A meeting of the Court was held on Monday 21 February 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), 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 IDM Wright

In Attendance: Vice-Principal Professor J Calderhead, University Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Information Services & Deputy Secretary, Directors of Human Resources, Strategic Planning and External Relations, Mr R Isles and Clerk to Court

Apologies: Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Lord Provost Dr J Letford, Mr KAC Swinley, Professor J Taylor

30. MINUTES

The Court decided: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 13 December 2010.

31. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

The Chairman provided members with an update on the activities he had been engaged in since the last meeting of the Court. These activities included: the University’s Discovery Days, which the Chairman had enjoyed immensely and which he recommended to members who had not yet been able to attend this annual event; attendance at a seminar hosted by the Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI) dealing with higher education funding; attendance at a CUC dinner; and continuing meetings with Deans, members of Court and the Senior Management Team.

The Chairman highlighted the Strategic Dialogue Meeting (SDM) he had participated in with Court colleagues, members of the Senior Management Team and members of the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), which had taken place in January. The meeting, a chance for Council members to get to know the University and to learn more about its strategic objectives, had proved to be particularly fruitful. The University had been able to put its own opinions across on a number of SFC matters, and the Council members remarked on how much they had learnt from the experience, and in particular, following a private meeting with students, they praised the very positive attitude of the student body.
32. **PRINCIPAL’S REPORT**

The Principal thanked the Court and also colleagues and members of the Senior Management Team for ensuring the University was kept on course during his recent period of absence.

The Principal spoke of the exceptional performance of the University. A recent survey published in the Times Higher Education had ranked the University of Dundee as fifth in the UK and first in Scotland in terms of the quality of its student experience. This was a tremendous accolade for the University, and the Principal reminded the Court of the University’s position (140th) in the World University Rankings published in 2010.

33. **SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT**

The Court considered a report from the Senior Management Team (Appendix 1), which set out the details of the Scottish Funding Council’s (SFC) indicative funding letter for 2011/12, which had been received by the University shortly before Christmas. This confirmed the funding expectations that Court had noted at its meeting on 13 December 2010.

The report also set out the main thrust of the recent Green Paper: ‘Building a Smarter Future’, published by the Cabinet Secretary for Education & Lifelong Learning, Mike Russell. The Court learnt that a short-life technical working group had been set up involving Universities Scotland and Scottish Government representatives to work through the options set out in the Green Paper and to consider the size and nature of any funding gap between Scotland and England. The findings of the working group were expected to be published at the beginning of March.

34. **STRATEGIC REVIEW AND FUTURE OPTIONS**

The Court received a paper from the Senior Management Team which provided an update on the progress made to date in implementing the Strategic Review and on continuing work in relation to the review of the University’s academic footprint. The Principal introduced the paper, noting that senior colleagues had reflected seriously on the nature of the review and its relationship to the development of longer term strategic plans for the future of the University. It was clear to the Principal that the University needed to focus on achieving the savings targeted as part of the Strategic Review. He felt it was dangerous and distracting to become focused on premature debates over the possible nature of the future academic footprint of the University, when the current prime responsibility was ensuring the University was in robust financial shape to withstand the funding reductions announced by the SFC. Fully implementing the savings identified during the Strategic Review would achieve this goal, and thereafter enable a more fruitful and considered discussion of the future shape of the University.

That said, he noted the results of key analyses which showed that there were areas of strength across all parts of the University, although that did not mean that disciplines should expect to retain their current size and composition. The corollary to this was that future structural changes could not be ruled out. The Principal was personally
convinced that a thematically based focus for the University’s activity was the most appropriate, but these questions would be subject to robust examination by the Senior Management Team and others over the coming months before being subject to wide discussion across the University.

Discussion centred on the consequences for the University of any further worsening in available public funding for higher education institutions in Scotland and on the effects of a thematic structure for existing disciplines in the University, particularly those which at first glance did not immediately align with the proposed themes.

On the first issue, it was made clear that, based on current forecasts, if SFC funding was flat into 2012/13, provided the £10m of Strategic Review savings were achieved as well as the challenging income targets for the period, then the University ought to be in a stable position, albeit there may be issues of timing depending upon when the full benefit of the savings were achieved. Of primary concern here was the speed with which any Scottish Solution could be implemented to ensure that a funding gap with England could be prevented or, at the very least, mitigated.

