management in relation to diabetes and has been helping to implement similar rich functionality in Kuwait in collaboration with Aridhia Informatics, a company established by the University of Dundee and NHS Tayside, and Sumerian, a data analytics company based in Scotland. In overview, the solution offers the Dasman Institute and collaborating primary care practices a secure network for delivery of high quality clinical information, data and documents, based upon the model that has successfully been implemented across Scotland for the past 10 years.

In terms of research development, we are collaborating with Dasman and the International Prevention Research Institute (IPRI) in Lyon to build upon the proposed informatics infrastructure to establish rapidly a Kuwaiti-led phenotypic and biologic resource for the study of the epidemiology, outcomes and genetics of diabetes and related conditions. This will import and adapt the proven processes, codes of conduct, governance and infrastructure established in Scotland and IPRI for large genomic studies.
This is exciting work and builds on the notable successes of the University of Dundee in this area. It is intended that colleagues from the School of Medicine will speak to Court at its meeting on 13 June 2011; but given the potential impact of the collaboration, we felt it was important to provide Court members with some detailed summary information at this meeting.

Professor Pete Downes  
Principal & Vice Chancellor
Senior Management Team Meetings

The SMT met on 9 February, 9 March and 13 April 2011. Full minutes for 9 February and 9 March are available online via the intranet, and those for 13 April will become available on 11 May 2011. Visit: http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/com/smt/welcome.htm

Discussions at these meetings, as well as at the weekly briefing meetings, covered the following issues:

- Strategic Review and Organisational Change;
- Review of Research Funding performance;
- Collaboration with the Dasman Diabetes Institute, Kuwait;
- Update on the Institute for Medical Science and Technology (IMSaT);
- Distance Learning Provision;
- Agreement on criteria for the new Sir James Black Award for Outstanding Achievement by a final year undergraduate student;
- Updates on progress with changes to the Universities’ Superannuation Scheme and the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme;
- Academic Calendar;
- A report from the Information Management Committee;
- Proposals to outsource University email provision;
- The provision of fundraising support within the University;
- Review of draft report on Strategic Framework: Aims 1-3;
- Human Resources Issues:
  - Discussions with the Trades Unions;
  - Statute 16;
  - Agreement to review recruitment requests to all core-funded posts of Grade 4 and above;
- Routine Matters:
  - Management Accounts;
  - Consideration of proposals for the award of Honorary Professorships for endorsement by the Senate;
  - Consideration of applications for Voluntary Severance.
Annex B

Major Grants & Awards

- **£1.1m from NHS Health Technology Assessment Programme to Professor Janet Clarkson** for To Fill or Not to Fill (FICTION) (Joint with Cardiff, Sheffield, Newcastle and Leeds)
- **£0.5m from European Framework 7 to Dr Shaun Treweek** for Developing and Evaluating Communications Strategies to Support Informed Decisions and Practice Based on Evidence (DECIDE) (joint with 9 partners)
- **£0.4m from BBSRC to Professor Paul Birch** for An Enduring Pipeline to Identify and Utilise Durable Late Blight Disease Resistance in Potato (Joint with SCRI and Sainsbury Institute, Norwich)
- **£0.3m from ESRC to Dr Yuki Kamide** for Dynamic Representations of Motion Events in Sentence Processing (Joint with Glasgow)

Annex C

People & Prizes

- The University has won two of the three major prizes at the 2001 Biotechnology & Biological Sciences Research Council Impact Awards: the College of Life Sciences won the award for ‘Greatest delivery of impact, and Professor Jason Swedlow was named ‘Innovator of the Year’
- Dr John Rouse has been awarded the 2011 Tenovus-Scotland Medal in recognition of his work how cells recognise and repair DNA damage
- Professor Roland Wolf has received the 2011 John Barnes Prize Lectureship awarded biennially to a scientist who has made a major international contribution to the area of drug metabolism and drug and chemical safety
- Three Dundee professor have been elected fellows of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Jill Belch (Vascular Medicine), Frank Sullivan (Primary Care) and Frank Sargent (Bacterial Physiology)
- Three Duncan of Jordanstone students (Claudia de la Pena, Hannah Imlach and Usman Malik) have received scholarships from the RSA to undertake an extended study tour in Italy
- Matt Cameron, currently studying on the MSc Animation & Visualisation, has been nominated in the Technical Achievement category of the BAFTA Scotland New Talent Awards 2011 for his film ‘META’
- Twelve art and architecture graduates from the University of Dundee have been chosen to appear at this year’s prestigious RSA New Contemporaries exhibition (Joss Allen, Kimberly Bartsch, Sinéad Bracken, Fiona Gordon, Charlene Noble, Lyndsey Redford, Mary Somerville, Kimberley Stewart, Lisa Ure, Jan Williamson, Colin Wilson and Alan Keane)
APPENDIX 3

STRATEGIC REVIEW AND FUTURE OPTIONS
(Minute 48)

Introduction

1. This paper provides an update for Court on the progress made to date in implementing the Strategic Review and on continuing work to review the University’s academic footprint, particularly in relation to emerging thinking arising from discussions at a Senior Management Team away day on 6 April 2011.

Communication

2. A series of Strategic Review Briefings took place across the University as planned in February. Each briefing featured a presentation on the Strategic Review itself, along with contextual information on the external financial environment and its impact on the University’s budget-setting process. Briefings confirmed the University’s commitment to seeking to avoid compulsory redundancies, while providing an opportunity to reinforce the availability and flexibility of the voluntary severance scheme in the run up to its closure on 28 February. As a result, a significant number of additional applications to the Scheme were received by the deadline. The presentations were followed by an opportunity for staff to ask questions and provide comments.

3. The Senior Management Team has not yet taken advantage of Court’s decision at its last meeting to allow the continued use of voluntary severance on a targeted and time-limited basis in parts of the University where further reductions might be identified.

4. The campus unions continue to be briefed at regular meetings of the respective Local Joint Committees and at Collective Consultation meetings. The Secretary and Clerk to Court meet regularly with the two student members of Court to keep them updated on the Review.

External context

5. The Scottish Funding Council provided final confirmation of its Main Grant Letter for 2011/2012 on 18 March 2011. This heralded no major surprises, being in line with the indicative funding letter received from the SFC before Christmas. Funding to the University has reduced by £5.5m overall, but this rises to around £7m when account is taken of the failure of the Scottish Government to restore funded numbers in teaching, the reduction in funded places overall, and the funding council’s decision not to implement its proposals in relation to funding price groups for a further year.

6. The Scottish Government and Universities Scotland established a Technical Working Group earlier in the year to consider the size and nature of any gap in funding between Scotland and England as a result of the increase in fees south of the border. The report includes a transparent methodology for defining such a funding gap and suggests that it could be as large as £202m by 2014/15 if average fees in England are set at £7,500 and are indexed for inflation. However, all Scottish political parties, aside from the Conservatives, have now declared opposition to the introduction of tuition fees in Scotland in their manifestos for the forthcoming Holyrood elections. The SNP has committed to filling any funding gap that may arise, but there remains no information yet on how it proposes to do so. The Principal and senior colleagues have continued to take forward lobbying and influencing activities in relation to funding for universities, with the Principal’s position having received support from a number of commentators.

7. In the face of these uncertainties, the Senior Management Team continues to believe that the University should focus on delivering the 10-12% level of savings identified in the Strategic Review and use these to cover the funding shortfall in 2011/2012, although further initiatives may arise from the ongoing work on the academic footprint that is reported below. By taking this approach, we would hope to protect the University’s academic activities in learning, teaching and research consistent with the aims of the Strategic Review and its emphasis on excellence, focus and impact.