**The Court decided:**

(i) noting that the voluntary severance scheme would close at the end of February 2011, to permit the continued use of voluntary severance on a targeted basis only for short periods of time in parts of the University where further reductions might be identified; and

(ii) otherwise, to note the report and await further updates.

### 35. **FINANCE**

(1) **Finance & Policy Committee**

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 31 January 2011 (Appendix 2). The Director of Finance introduced the report, highlighting two issues in particular: the approval mechanism for external funding bids and the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (UoDSS).

On the first of these matters, the Director reported that the Committee had approved a mechanism for ensuring that capital funding bids to external bodies which included a commitment for University funding could be properly considered. Under the mechanism, funding bids including a commitment to funding in excess of £1m on the part of the University would first be subject to consideration by the whole Committee before they could be submitted to the funding body. It had been agreed that such consideration by the Committee could be prosecuted by correspondence if the timing of funding competitions demanded it. The Court discussed the appropriateness of the £1m threshold, finally agreeing that it was commensurate with the terms of the Schedule of Delegation and Decision-Making.

On the issue of the UoDSS, the Director reported that broad agreement with the Trustees had been reached on the proposed changes to the scheme, and that therefore a 60-day period of consultation would now take place,
beginning in early March. The proposals as finally agreed, following the consultation period, would be brought to Court for general approval.

The Court decided: (i) to endorse the proposed mechanism for considering external funding bids which included a commitment for funding from the University of Dundee, and thereby to approve a consequent amendment to the Schedule of Delegation & Decision-Making; and

(ii) otherwise, to approve the report.

(2) Renewal of Borrowing Facilities: Barclays Bank plc

The Court received a paper outlining the proposed terms of the renewal of the University’s revolving credit facility with Barclays Bank plc (the ‘Bank’), which was due to expire in January 2012. The proposed new facility was for £34m of revolving credit for a period of five years.

Court members noted that such a facility would allow £10m to be used to support the capital plan with some headroom to address any possible unforeseen fluctuations in the University’s funding position. There was discussion on the financial covenants applicable to the proposed facility and on the manageability of the proposed level of borrowing. Court members were satisfied that the proposed terms were favourable in the current financial context.

The Court decided: (i) that, having considered all the terms of the new facility and the facility agreement, the acceptance of the new facility was in the best interests of and to the advantage and further benefit of the University;

(ii) that the University (the ‘Borrower’) delegate to the Director of Finance the power to review, amend, negotiate and agree the new facility and the facility agreement with the Bank;

(iii) that the Director of Finance and the University Secretary be hereby authorised to jointly sign the acceptance of the facility agreement on behalf of the University and to bind the University to the terms and conditions contained therein;

(iv) that the Director of Finance and the University Secretary be hereby authorised to jointly execute any other related documents in connection with or ancillary to or required under the facility agreement on behalf of the University and to bind the University to the terms and conditions contained therein; and
that the University authorise the Bank to accept instructions and confirmations in connection with the facility agreement signed in accordance with the Bank’s signing mandate current from time to time and to accept instructions in connection with drawings under the facility agreement by telephone from any person specifically authorised to give such telephone instructions.

36. CAPITAL PLAN

At its meeting on 13 December 2010, the Court had received a paper setting out the proposed priorities for the University’s capital plan for the period to the end of July 2013. At that meeting, the Court had asked the Senior Management Team to provide additional information to enable the Court to reach a decision. The Court had also approved recourse to £10m of borrowing to support capital expenditure over the period, subject to appropriate borrowing facilities being able to be put in place (see paragraph 35(2) above).

The Court now received a revised capital plan which included account of Court’s previous discussions and also of those that had taken place at the Finance & Policy Committee meeting on 31 January 2011.

The Chairman introduced the paper. In so doing, he emphasised to the Court that discussions had taken place with each of the Colleges and that the Heads of each College had endorsed the plan as now presented to the Court. The Chairman reported that he had spoken with Deans or their representatives in respect of each of the four major capital projects contained in the plan. He recognised that the plan represented a compromise in difficult financial times, but stressed that Heads of Colleges and the Senior Management Team fully supported the plan.

Court members discussed the merits of the various projects in the plan, and encouraged the University to consider how best to address fundraising issues, given that a number of the projects would need to identify significant external financial contributions. Court also considered the scope of the plan in relation to the University’s current financial position and to its borrowing capability. The Court also considered what additional funding might become available if the financial position were to prove better than anticipated.

Of greatest concern to Court members were the consequences the revised plan would have on the refurbishment plans of Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design (DJCAD). Many members had visited DJCAD and seen for themselves the poor condition of the accommodation. Nevertheless, Court members understood also the opportunity for increased research funding represented by the project to build a Centre for Translational & Interdisciplinary Research.

The Court decided: (i) to approve the capital plan as proposed; but

(ii) to note the significant concerns raised in relation to the refurbishment of DJCAD; and
(iii) therefore to impress upon the Senior Management Team the need to consider DJCAD as a key priority both in the event additional funding became available before the end of the capital plan period and in re-appraising capital plans beyond that period; and

(iv) to hold its meeting on 26 April 2011 at DJCAD and to request that on that occasion Court members be offered the opportunity to tour DJCAD.

37. **HUMAN RESOURCES**

(1) **Human Resources Committee**

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 1 February 2011 (Appendix 3). The Director of Human Resources presented the report and highlighted the issue of industrial action. The Court noted that the local branch of the University & College Union (UCU) had voted to take strike action, although it was not yet clear when this would be. Members had been balloted on two issues: the reluctance of the University to rule out compulsory redundancy, and the lack of progress on agreeing a Redundancy Avoidance Policy. The Director reported that agreement in principle had now been reached on the second of these issues, and she noted therefore her disappointment that the local branch had decided to continue with its intended industrial action. The Director reported also that nationally UCU had given notice of two ballots on industrial action: the first on the issue of changes to the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) and the second on pay and job security. The University would learn the outcome of these two national ballots in due course.

The Director also invited the Court to approve the repeal of Statute 17 – Retirement of Members of Staff. Given that the national retirement age was being abolished with effect from 1 October 2011, Statute 17 would be meaningless.

The Court noted also that discussions were underway to revise Statute 16 – Academic Staff. This issue had been raised with each of the campus unions and had been discussed at the Human Resources Committee. It was intended to replace Statute 16 with an enabling Statute, setting out guiding principles to be adhered to in devising HR policies and procedures. The procedures contained in the current Statute 16, which were no longer legally compliant nor fit for purpose, would be removed from Statute and published in a suite of documents which would harmonise procedures for all staff groups within the University. It was the Director’s intention to bring forward formal proposals for change to the meeting of Court on 26 April 2011.

**The Court decided:** (i) to approve the repeal of Statute 17, subject consultation with the Senate, to ratification at a subsequent meeting of the Court and finally to approval by the Lords of the Privy Council; and
(2) **Public Holiday: 29 April 2011**

The Court received representations from each of the campus unions relating to their wish to see the date of the wedding of HRH Prince William to Miss Catherine Middleton recognised as a public holiday by the University. Having reviewed its position and having assessed the position of other Scottish universities as well as the precedent established by the holiday awarded in recognition of HM The Queen’s Golden Jubilee in 2001, the University Secretary reported that the Senior Management Team had decided to recognise the date as a public holiday. Operational issues relating to this decision would require to be addressed, as the University needed to be open on the day in question, but staff should now expect to receive an additional day’s holiday entitlement in recognition of the occasion.

**The Court decided:** to note the decision of the Senior Management Team.

(3) **Senior Appointments**

**The Court decided:**

(i) to approve the proposal that there be a sole candidate interview for the post of Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Life Sciences, and approving further that Dr Howard Marriage would be the Court’s representative on the interview panel;

(ii) to approve the proposals that there be an external recruitment process for the post of Vice-Principal and Head of the College of Art, Science & Engineering; and

(iii) to approve the proposal that Professor Christopher Whatley be awarded a period of six months’ research leave with effect from 1 March 2011, noting that his Head of College duties would be undertaken by Professor Robert Duck (Dean of the School of the Environment), but that he would continue to carry out his University-wide responsibilities as Vice-Principal (for instance in leading on employability issues) throughout the period of leave.
38. **STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK – AIMS 6 & 7**

The Court received a report from the Director of Strategic Planning, which outlined the progress being made by the University against targets set in the Strategic Framework in the two areas of support services’ responsiveness and the University’s long-term financial sustainability. The Director highlighted three main issues: 1) that the overall quality of the estate had improved, although the University was still behind its peers on this indicator; 2) that the University’s efficiency in relation to energy consumption had worsened; and 3) that good progress was being made on staff performance management, although the roll-out to all staff groups in 2010 had caused some delays in all areas integrating objective-setting and review into their annual routines. On this last issue, the Director of Human Resources was able to report that she anticipated near full compliance for 2011.