Budget setting

8. The budget-setting process for 2011/2012 is now well underway, with savings arising from Strategic Review being incorporated into the drafts discussed by the Principal, Secretary and Director of Finance with Colleges and SASS. The exercise has further confirmed the difficult environment in which we are operating, with research
income largely static and unregulated teaching income showing growth below that which had been projected in our earlier financial forecasts. The current focus is on trying to deliver at least a breakeven position when the draft budget comes to the next meetings of the Finance & Policy Committee and Court for approval. However, it should be noted that such a budget would be well short of the 3-5% level of surplus required for future investment and longer-term sustainability, especially given the significant reduction in external capital funding.

Current projections

9. The current projections for savings as a result of the Strategic Review are set out in table 1 below. It must be noted that these savings include, for example, projected retirements, withdrawn vacancies and savings in non-staff budgets as well as those accruing as a result of the voluntary severance scheme. The projections take account of voluntary severance applications that have not yet been fully considered through the decision-making process, but where senior managers have indicated that they are minded to approve them.

10. The current projected savings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Identified Savings</th>
<th>Savings 2011/12</th>
<th>Savings 2012/13</th>
<th>Savings 2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>FTE £M</td>
<td>£M</td>
<td>£M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21 1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>27 1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>22 0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>43 2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS - Pay</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>69 1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASS - NPay</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>182 8.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Projected savings from Strategic Review to 2013/2014

11. In the Student & Academic Support Services (SASS), the target includes a mix of pay and non-pay savings. The non-pay savings included savings from a reduction in the estate (including Taymills) and minimising the University subsidy to some of the income-generating units. The non-pay savings have yet to be fully identified; some will be delivered through staff savings (such as the Book & Paper Conservation Studio). As part of the budget-setting process, all non-pay budgets across the University have been scrutinised in detail.

12. Table 1 shows that the Strategic Review is close to achieving the level of staff and other savings that were targeted at its outset. However, it is important to bear in mind that the data includes assumptions around retirements that, given changes in the legislation relating to retirement ages, can no longer be regarded as certain. Furthermore, the overall position for 2011/2012 will not become clear until the budget-setting process is completed.

Strategic options

13. The Senior Management Team held an away day at University House on 6 April 2011, which considered a number of issues, including: (a) what kind of University we should aim to be in future; (b) what role the proposed key themes might play within the University; (c) further discussion on the academic footprint, including possible projects to be implemented; and (d) the University’s academic structure. The key outcomes of the day were as follows:

What kind of University should we aim to be?

14. The team identified that the University had, over recent years, evolved and grown organically and through the acquisition of organisations of varying mission and character. This has left it, in some respects, rather more diverse than many similar universities, for example in terms of research reputation. The Team considered that a future vision and mission should be consistent with the University’s history as a Chartered university looking to further improve its standing from its current world ranking; and might centre around the following aims:

- To meet the needs of society and have impact locally, nationally and internationally;
- To deliver a high quality student experience characterised by exposure to teachers, practitioners and researchers working in an interdisciplinary and research-led environment;
• To undertake research across and between its disciplines, but within a culture in which the breadth, depth and intensity of research in each discipline is determined by the extent to which it meets national and international standards of excellence (3*/4*);
• To produce employable and entrepreneurial graduates; and
• To transform lives through access to learning opportunities irrespective of social background or culture

The role of themes

15. Court will recall that the four key themes emerging from the strategic review process were:
• Biomedical and Clinical Sciences;
• Business and Professional Education;
• Creative Arts and Cultural Understanding;
• Sustainability and the Environment.

16. There was a general consensus that the proposed themes need to be sharpened and consulted upon more broadly across the University, but that they could provide a basis for the way the University might brand and position itself externally. In addition, themes might provide a focus for research in those areas where the standards set out in the mission and vision above mean that disciplines have a relatively low scale and lack critical mass (where that is important), by enabling them to draw upon other areas of activity across the University.

17. In this way, the themes could help drive future strategic investments and influence the focus of future staff recruitment in certain disciplines.

Academic footprint

18. The Team reviewed those areas where the recent research reviews, supplemented by available data and their own judgements, indicated that academic disciplines were ‘at risk’ in their preparations for REF and where the breadth, depth and intensity of research required to be realigned in the context of supporting only research that meets national and international standards of excellence. They also analysed the academic and financial strengths of individuals Schools based on their performance in the key areas of research, regulated teaching activity and unregulated teaching activity.

19. The Team is currently in the process of identifying a range of possible options arising from this analysis. These will be refined over the coming weeks, but remain based on the key principles of excellence and focus that underpinned the Strategic Review.

Academic structure

20. The Team concluded that the current College structure had served the University well and should be retained. A number of different configurations in terms of the number of Colleges were considered. However, it was agreed that there was a benefit in retaining the College of Life Science and College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing in their current form; and that to merge the College of Art, Science & Engineering with the College of Arts & Social Sciences might create an unwieldy College that was too disparate in terms of subject and disciplinary base to be coherent. However, consideration is being given as to whether a further evolution of the disciplinary base of the latter two Colleges might provide greater balance and link better to the proposed institutional themes. These discussions will continue, with a view to reporting on their outcome to Senate and Court in June.

21. Consideration will be given, consistent with any further refinement of the College structure, to strengthening the role of Colleges as administrative hubs, with activities relocated there from Schools to generate enhancements in consistency of process, resilience of service provision, co-ordination with central services and opportunities for efficiency.

22. The Team noted the important role played by Deans in the strategic management of the University, in its management structure and in ensuring Heads of College could be released to take on greater levels of corporate
responsibility for key portfolios. It agreed that consideration also required to be given to whether the University would benefit from one or more ‘stand-alone’ Vice-Principals for major portfolios (for example, research or educational development).

Conclusion and recommendation

23. It is evident that the Strategic Review will deliver significant savings, but that further work is required if we are to deliver a breakeven budget proposal in June. Such a budget would have to be viewed as representing a ‘holding position’ given the need to deliver the consistent 3-5% surpluses required to ensure our longer-term academic sustainability. It would also retain an element of risk given the uncertain funding environment that we face, particularly in terms of achieving targets for research overheads and unregulated teaching income. The Senior Management Team will therefore continue to implement the key objectives of the Strategic Review and will bring forward further proposals in due course.

24. Court is invited to discuss the issues raised in this paper and thereafter formally note the current position.

Senior Management Team
April 2011
A meeting of the Committee was held on 28 March 2011.

Present:  Mr R Burns (Convener), Mr C Browne (Acting President, Students’ Association), Professor J Calderhead, Dr J Lowe, Dr LI McLellan, Mr EF Sanderson, Mr IDM Wright

In Attendance:  University Secretary, Director & Deputy Director of Finance, Director of Campus Services, Capital Projects & Development Manager and Clerk to Court

Apologies:  Principal Professor CP Downes, Mr WI Ball, Mr KA Richmond, Dr H Marriage, Director of Strategic Planning

1. MINUTES

Resolved:  to approve the minutes of the meeting on 31 January 2011.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Pensions Update (Minute 2(1))

Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS)
The Director of Finance reported that the proposed changes to the USS would not now be implemented by 1 April 2011. Recent meetings of the Joint Negotiating Committee (JNC), charged with approving the changes, had been inquorate, with UCU representatives absent, and this had meant that the changes could not be approved. Negotiations were underway on how to take this matter forward.

The Committee also noted that the University & College Union (UCU) had staged two days of national industrial action in protest at the proposed changes and the wider issue of University funding.

University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (UODSS)
The Director reported to the Committee that consultation had now begun on the proposed changes to the University’s own pension scheme, and that five open meetings had been held with the staff affected. The consultation exercise would continue until 10 May 2011 and it was anticipated that the proposed changes, if approved by the Trustees, would be implemented with effect from 1 August 2011.

(2) Borrowings Update (Minute 5)

The Director of Finance reported that the Barclays Bank’s credit committee had approved the terms of the borrowing facility for the University, which the Court had approved at its meeting on 21 February 2011. It was hoped that the new agreement would be signed off before the end of March 2011.

3. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 7

The Committee received the management accounts for the period to the end of February 2011. In presenting the accounts, the Deputy Director of Finance noted that there had been no significant change from the previous month’s accounts and the University was forecasting an operating surplus for the year to 31 July 2011 of £3.3m. She did, however, point out the increase in forecast costs as a result of the voluntary severance scheme, noting that outstanding applications were being rigorously reviewed and that there would be a clearer picture of the effects of the voluntary severance scheme for the Court meeting on 26 April 2011.

A mid-year review of the accounts had been undertaken and this had not identified any problems.
In discussion, members wondered whether schools were setting fees appropriately to take maximum benefit from their individual markets, but acknowledged that there was a question of balance between maximising income and maintaining a competitive edge in some areas.

4. **SFC MAIN GRANT LETTER**

The Committee received a summary of the details of the grant letter from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC). The Director of Finance noted that the contents of the letter were broadly as had been expected from the indicative funding letter received from the SFC before Christmas. Funding to the University had reduced by £5.5m overall, but this had been compounded to around £7m following the decision by the Scottish Government not to restore funded numbers in teaching, by the reduction in funded places overall, and by the SFC’s decision not to implement its proposed changes to funding price groups for a further year, all of which had been built into the University’s budget projections for 2011/12. The University also received a 50% reduction in capital funding down to £2.5m. The Committee noted the decision by the SFC to reduce funding to research pooling initiatives, which was seen as unhelpful and, to some extent, impracticable.

The Director of Finance also reported to the Committee the outcomes of the recent report from the Scottish Government and Universities Scotland Technical Working Group, which had been established to consider the size and nature of any gap in funding between Scotland and England as a result of the increase in fees in England. The report had included a transparent methodology for defining such a funding gap and suggested that the gap could be as large as £202m by 2014/15 if the average fees in England were £7,500 and were indexed for inflation. This had to be set against the fact that all Scottish political parties, aside from the Conservatives, had now declared opposition to the introduction of tuition fees in Scotland. The SNP had committed to filling the funding gap, but there was no information yet on how this would be achieved.

5. **SUBSIDIARIES AND ASSOCIATE COMPANIES**

1. **Six-month accounts**

The Committee received half-year results for the following subsidiary and associate companies:

- AMCET Ltd
- Dundee University Press Ltd
- Dundee University Project Management Ltd
- Dundee University Utility Supply Company Ltd
- University of Dundee Nursery Ltd
- Dundee University Incubator Ltd

Resolved: to note the results.

2. **Dundee University Press Ltd (DUP)**

The Committee received a report setting out the financial position of DUP. In October 2008 the Committee had approved a revolving credit facility to DUP up to a maximum of £100k. The maximum had now been drawn down, and in addition DUP’s creditor terms were currently outside the agreed 60 days.

The Committee considered the overall performance of DUP, the reputational benefits accruing from such a company to the University as well as the longer term outlook and health of the company.

Resolved: to request a detailed business plan from DUP to inform further discussions on its future.

3. **Dundee Student Villages Ltd (DSV)**

The Committee received a routine report on the performance of DSV and its subsidiary, West Park Conference Centre Ltd (WPCC).

DSV
The Director of Finance reported that DSV was performing well and that its forecast for the year would be above that set by the revised model for the vehicle. This was in most part due to the sustained, increased occupancy levels enjoyed by DSV. During the year, the real estate adviser, DTZ, had conducted a valuation of DSV properties, the outcome of which had satisfied the bank that the asset cover covenant of the vehicle had been complied with.

The Committee learnt that, for 2011/12, residence fees would be increased by 5.54% in line with the revised model. It was noted that the fees for accommodation on the West Park site would be set 10% lower than other accommodation on the city campus. The Committee noted that September 2011 would see the end of the University’s lease of Taymills.

WPCC
The Committee noted the continuing challenges being faced by WPCC in line with those being experienced by other businesses in the conference sector. A new general manager had been appointed and the management team had been restructured. Sanctuary Management Services (SMS), who operate WPCC, had conducted a detailed review of the business, and plans had been adapted as a result, including changes to the organisational structure to address marketing and other delivery issues.

The Committee acknowledged the inherent risks associated with the struggling performance of WPCC, particularly if DSV decided to wind up WPCC.

Resolved: to ask the Director of Finance to provide the current potential buyback value for WPCC, should DSV decide to withdraw its support.

6. ESTATES & BUILDINGS REPORT

The Committee received a routine report from the Director of Campus Services on ongoing issues, including an update on capital works in light of recent Court decisions on the Capital Plan.

In discussion, the Committee considered the issues of effective space management and energy efficiency, noting in particular that both issues were receiving greater prominence across the University, although they were proving challenging to address.

7. DIRECTOR OF CAMPUS SERVICES

The Committee recorded its gratitude and best wishes to Mr David Yule, who was retiring as Director of Campus Services after a long and dedicated service to the University. Mr Yule had been a driving force in the redevelopment of the University’s city campus and was a key player in the capital projects at Ninewells.

The Committee noted that Mr Colin McNally had been appointed to the post of Director of Campus Services with effect from 1 April 2011.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 8 March 2011.

**Present:** Dr H Marriage (Convener), Mr JE Barnett, Mr J Elliot, Mr KAC Swinley, Miss J Thomson.

**In Attendance:** Mr R Burns, University Secretary, Director and Deputy Director of Finance, Mr S Reid and Ms A Taylor (KPMG) and Clerk to Court.

**Apologies:** Emeritus Professor A Burchell.

1. **MINUTES**

   Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 2 December 2010.

2. **MATTERS ARISING**

   (1) **Bribery Act (Minute 12)**

   The Clerk to Court introduced an update from the Bribery Act Working Group which had been set up in response to the Committee’s previous meeting. The group had now had its first meeting, had agreed a membership and remit and had begun to consider how to address the issues of bribery and corruption across the institution in preparation for the implementation of the Bribery Act 2010. The Committee also considered a draft institutional policy statement on bribery, noting that this would be subject to further internal consultation, but that it remained the University’s intention to submit the statement to Court for approval at its meeting on 26 April 2011.

   In light of recent revelations surrounding other universities’ relationships with overseas regimes, notably in Libya, members wondered whether the University currently had any such relationships. The University Secretary reported that, as far as was known, this was not the case, although it was certainly the case that there were many overseas students at the University who were being funded by their own governments. Such a relationship was, however, not unusual, and the University’s internal quality assurance arrangements provided comfort that these relationships were not open to abuse.

   The Committee also discussed the significance and inherent risks of overseas institutional collaborations, noting ongoing links with both West African and Gulf states.

   Resolved: (i) to recommend to Court approval in principle of the draft institutional policy statement on bribery, noting that further consultation would take place (annex a refers); and

   (ii) to ask the University Secretary to prepare a paper on the management of relationships with overseas individuals, institutions and organisations.

3. **INTERNAL AUDIT**

   The internal auditors presented a series of reports as outlined below. Committee members made a number of helpful comments on the layout and presentation of the reports, which the auditors agreed to bear in mind for future reports.