In discussion, Court members wondered whether improvements could be made to the strategy for internal communications. There was anecdotal evidence that the system of cascading information was not working effectively in all areas of the University. On this point, the Director External Relations undertook to review current practice and come forward with proposals for a consistent approach.

39. **YEAR-ON INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO THE QAA SCOTLAND ENHANCEMENT LED INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW (ELIR) 2009**

The Court received the University’s follow-up response to the 2009 ELIR report, noting that under the terms of the ELIR, the SFC required individual institutional governing bodies to endorse the response. The response itself set out the outcomes and recommendations generated by the ELIR and the internal action plan that had been developed to address them.

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

40. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS**

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Senate on 9 February 2011 (Appendix 4).

**The Court decided:** (i) to endorse, for its part, the appointment of Dr Frederik Paulsen to an Honorary Professorship on a permanent basis;

(ii) to approve changes to Ordinance 40 – Student Discipline, such that:

a) reference *passim* to the ‘Director of Student Services’ be replaced with ‘Director of Student Operations’; and

b) under the section: General Procedures, paragraph 5(1) of the Ordinance be deleted and replaced with:
Where, apart from section 4 above, any student denies the misconduct alleged, a Hearing should be held by the Authorised Officer to consider and to determine the matter. The Authorised Officer should decide, in the light of the seriousness of the alleged misconduct and all the circumstances, whether the Hearing should be formal or informal. The disciplinary allegations must be communicated in advance to the student(s), who has/ have the right to attend the Hearing and be heard by the decision-makers, to present evidence, to make representations and to present a defence countering the disciplinary case against the student(s).

(iii) and furthermore, noting the non-contentious nature of the changes to Ordinance 40 and noting also that the Director of Student Operations was already in post, to approve the proposal that these changes be considered urgent in terms of the proviso to article 12.1 of the Charter, and that they therefore be approved at a single meeting and come into immediate force; and

(iv) otherwise, to note the report.

41. ETHICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Court received the annual report from the Committee.

The Court decided: to approve the report.

42. HONORARY CHAPLAIN

The Court decided: to approve the appointment of Father Martin Pletts as Catholic Honorary Chaplain to the University with effect from 1 January 2011.

43. STAFF

Professiorial and Other Grade 10 Appointments

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

Fabio Sani  Personal Chair of Social Psychology  1 February 2011
APPENDIX 1

SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT
(Minute 33)

Scottish Funding Council (SFC)

As reported at the Court meeting on 13 December 2010, the Scottish Government had asked the SFC to provide institutions with an indication of the effects of the budget on individual allocations before the end of December 2010. The University received details of its funding shortly before the Christmas break, and, on the basis of the draft Scottish budget, these will be as follows:

- The University teaching grant is to be reduced by £4.6m (10%). In addition, we had been expecting that teacher training numbers would return to previous levels (they had been dramatically cut for 2010/11) and that the proposed new teaching price groups would have been implemented; neither will now happen and this results in an additional £1.6m reduction in our anticipated SFC income. In total, against the financial plans there is a shortfall of £6.2m on teaching for 2011-12.
- We now have final confirmation on student numbers in controlled subjects, although we have yet to learn what this will mean in financial terms.
- The SFC have reviewed the funding for widening access and part time incentives. Those institutions deemed to have a strong regional presence have received additional funding, but we are not amongst these institutions and so have seen a 30% reduction (0.4m) in funding from these streams.
- The overall research grant (REG) has been kept flat. However the formula for allocating this has changed: 3* and 4* have been protected in real terms by reducing the funding for 2* and removing the funding for 1*. The result of this is an increased weighting to 3*/4*.
- There is no information on the main Knowledge Transfer (KT) grant, which was reduced by 20% last year; given that the Horizon Fund has been reduced, whence the KT grant flows, we can expect a further cut.
- Capital funding has also been significantly reduced from £3.2m (which was a reduction on the previous year) to £1.9m.