   (1) **Review of Schools**

   The auditors presented a report which examined the decentralised support functions and processes within the Schools of Medicine and Humanities and within Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design (DJCAD). This represented the first in a series of reports looking at
School operations to be carried out during the auditors’ period of appointment. In general, the auditors’ view of the three Schools under review in the present report was positive, and they noted that the devolved structure worked well. The report made eight moderate recommendations which were focused in reducing unnecessary duplication as well as increasing the level of automation across the University. In particular, the report highlighted that the University required a clear methodology to support change management. Officers, for their part, responded that all recommendations within the report had been accepted, and indeed some had already been implemented (e.g. organisational change procedure).

The Committee was on the whole comforted by the level of reassurance provided by the report, and was satisfied by the management responses.

(2) Human Resources and Payroll

The auditors presented a review which considered the operating effectiveness and efficiency of processes and controls in the human resources and payroll systems. The report set out four recommendations (three of moderate and one of low risk), although none was a control risk and each sought to enhance existing processes. The auditors felt that roles and responsibilities between the central HR function and the Schools required clarification, that the HR system (P3) required development within the wider IT context, and that the institution needed to pay attention to ensuring that the implementation of e-recruitment did indeed lead to reduced paper costs. The Committee was satisfied with the management responses.

(3) Research Approval and Management

The Committee received a report from the auditors into the processes and controls around approving and managing research projects. Three of the four recommendations emerging from the review were of low risk and required the continued monitoring of processes to ensure they remained efficient. The fourth recommendation concerned the system of internal peer review for research proposals, and suggested that the modified process utilised in the College of Life Sciences be monitored to ensure research projects remained of sufficiently high quality.

(4) Commercial Income Generation

The Committee received a report which considered the commercial income generation activities in Research & Innovation Services (RIS). The auditors had made five recommendations, none of which was of greater than moderate risk. The Committee’s discussion focused on the scope and intensity of RIS’s activity in this area, since the recommendations addressed potential risks arising from RIS’s commercialisation capability. It was agreed that the central issue for commercial income generation was the level of resource that the University was prepared to invest to ensure appropriate financial benefits from the activity in the context of the relatively low income received from this source. To some degree, the Committee accepted that this was a strategic matter for the University, which required consideration among the University’s research community and senior management.

(5) Centralised Timetable

The auditors presented a report which assessed the success of the implementation of centralised timetabling within the University, and provided some lessons that could be learnt for similar projects in the future. The auditors had identified one high risk recommendation and ten others. They also found that, on the whole, the system was being successfully used across the institution, except in those areas which were not incorporated in the initial roll-out. The recommendations focused on the need for a clear methodology, the desirability of achieving wide ‘buy-in’ prior to implementation, the requirement to identify the means to measure the success of projects before implementation and the suggestion of a more comprehensive assessment of the elements of risk and therefore of any necessary contingencies. The Committee acknowledged the potential reputational damage that could have been done had the project failed, but likewise understood the role that cultural factors such as resistance to change had played in the implementation process. Officers had accepted the findings and would adopt the recommendations in similar future projects.
(6) Quarterly Update Report

The Committee received a report on the progress of work to date and the plans for work during the remainder of the academic session.

4. EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT

The Committee received a copy of the University’s submission to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) as part of the efficient government initiative. The Committee noted the possibility that in future Audit Scotland may wish to review the higher education sector’s plans in this area.

Resolved: to endorse the submission to the SFC.

5. TRANSPARENT APPROACH TO COSTING (TRAC)

The Committee reviewed the University’s TRAC return for 2009/10, which had been submitted at the end of January 2011. The Convener, at that time, had confirmed compliance with the TRAC statement of requirements, and the Committee was now being invited to provide its satisfaction that the requirement for compliance had in its collective view been met. In terms of the submission itself, the Committee noted that the University’s return was broadly in line with that of other institutions.

Resolved: to record the Committee’s satisfaction that the return had been prepared in accordance with the TRAC Statement of Requirements.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

(1) Institutional Risk Register

Resolved: to recommend to the Court the formal adoption of the Register (annex b refers), noting that, as a result of ongoing internal audit work, its structure and content would be comprehensively reviewed in advance of the next annual review.

(2) Risk Appetite

The Committee considered a paper from the Clerk to Court which set out a potential framework for assessing the University’s attitude towards risk. The Committee welcomed what it considered to be a helpful framework, and encouraged officers to consider how such a tool might be usefully applied in the context of the University’s management of risk. It was felt that this should be done against the background of the upcoming internal audit report into the risk management apparatus of the University. It was also suggested that risk and risk appetite could form part of the discussions at the next Court Retreat in September 2011.

7. HEALTH & SAFETY SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report of the Sub-Committee’s meeting on 19 January 2011.

Resolved: to note the report.

8. PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE GROUPS (PVG) SCHEME

The Committee received a paper from the Deputy Director Human Resources, which explained the changes to the system for carrying out criminal records checks for staff and students whose work would bring them into contact with vulnerable groups. The new legislation places emphasis on regulated types of work and excludes activity which only incidentally brings people into contact with vulnerable groups. The focus of the new scheme therefore would be to ensure that staff and students engaged in regulated work are members. The Committee learnt that the new scheme was portable, with membership for life, so that any new information on individuals would be flagged up to employers. One consequence of the introduction of the new scheme was that Court members would no longer be required under the legislation to undergo a criminal records check.
9. **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.

**Resolved:** to note the report.

10. **EXTERNAL AUDIT TENDER**

The Director of Finance reported the outcomes of the recent tender process for the provision of external audit services.

**Resolved:** to recommend to Court that the University engage Pricewaterhouse Coopers for the provision of external audit services for the financial years 2010-11 to 2012-13 inclusive, with the possibility of an extension of up to two further years.
University of Dundee
Anti-Bribery Policy Statement

1. Precepts

1.1 The University of Dundee requires its staff at all times to act honestly and with integrity and to safeguard the resources for which they are responsible.

1.2 The University is committed to ensuring that its business is conducted in an open and transparent manner and it will take all appropriate steps to address the risks of bribery.

1.3 The University condemns all acts of bribery or corruption; any cases brought to its attention will be investigated exhaustively and dealt with appropriately.

1.4 The University is committed to the highest international standards of integrity and to ensuring it adheres to and promotes best practice in bribery prevention.

2. Definition & Scope

2.1 Bribery is commonly described as the offer or acceptance of a reward to persuade another to act dishonestly and or in breach of the law.

2.2 It includes the offering, promising, giving, receiving or soliciting of a financial, academic or other advantage or favour as a means to influence the actions of an individual (or individuals).

2.3 The Bribery Act 2010, due to come in force later this year (amend when known), provides for 4 bribery offences:

• Bribing: offering, promising or giving an advantage;
• Being bribed: requesting, agreeing to or accepting an advantage;
• Bribing a foreign official;
• Failing as an organisation to prevent any person who performs services on its behalf from committing an act of bribery.

2.4 The University will work at the highest level to adopt and adhere to the six principles of bribery prevention outlined in the Government’s guidance\(^1\), and will set out clear anti bribery procedures for its staff and students and for those persons who represent the University.

2.5 The University has in place a robust Public Interest Disclosure (whistleblowing) policy to enable concerns to be brought to its attention\(^2\).

3. Responsibilities

3.1 The University is responsible for issuing relevant procedures for the prevention, detection, reporting and handling of bribery and for making all relevant persons aware of the necessity of complying with this policy.

3.2 The Audit Committee has a general responsibility for monitoring the operation and effectiveness of anti-bribery arrangements and should receive appropriate reports on any bribery activity.

3.3 Each member of staff or student or other person who performs a service or otherwise represents the University is responsible for:

---


\(^2\) Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblowing), March 1999 [http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/policy/whistle.htm](http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/policy/whistle.htm)
• acting with propriety at all times and in particular in the use of official resources and the handling and use of public funds;
• conducting themselves in accordance with the principles identified by the Committee on Standards in Public Life, which are: integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership;  
• being alert to the possibility that unusual events, behaviours or transactions could be an indication of bribery;
• reporting details immediately through the appropriate channel if they suspect bribery is taking or has taken place;
• cooperating fully with whomever is conducting internal checks, reviews or investigations.

4. Applicability

4.1 This Policy extends to all of the University’s activities and operations and to all of its dealings and negotiations with third parties in all countries in which its staff, students, subsidiaries, agents, partners and associates operate.

4.2 All employees and students and all individuals working on behalf of, under contract from or in collaboration with any part of the University or with any of its employees or students are required to comply with this Policy.

5. Action in the Event of Bribery

5.1 All cases of actual or suspected bribery will be vigorously and promptly investigated and appropriate action will be taken. The police will be informed where considered appropriate.

5.2 In addition, disciplinary action will be considered, not only against those members of staff found to have perpetrated bribery, but also against managers whose negligence is held to have facilitated or condoned an act of bribery. Both categories can be held to constitute gross misconduct, the penalty for which may include summary dismissal.

April 2011
The University Court

---

3 The Seven Principles of Public Life, Committee on Standards on Public Life (Accessed 28 February 2011 at: http://www.public-standards.gov.uk/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Improvement Actions</th>
<th>Responsible Officer /Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Business Risk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduction of public funding in the higher education sector</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>• Lobbying through Universities UK/Universities Scotland&lt;br&gt;• Avoidance, where possible, of unbreakable long-term financial commitments&lt;br&gt;• Early warning of changes through existing networks and monitoring of political developments&lt;br&gt;• Strategic Review of University activity</td>
<td>• Increased engagement with Scottish Ministers and Universities Scotland&lt;br&gt;• Diversification of sources of income&lt;br&gt;• Implement a prudent approach to capital development</td>
<td>Senior Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Business Risk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loss of teaching income through:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• failure to recruit and retain sufficient numbers of students;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes by SFC to teaching funding methodology;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reductions in controlled student places;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consequences of any introduction of a graduate contribution to the cost of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A | Effective External Relations Strategy: co-ordinating all externally facing activities, including Admissions & Student Recruitment |
|   | Detailed market knowledge and awareness feeding: |
|   | • responsiveness for the development of new programmes |
|   | • internal monitoring of the quality and attractiveness of programme portfolios, as well as student progression |
|   | Ongoing enhancement of student experience through the leadership of the Vice Principal (Educational Development) and the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) |
|   | Senior Management Team monitoring of admissions processes and trends and allocation of funded numbers |
|   | Lobbying through Universities Scotland and close discussion with SFC and other bodies. |
|   | • Increased responsiveness to emerging markets and disciplines |
|   | • Increased drive to recruit from beyond the East of Scotland |
|   | • Improvements to retention strategy |
|   | • Development of the University’s web presence |
|   | • Increased drive to recruit international students |
|   | • Development of PG taught provision |
|   | • Enhancement of the PG experience |
|   | • Increased lobbying on the effects of restrictive Home Office Immigration policies |
|   | • Lobbying in relation to controlled student numbers and modelling in relation to the impact of any reductions |