‘Building a Smarter Future’: the Green Paper

Shortly before Christmas, the Scottish Government published its Green Paper on a sustainable Scottish solution for the future of higher education. This had been eagerly anticipated by the sector, and there were hopes that this would provide Scottish universities with a degree of confidence in the longer term financial sustainability of the sector. In particular, it was hoped that it would contain proposals for a solution to the current funding crisis and the possible funding gap, but instead it disappointingly invites comment on a variety of ‘funding options’, namely:

- State retains the prime responsibility
- State retains the prime responsibility but requires some form of graduate contribution
- Increasing income from cross border flows of students
- Increasing donations and philanthropic giving
- Increasing support from business
- Increasing efficiency

These aren’t really options for funding and, aside from the first two, they do not offer a means to secure stability in the long term. Although the second option mentions graduate contribution, there is nothing in the green paper which unpacks how this might work in practice. And as for the final four ‘options’, these are in fact just the kind of activity that any well-run, entrepreneurial and conscientious University should be involved in, and in any case none of them can provide a secure alternative means of funding.
Senior Management Team Meetings (SMT)


Visit: http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/com/smt/welcome.htm

Discussions at these meetings covered the following issues:

- Strategic Review and Organisational Change;
- The University’s Capital Plan;
- Research Committee business;
- Distance Learning Provision Review;
- Early draft of a report to Court on performance against the Strategic Framework targets for aims 6 & 7;
- Strategic Investment Fund – Translational Medicine;
- Use of campus to deliver advanced higher courses for Dundee City Council;
- Technology and Innovation Centres;
- The effects of UK Borders Agency policies on the recruitment of students and staff;
- Human Resources issues:
  - Review of Probationary Lecturers;
  - College Annual Reviews;
  - Public Holiday: 29 April 2011
  - Relationships with the Campus Unions;
- 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

- £1.5m from the Wellcome Trust to Professor Colin Watts for Regulation of Adaptive Immunity by Proteolytic Systems
- £0.9m from a collection of charity, industrial and Government funding sources to Professor Nora Kearney for Implementation of an Innovative, Nurse-led Advanced Symptom Management System (ASyMS III) to Improve Patient Care
- £0.5m from the European Framework 7 Programme to Dr David Coghill for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder Drugs Use Chronic Effects (ADDUCE)
- £0.4m from Natural Environment Research Council to Dr Steve Parkes for NERC Earth Observation Data Acquisition and Analysis Service
- £0.4m from the European Space Agency to Dr Steve Parkes for Space Fibre Very High Speed Link Technology Demonstrator

Annex C

People & Prizes

- Susan Philipsz, former student of Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design, was awarded the prestigious Turner Prize in December 2010
- Jane Forbes, graduate of the Master of Fine Art programme, was awarded first prize in ‘The Shoe is Art’ competition organised by shoe retailer Dune
- Filipa Oliveira, Jennifer Tsang, Laura Cowan, Dougie Kinnear and Merlin Planterose (all Level 4 students on the Jewellery & Metal Design programme) scooped prizes at the Goldsmith’s Precious Metal Bursary Awards 2011
A meeting of the Committee was held on 31 January 2011.

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

In Attendance: Dr H Marriage, University Secretary, Director & Deputy Director of Finance, Director of Campus Services, Mr C McNally and Clerk to Court

Apologies: Principal Professor CP Downes, Director of Strategic Planning

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 22 November 2010.

2. MATTERS ARISING

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

The Director of Finance provided updates on proposed changes to both the national Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) and the local University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (UoDSS).

In relation to USS, the Committee noted that the responses to the recent consultation had been considered by the Trustees, following which some modifications had been proposed for consideration by the Joint Negotiating Committee. It remained the intention that, subject to their approval, the changes would be implemented with effect from 1 April 2011.

In relation to the University of Dundee scheme, agreement had now been reached with the Trustees and a consultation process would begin in March 2011, with the intention that proposed changes to the scheme would be implemented from 1 August 2011. The Director reported additionally that the Trustees were reviewing their investment strategy with a view to greater diversification in order to both reduce volatility and increase investment return.

(2) Funding Update (Minute 2(2))

The Director of Finance also reported to members the contents of the Scottish Funding Council’s (SFC) indicative funding letter, which the University had received shortly before Christmas. This letter confirmed many of the expectations for funding that had been reported to Court at its meeting on 13 December 2010. Teaching funding would reduce by around 10% (equating to a £5m reduction); research funding would be broadly flat; there would be a reduction in funding for wider access and part-time initiatives as the SFC sought to concentrate funding on a group of institutions with ‘regional focus’ of which the University was not one; and capital funding would be reduced by 40% to £1.9m. Student numbers in controlled subjects were still to be confirmed as was the level of knowledge transfer funding.

In addition, the Director noted that the Scottish Cabinet Secretary for Finance, John Swinney, had in the interim provided an indication that future education funding would remain flat for both 2012-13 and 2013-14 which, though better than might have been anticipated, nonetheless made it unlikely that the funding situation would improve in the medium term unless and until a ‘Scottish Solution’ to university funding was found.

(3) External Funding Bids (Minute 7(2))

The Committee considered a paper which set out a procedure for early notification and review of those applications for external funding for capital projects which also included a commitment to a financial contribution on the part of the University. Under the procedure,
where such a contribution would be in excess of £1m, the application for funding would first require to be considered by the Committee before it could be submitted to the funding body.

**Resolved:**

(i) to approve the proposals, recommending that applications could be considered by correspondence in cases where the deadline for submission preceded an appropriate meeting of the Committee; and

(ii) to recommend that Court amend the Schedule of Delegation & Decision-making to reflect the new procedure by insertion of the following additional power for the Committee:

‘Approve applications to external funding bodies for capital projects where a commitment to a financial contribution on the part of the University of more than £1m is included.’

(4) **Dundee University Press Ltd (DUP) (Minute 3)**

At its previous meeting, the Committee noted that DUP had drawn down the full value of its loan from the University. The Director of Finance reported that DUP was currently behind on payments to the University as outlined in the terms of the original agreement. The Committee would receive a paper at its next meeting setting out the situation in full.

**Resolved:** to discuss the position of DUP at the Committee’s next meeting.

3. **MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 5**

The Deputy Director of Finance presented the accounts for the period to 31 December 2010. These showed an operating surplus to the end of the period of £4.9m, representing a favourable variance of £3.8m against the phased budget. However, the current forecast for the year end remained at an operating surplus of £2.5m. A detailed review of budget phasing was underway, particularly in the Student & Academic Support Services (SASS), and it was hoped that this would enable a more realistic representation of income and expenditure through the year in future. The Committee noted the inclusion of projected voluntary severance costs of £2m for the year.

In terms of capital expenditure, the University was forecasting £14.2m for 2010/11, although forecasts for subsequent years would be dependent on prioritisation at the February meeting of Court. The cashflow projections to 2013 had now been updated to include the reduction in funding from the SFC, revised estimates on voluntary severance costs and savings and the expected capital expenditure envelope as agreed at the December meeting of Court.

The Committee noted that the University had considerable net funds at the moment, although it was expected that this position would worsen in the short to medium term as research funds amongst others began to unwind.

In discussion, the Committee concentrated on the performance of the voluntary severance scheme to date and the likelihood of its meeting the savings targets set out at the October 2010 meeting of the Court. The Committee noted that open Strategic Review briefings would be taking place with staff in February.

The Committee briefly discussed the progress being made in the Human Resources Committee on the revision of Statute 16 – Academic Staff.

4. **BUDGET SETTING: 2011-12**

The Director notified the Committee that budget instructions had now been issued to budget-holders informing them of the priorities and timetable for agreeing a budget for 2011/12. A draft budget would be presented to the meeting of the Committee on 16 May 2011. The Director noted that a 3% surplus, as was the original target for 2011/12, was unrealistic in the current financial climate, and the aim of the budget would therefore be to close as far as possible the funding gap created by reductions in public spending.
5. **CAPITAL PLAN**

The Committee received a revised draft Capital Plan for consideration and recommendation to the Court at its meeting on 21 February 2011. At its meeting on 13 December 2010, the Court had asked the Senior Management Team to provide additional information to enable it to reach a conclusion on the University’s capital priorities. The revised plan included proposed borrowing of £10m, which the Court had approved at its meeting on 13 December 2010; it also set out the proposed capital priorities for 2011/12 and 2012/13 along with a revised phasing of work on each of the individual projects included in the plan.

In considering the plan, the Committee explored the University’s assumptions on working capital to determine whether they were robust enough. Acknowledging the difficulty in predicting such movements, the Director indicated that a reduction in working capital was likely but that it was hoped that the projections contained in the paper were prudent. He also acknowledged that research awards appeared to be down on previous years, although it was still difficult to assess how much of this was due to the timing of the various renewals as opposed to a general reduction in awards.