<p>| | | Colleges/Schools |
| | | Director of Student Operations/Schools |
| | | Vice-Principal (ED) &amp; LTC |
| | | Directors of Student Operations/ICS/External Relations |
| | | Director of Student Operations/Schools |
| | | Colleges/Schools |
| | | Senior Management Team |
| | | Senior Management Team |
| | | Senior Management Team |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Improvement Actions</th>
<th>Responsible Officer /Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Core Business Risk** |     |                                                                     | A           | - Institutional steering of and support for REF strategy through Heads of Colleges and Research Committee  
- RIS provision of specialist support to maximise number/financial value of research awards and to maximise benefits of full economic costing  
- Ongoing diversification of funding sources by RIS and Colleges  | - Improved monitoring and reporting of research income  
- Increase overhead recovery rates associated with research income  
- Earlier and increased liaison between researchers and RIS  
- Establishment of the Tayside Medical Sciences Centre (TASC)  | Director of Finance  
Director of RIS/Colleges  
Director of RIS  
Dean of Medicine |
|                      | 3   | a) Loss of research-related income through                          |             | - Failure to achieve research grants; Reduction in available research funding as a result of economic factors  |                                                                      |                                         |
|                      |     |                                                                     |             | - Provision of leadership and support by Principal, Vice Principals and RIS  |                                                                      |                                         |
|                      |     | b) Inability to maximise commercial potential of research activity   |             |                                                                      | - Implementation of research commercialisation strategy  
- Review of RIS through Strategic Review  | Principal and Heads of Colleges  
Director of RIS |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c) Over-reliance on research income from funding sources which exclude overhead component</th>
<th>d) Failure to make research pooling initiatives sustainable in the long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing diversification of funding sources by RIS and Colleges</td>
<td>• Rigorous appointment procedure of research-pooling posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased awareness of alternative funding opportunities</td>
<td>• Effective monitoring of activity controlled by research pooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Category</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Core Business Risk**  | 4   | Inability to maximise income potential from teaching and other activities | A           | • Provision of strategic funding at institutional and College levels  
• Monitoring of College/School plans by Senior Management Team  
• Provision of leadership and support by Vice Principal (Educational Development) and Senior Management Team Research Lead  
• Development of institutional partnerships  
• Robust governance arrangements for collaborations and partnerships  
• Robust fee-setting processes | • Development of income-generating potential of e-learning, CPD and other activities not centrally directed  
• Increased proactivity at College/Support Service level  
• Increased flexibility in organisational structures and funding mechanisms to exploit opportunities  
• Improve planning by entrenching funded numbers, targets and fee income in the process  
• Development of a strategic approach to opportunities from the SFC Horizon Fund | College Heads/Directors of Support Services  
College Heads/Directors of Support Services  
Senior Management Team  
Senior Management Team  
Senior Management Team |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Improvement Actions</th>
<th>Responsible Officer /Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Core Business Risk    | 5   | Loss of reputation | A           | • Maintenance of academic standards through quality assurance arrangements  
• Central co-ordination of student support services  
• Ongoing investment in student facilities  
• Periodic review of student discipline procedures  
• Institutional steering of and support for REF strategy  
• Enhancement of teaching and learning through institutionally led strategy  
• Robust policies, strategies, procedures  
  • Health and Safety  
  • Human Resources  
  • External Relations  
  • Estates strategy (incl. residences)  
  • Business Planning Process  
  • Misconduct in Research  
  • Research Governance (incl. clinical trials)  
• Continued engagement with Campus Unions | • Increased focus on quality of student experience  
• Increased focus on financial sustainability  
• Improved structures for communicating with staff  
• Maintaining good relations with the media  
• Improving the green credentials of the University  
• Improve the robustness of external data submissions to enhance showing in League Tables | Heads of College/Senior Management Team  
Heads of College/Senior Management Team  
Senior Management Team/Director of HR  
Director of External Relations/Press Officer  
Senior Management Team/Director of Campus Services  
Senior Management Team/ Director of Registry |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risk Category</strong></th>
<th><strong>No.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Risk</strong></th>
<th><strong>Risk Rating</strong></th>
<th><strong>Existing Controls</strong></th>
<th><strong>Improvement Actions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responsible Officer /Body</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Control Risk**       | 6       | Inadequate budgetary control of University's financial resources, and inability to achieve savings and income generation targets | A               | • Monitoring by Senior Management Team, Finance & Policy Committee and Audit Committee  
• Monitoring of internal controls by Finance Office and internal auditors  
• Rigorous control of new appointments  
• Tight budgetary control  
• Implementation of Strategic Review | • Enhancement of financial systems  
• Improved financial monitoring procedures  
• Development of budget holders’ expertise  
• Introduction of commitment accounting and e-Procurement Systems  
• Encouragement of opportunities for income generation  
• Implementation of workload planning and performance management | Director of Finance  
Finance & Policy Committee  
Director of Finance  
Senior Management Team  
College Heads/Directors of Support Services |
| **Business Continuity Risk** | 7       | Breach of IT security with consequent damage to mission-critical operations and theft of IPR or personal data | A               | • Firewalls  
• Anti virus procedures  
• Network monitoring | • Development of information systems security policy within network improvement project  
• Implementation of recommendations of Internal Audit on Information Governance | Director of Information Services  
Senior Management Team/Directors of Support Services |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Improvement Actions</th>
<th>Responsible Officer / Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Control Risk  | 8   | Inability to manage capital programme within budget                  | A           | • Approval of capital developments on project-by-project basis  
• Improved communications between Estates, Finance and the Secretary via a regular forum  
• Monitoring of cashflow and borrowing requirements by Senior Management Team and Finance & Policy Committee  
• Restriction of capital expenditure to external funding levels only  
• Careful selection of approved contractors  
• Improved financial monitoring procedures | • Ensuring timely expenditure of external income to avoid SFC clawback  
• Packaging of capital works to provide maximum flexibility to adapt to financial circumstances | Directors of Finance and Campus Services  
University Secretary/ Directors of Finance & Campus Services |
| Control Risk  | 9   | External claims against the University for breach of contract       | B           | • Provision of specialist advice from Human Resources, RIS, Procurement Office and University solicitor for prevention and mitigation  
• Annual review of professional indemnity insurance  
• Increased scrutiny of proposed contracts | • Develop mechanisms (such as internal dipstick checks) to increase compliance by academic staff  
• Raise awareness of compliance duties and risks  
• Review of contracts by RIS and University Solicitor | Director of RIS / College Heads  
Director of RIS/ College Heads  
RIS/University Solicitor |
| Control Risk  | 10  | Failure of Health and Safety mechanisms                              | B           | • University Health and Safety Policy  
• Network of Safety Officers | • Improve compliance with, and monitoring of, University Health and Safety Policy  
• Improve vigilance for identifying Health & Safety risks | Director of HR  
Heads of Colleges/Deans/ Directors |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Improvement Actions</th>
<th>Responsible Officer /Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Risk</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Failure to comply with other legislative requirements</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>• Employment-related policies</td>
<td>• Application of effective compliance policies and procedures</td>
<td>Secretary/ Director of Human Resources/ Records Manager/ Equality &amp; Diversity Officer /University Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Equality-related policies and staff network</td>
<td>• Increased awareness of the implications of legislation relating to corporate homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Data Protection and Freedom of Information guidance and FoI Publication Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring by Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clinical study-related procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Disruption to operations following:</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>• University Disaster Recovery Team</td>
<td>• Co-ordination of disaster planning by Emergency Planning Working Group</td>
<td>Risk Management Monitoring Group Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Continuity Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>catastrophic loss (buildings or life)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fire Prevention and Safety Officers</td>
<td>• Reflection on lessons provided by actual incidents</td>
<td>College Heads/ Directors of Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>breakdown of critical equipment or services</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disaster recovery plans developed by Colleges and Support Services</td>
<td>• Diversify External Providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>loss of single source of external provision</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Estates and Buildings damage control capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>staff absence as a result of widespread disease or infection</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of 24 hour emergency cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Action (at local or national level)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continued engagement with campus unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Category</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Rating</td>
<td>Existing Controls</td>
<td>Improvement Actions</td>
<td>Responsible Officer /Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Continuity Risk</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Disruption to operations due to concerted campaign by activists to interfere with scientific work or due to attempts to use restricted materials by terrorist groups</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>• Security procedures pertaining to Resource Units and hazardous materials</td>
<td>• Increased security for high profile activities</td>
<td>Director of Campus Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rigorous ethical review procedures</td>
<td>• Development of PR response strategy</td>
<td>Director of External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Vetting of publicity by Principal’s Office and Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaison with police and other agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Degradation of estate through failure to address backlog maintenance requirements</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>• Prioritised maintenance programme</td>
<td>• Provision of data on backlog maintenance completion</td>
<td>Director of Campus Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-ordination of programmes across all campus locations</td>
<td>Director of Campus Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disposal of poor quality and/or uneconomic buildings</td>
<td>Senior Management Team/Director of Campus Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Risk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Effect on the University’s core finances of failure or poor performance of subsidiary or associated companies</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>• University Membership on subsidiary and associated Company Boards</td>
<td>• Provision of data on performance of subsidiary and associated companies</td>
<td>Secretary/ Director of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Category</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Rating</td>
<td>Existing Controls</td>
<td>Improvement Actions</td>
<td>Responsible Officer /Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Business Risk</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>a) Inability to retain and develop high calibre staff</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>• Ongoing improvement of workplace capabilities through Estates strategy &lt;br&gt;• Maintenance of high standards of teaching and research performance &lt;br&gt;• Comprehensive HR strategy, including reward mechanisms, staff development and management training &lt;br&gt;• Strong corporate ethos in high-performing research areas &lt;br&gt;• Development of critical staffing mass in successful research areas &lt;br&gt;• Reward strategy for senior staff through Remuneration Committee</td>
<td>• Promotion of corporate ethos &lt;br&gt;• Broaden opportunities for staff training and development &lt;br&gt;• Develop mechanisms to monitor levels of staff satisfaction &lt;br&gt;• Development of Succession Planning within Colleges, Schools and Support Services &lt;br&gt;• Increased lobbying on the effects of restrictive Home Office Immigration policies</td>
<td>Principal Director of Human Resources HR Committee College Heads/Directors of Support Services Senior Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Continuity Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Loss of staff with specialised knowledge</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>• Provision of succession/back-up training &lt;br&gt;• Sickness absence management</td>
<td>• Identify and eliminate single points of failure &lt;br&gt;• Staff training and development</td>
<td>College Heads / Directors of Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Category</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk Rating</td>
<td>Existing Controls</td>
<td>Improvement Actions</td>
<td>Responsible Officer /Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Control Risk  | 17  | Fraud, impropriety or misconduct                                      | D           | • Financial Procedures and Policies:  
  • Finance Operations Manual  
  • Procurement Strategy  
  • Fraud Policy  
  • Adherence to key principles and good practice in corporate governance  
  • Monitoring of internal controls by Finance Office and internal auditors, as well as the Audit Committee  
  • Policy and Procedures on Misconduct in Research  
  • Policy on Public Interest Disclosure/Whistleblowing | • Increased staff awareness of University rules and guidelines on financial procedures  
  • Improved awareness of procurement  
  • Development of Financial Regulations  
  • Address implications of the introduction of the Bribery Act 2010 | Secretary/ Director of Finance  
  Director of Finance/ Procurement Officer  
  Director of Finance  
  University Secretary/ Director of Finance/ University Solicitor |
| Control Risk  | 18  | Vulnerability to theft of equipment and damage to buildings through poor physical security | D           | • Security Manager and staff  
  • CCTV on main campus  
  • Access control in some high risk areas  
  • Asset registers | • Review of security  
  • Enhancement of staff awareness of security issues  
  • Improved vigilance and control by academic and non-academic units  
  • Central co-ordination of asset registers procedures  
  • Relocation of Security Control Centre | Director of Campus Services  
  Director of Campus Services  
  College Heads/ Directors of Support Services  
  Director of Finance  
  Director of Campus Services |
APPENDIX 6

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

(Minute 54)

1. CHANGES TO STATUTES

(1) Statute 16 – Academic Staff

The Senate received a paper from the Secretary and the Director of Human Resources setting out the rationale for reform of Statute 16, its replacement by a simplified version setting the principles under which human resources procedures must operate and enshrining the right to academic freedom for members of academic staff along with initial drafts of employment-related policies and procedures to accompany the revised statute.

The Director of Human Resources gave a presentation to the Senate which provided an overview of the statute’s current content, the reasons for changing it, the emphasis upon academic freedom in any revised statute, the legal considerations which bore on the issue and an outline timetable for the change process.

The main drivers for change presented were that the statute had not changed to reflect major advances in employment law since 1992, that it was cumbersome and complex to operate, that in some respects it was not legally compliant and, because the existing statute only covered academic staff, failed to support the recently introduced harmonization of terms and conditions for all staff.

In his introduction to the discussion, the Principal noted that while the final revision of the statute was a matter for the Court as the employer, he felt that it was valuable for the Senate to be involved in the consultation process and for it to be able to express its views on the fundamental issues of academic freedom and the modernization of HR policies and procedures.

In the course of discussion, inter alia, the following views were expressed. There was concern at the perceived simplification of statute 16 with some principles being removed to policies and procedures where it might be easier for them to be diluted; in response it was made clear that new policies and procedures would go through the same consultation process used at present involving the campus trades unions and HR Committee prior to final consideration by Court.

While members were pleased to see that the principle of academic freedom was enshrined in the proposed amended statute, some concern was expressed both about the timescale for change outlined by the HR Director as well as an anxiety that the Senate was being asked to endorse the draft policies and procedures without having had adequate time to scrutinize them in detail. In that latter regard, it was stressed that the policies had been derived from ACAS codes of good practice and were being presented to the Senate for its information and not for its endorsement. The University had signaled its intent to change the statute over a year ago and drafts of both the revised statute and many of the policies had been with the Unions for some time.

On the issue of academic freedom, the view was expressed that the principle could not be protected if it was separated from employment protection and that both issues would be better included in any statute revision. In response it was noted that the amendments were intended to improve employment protection for all University staff by making the processes more transparent, effective and easier to update when legislation changed.

On the process of change itself, some members were concerned that there was a linkage between the Strategic Review and statute 16 revisions in order to make it easier to lose academic staff. On that point it was noted that there was no connection between the two issues and that, in fact, the proposed policies would include one concerned specifically with the avoidance of redundancy: a feature that was not present in the existing statute.

The emphasis in the process was to try to achieve the assent of the campus unions prior to seeking Privy Council approval via the normal means of meetings of the local joint negotiating committees. It was stressed that there was no intention to remove employment rights but
instead to create policies and procedures which complied with best practice in protecting those rights. Some members remained concerned about their perception that valuable checks and balances were potentially being removed from Statutes but it was again emphasized that the purpose of consideration of the new policies by the local joint committees, HR Committee and Court was to ensure that they reflected good practice and that these sorts of concerns were addressed.

The Senatus decided: to assent to the consultative process being undertaken and to note that a revised Statute 16 would be presented to the next meeting of the Senatus for its consideration after the initial stages of consultation with the local joint committees, HR Committee and the Court.

(2) Statute 17 – Retirement of Members of Staff

The Senatus received a paper from the Clerk to Court.

The Senatus decided: for its part, to endorse the proposal.

2. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

The Principal drew members’ attention, in particular, to the current political landscape and the political parties pronouncements on fees in the run-up to the Scottish elections in May. The size of the funding gap between Scottish and English universities was the subject of considerable disagreement but three of the four main parties were claiming to be able to close the gap from the public purse. Universities Scotland was continuing to lobby for what in its view the correct figure to be recognised and for the gap to be filled as soon as possible after the election.

The Senatus decided: to note the report.

3. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received a communication from the meeting of the University Court held on 21 February 2011.

On the ‘Strategic Review and Future Options’ paper which had been presented to the Court, there was a sense of disquiet at the emergence of the ‘four key themes’ referred to in paragraphs 30-33. The themes, as they were currently expressed, seemed to some members to confuse and obscure the main purposes and constituent parts of the University. The Principal explained that the themes were not thought of as defining characteristics of the University but as cross-cutting topics serving to encourage disciplines to work together more productively. He emphasized that he wished to see Senate debate the validity of these themes in detail at an early meeting.

The Senatus decided: to note the report.

4. SENATE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW GROUP

The Senatus received a paper from the Academic Secretary setting out specific proposals arising from the report on ‘Improving Senate’s Effectiveness’ which was considered at the meeting on 9 February 2011.

The Senatus decided: for its part, to approve the proposals and to invite the Court to approve the following proposed amendments to Statute 10(1) and Ordinance 18:

To amend Statute 10(1) as follows:

(i) delete paragraph (g) and substitute:

‘(g) The Deans of the Schools;

(h) A minimum number of thirty four members of the academic staff who shall be elected in accordance with such procedures, and who shall hold office for such period and on such conditions, as may be prescribed by Ordinance’
(ii) renumber current paragraph (h) as paragraph (i).
To amend Ordinance 18 as follows:

(i) paragraph 6(2) delete ‘Colleges’, ‘College Secretary’ and ‘Head of College’ and substitute ‘Schools’, ‘School Secretary’ and ‘Dean’;

(ii) paragraph 7(1) delete and substitute:

‘There shall be School quotas for the members of the Senatus to be elected by Schools under clause (h) of paragraph (1) of Statute 10, which shall be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Elected members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJC</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Physics &amp; Maths</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESWCE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) paragraph 7(2) delete and substitute:

‘It shall be in the power of the Senatus at any time to amend these School quotas provided that the total numbers of seats for elected members do not fall below thirty four’

5. **ORDINANCE 43 - TUITION AND OTHER FEES**

The Senatus decided: to endorse to the court the recommendation that Ordinance 43, paragraph 11 be revoked to permit Colleges to establish their own staff scholarship schemes.

6. **ACADEMIC CALENDAR**

The Senatus received the Academic Calendar for 2011-12 (annex).

The Senatus decided: to forward the Calendar to the Court for approval.

7. **ACADEMIC COUNCIL ELECTION TO COURT**

The Senatus decided: to note that Professor Gary Mires has been elected to serve as an Academic Council representative on the Court until 31 July 2015.

8. **DUSA EXECUTIVE ELECTIONS**

The Senatus decided: to note the outcome of the DUSA Executive elections held on 9, 10 and 11 March 2011:
President: Iain Kennedy
Deputy President: Stuart Fitzpatrick
Vice President Communications: Navid Gornall
Vice President Student Activities: Rachael Doherty
Vice President Student Welfare: Thomas Dale
Vice President Campaigns: Julie McGovern
Honorary Secretary: Iain MacKinnon
Independent Member of Court: Matthew Kendrick
## ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2011-12

### August 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Resit examinations begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Last day of resit examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Finance and Policy Committee 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Senior Management Team 8.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Last day for announcement of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last day for issue of Termination letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### September 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Court Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Welcome Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last day for lodging appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>Last day for School Committee Termination meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Last day for Matriculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>First issue of Termination of Studies (Appeals) Committee agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Semester 1 begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>Postgraduate Affairs Sub-Committee 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Termination of Studies (Appeals) Committee 9.15am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>Information Management Strategy Group 11am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University/Unite Joint Committee 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University/Unison Joint Committee 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Health and Safety Sub-C 10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>Honorary Degrees Committee 11am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources Committee 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Senior Management Team 8.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Thur</td>
<td>University/UCU Joint Committee 10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Committee 12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Library &amp; Information Services Committee 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>College Board of Art, Science and Engineering 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>College Board of Arts &amp; Social Sciences 4pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 2011

University Opening Service 5.15pm

28 Wed College Board of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing 4pm

29 Thurs S Learning and Teaching Committee 10am

College Board of Life Sciences 3.30pm

30 Fri Senior Staff Workshop 9am

October 2011

3 Mon C Governance and Nominations Committee 10am Wk 4

School Secretaries Forum 12.15pm

C Finance and Policy Committee 2pm

Dundee Autumn Holiday

4 Tues C Audit Committee 2pm

5 Wed Personal Chairs Committee 2pm

10 Mon Wk 5

12 Wed C Senior Management Team 8.30am

S Senate 4pm

17 Mon Wk 6

18 Tues S Advisory Group on Appeals & Complaints Procedures 11am

24 Mon C Court 2pm Wk 7

26 Wed S Postgraduate Affairs Sub-Committee 2pm

27 Thurs S Academic Quality Sub-Committee 10am

31 Mon Academic Council Standing Committee 1pm Wk 8

November 2011

1 Tues C Risk Management Monitoring Group 10am

7 Mon School Secretaries Forum 12.15pm Wk 9

College Board of Art, Science and Engineering 4pm

8 Tues College Board of Arts & Social Sciences 4pm

9 Wed C Senior Management Team 8.30am

College Board of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing 4pm

10 Thurs S Research Committee 12 noon

College Board of Life Sciences 3.30pm

11 Fri S Library and Information Services Committee 2pm
April 2011

14 Mon Academic Council 1pm
15 Tues S Learning and Teaching Committee 10am
16 Wed Graduation
18 Fri Senior Staff Workshop 9am
21 Mon C Finance and Policy Committee 2pm
22 Tues C Remuneration Committee 10am
C Human Resources Committee 2pm
25 Fri Complaints Session Workshop 10.30am
28 Mon C Audit Committee 2pm
30 Wed C Senior Management Team 8.30am
S Senate 4pm

December 2011

5 Mon Semester 1 examinations begin Wk 13
School Secretaries Forum 12.15pm
7 Wed Personal Chairs Committee 2pm
11 Sun University Carol Service 5pm
12 Mon C Court 2pm Wk 14
16 Fri Semester 1 examinations end
End of Semester 1
21 Wed C Senior Management Team 8.30am
23 Fri University closed after business until start of business on Wednesday 4 January 2012
25 Sun Christmas Day

January 2012

4 Wed Start of business
9 Mon Welcome Week – January Intake
School Secretaries Forum 12.15pm
11 Wed C Senior Management Team 8.30am
12 Thurs C University/Unite Joint Committee 2pm
C University/Unison Joint Committee 3pm
13 Fri Discovery Day
16 Mon Start of Semester 2 Wk 15
April 2011

18 Wed C Health and Safety Sub-C 2pm
19 Thurs S Research Committee 12 noon
23 Mon College Board of Art, Science and Engineering 4pm Wk 16
24 Tues College Board of Arts & Social Sciences 4pm
25 Wed College Board of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing 4pm
26 Thurs College Board of Life Sciences 3.30pm
30 Mon C Finance and Policy Committee 2pm Wk 17
31 Tues C Human Resources Committee 2pm

February 2012

6 Mon School Secretaries Forum 12.15pm Wk 18
8 Wed C Senior Management Team 8.30am
   S Senate 4pm
13 Mon Wk 19
20 Mon C Court 2pm Wk 20
22 Wed Information Management Strategy Group 2pm
24 Fri S Library & Information Services Committee 2pm
27 Mon S Postgraduate Affairs Sub-Committee 2pm Wk 21

March 2012

2 Fri Senior Staff Workshop 9am
5 Mon School Secretaries Forum 12.15pm Wk 22
6 Tues C Audit Committee 2pm
7 Wed C Senior Management Team 8.30am
8 Thurs S Research Committee 12 noon
12 Mon S Learning and Teaching Committee 10am Wk 23
   College Board of Art, Science and Engineering 4pm
13 Tues College Board of Arts & Social Sciences 4pm
14 Wed College Board of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing 4pm
15 Thurs College Board of Life Sciences 3.30pm
19 Mon Wk 24
20 Tues Academic Council Standing Committee 1pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 Apr 2011</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Finance and Policy Committee</td>
<td>2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Apr 2011</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Apr 2011</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Complaints Session Workshop</td>
<td>10.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May 2012</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Dundee Holiday ??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May 2012</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Good Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 2012</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Easter Sunday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 2012</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Senior Management Team</td>
<td>8.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 2012</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examinations begin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May 2012</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>School Secretaries Forum</td>
<td>12.15pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 May 2012</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Risk Management Monitoring Group</td>
<td>10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Postgraduate Affairs Sub-Committee</td>
<td>2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 2012</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>Academic Quality Sub-Committee</td>
<td>10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 May 2012</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>University/UCU Joint Committee</td>
<td>10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May 2012</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Health and Safety Sub-C</td>
<td>10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
<td>1pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dundee Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 2012</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>Advisory Group on Appeals &amp; Complaints Procedures</td>
<td>10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>University/Unite Joint Committee</td>
<td>2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>University/Unison Joint Committee</td>
<td>3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May 2012</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Senior Management Team</td>
<td>8.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Chairs Committee</td>
<td>2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May 2012</td>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>Information Management Strategy Group</td>
<td>11am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Research Committee</td>
<td>12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 2012</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Library &amp; Information Services Committee</td>
<td>2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 May 2012</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Learning and Teaching Committee</td>
<td>10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Governance and Nominations Committee</td>
<td>10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Finance and Policy Committee</td>
<td>2pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College Board of Art, Science and Engineering  4pm
15 Tues  College Board of Arts & Social Sciences  4pm
16 Wed  College Board of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing  4pm
17 Thurs  College Board of Life Sciences  3.30pm
18 Fri  Senior Staff Workshop  9am
21 Mon  C  Human Resources Committee  2pm  Wk 30
23 Wed  C  Audit Committee  2pm
25 Fri  Semester 2 examinations end
        End of Semester 2
28 Mon  Dundee Holiday
30 Wed  C  Senior Management Team  8.30am
        S  Senate  4pm

June 2012
4 Mon  School Secretaries Forum  12.15pm
11 Mon  C  Court  3pm
19 Tues  Graduation Ceremonies
20 Wed  Graduation Ceremonies
21 Thurs  Graduation Ceremonies
22 Fri  Graduation Ceremonies
27 Wed  C  Senior Management Team  8.30am

July 2012
4 Wed  Personal Chairs Committee  2pm
12 Thurs  Information Management Strategy Group  11am
16 Mon  Systems upgrade to Blackboard 9.1 – potentially all week
18 Wed  C  Senior Management Team  8.30am

August 2012
6 Mon  Resit examinations begin
20 Mon  C  Finance and Policy Committee  2pm
22 Wed  C  Senior Management Team  8.30am
31 Fri  C  Court Retreat

September 2012
3 Mon  Semester 1 Welcome Week  Wk 0
10 Mon Semester 1 Teaching begins Wk 1

C = Court Committee
S = Senate Committee