For a number of members of the Committee one crucial factor in deciding whether to support the plan was the total level of credit facilities that would be available to the University, and whether these would be sufficient to cover all possible liabilities. The Committee and the officers understood the level of risk inherent in the plan, and in particular the number of variables that could influence the forecasting (meeting income generation targets, success in external fundraising, further public funding cuts, deteriorating working capital, failure to meet savings targets, etc). Some members were convinced, nevertheless, of the need for capital expenditure to strengthen key areas in order to make the University as strong as possible for the future and that the level of borrowing proposed could be accommodated given the University’s turnover and balance sheet. The Director indicated that discussion with the University’s bankers was ongoing in respect of the renewal of the current facility, due to expire in 2012. Given the uncertain funding landscape, members felt that approval of the proposed level of borrowing to support the capital plan should be contingent on the University receiving confirmation of the credit facility, which would ideally be up to a value of £34M (the current facility is £25M). Some members felt there was considerable headroom. It was generally noted that, in the current climate, banks were now taking longer to reach credit decisions.

There was discussion also on the risks to the projects contained in the plan which would be generated by the proposals contained in the revised capital plan. The paper provided extracts from the original capital project proposal documents, so that members could get a sense of the level of change proposed for each of the projects. However, members felt that additional information could be included to demonstrate that there had been an assessment of the risks inherent in not continuing as originally planned with the previously approved projects. These risks might include for instance effects on student recruitment, on a School’s ability to meet income generation targets, or on the University’s ability to deliver its teaching and research provision effectively and at a sufficiently high quality. In terms of the Ninewells teaching accommodation project, one member was concerned at the effects of the revised proposals on the NHS funding element of this proposal and consequently the University’s relationship with NHS Tayside.

Officers reinforced the Senior Management Team’s collective approval of the plan, having itself weighed up the merits and disadvantages of the proposed changes.

**Resolved:** to recommend to Court approval of the Capital plan as set out in the paper as presented, provided:

(i) that the University secure borrowing facilities such that they would provide sufficient headroom to deal with any changing circumstances; and

(ii) that officers demonstrate in the paper to be presented at Court on 21 February 2011 that an assessment had taken place of the risks of not progressing with each project as initially conceived.

6. **STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK – AIMS 6 & 7**

The Committee received a draft of a report to be presented to Court at its meeting on 21 February 2011 setting out the University’s progress against performance targets in the areas of support services’ responsiveness and institutional financial sustainability.

**Resolved:** to note the report.
7. **ENDOWMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report of the Sub-committee’s meeting on 26 November 2010.

**Resolved:** to approve the report.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 1 February 2011.

Present: Dr J Lowe (Convener), Professor R Abboud, Mr D Cathcart, Mr I Leith, Mr H Marriage, Professor G Mires, Ms C Potter, Professor C Whatley.

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Human Resources, Director of Finance, Deputy Director of Human Resources, Director of Strategic Planning (for item 6(5)), HR Student Intern.

Apologies: Dr A Rogers.

1. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of 3 November 2010 were approved.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) HE Career Barometer (Item 6(5))

It was confirmed that the University had just received the results from the HE Career Barometer Survey on 31 January 2011 and that these would be made available for the next meetings of the Human Resources and Local Joint Committees.

Resolved: to note the position.

(2) Change to Academic Terms and Conditions

At previous meetings the proposal to remove the clause in the academic contract of employment which provided for 12 months’ notice of redundancy had been considered. The Committee had supported this in principle recognising that this was an anomaly in relation to other staff groups and to other HE institutions. An updated paper was considered which outlined the current situation and the proposed changes to the redundancy clause. For Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, it was proposed that the period of notice of redundancy should be harmonised to 3 months to be consistent with the standard notice periods in the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer contract and that for Professors it should be 6 months, which was consistent with the current notice periods for Professorial Staff. It was confirmed that the 6 month notice period for Professorial Staff had always existed at the University and that it was not unusual to have a longer period of notice for senior staff. It was confirmed that the proposal was that these changes would apply to new appointments which included both staff new to the institution and to existing staff moving into a new role.

Resolved: to note that the Committee supported the proposed changes and that these should be submitted to DUCU for further consideration and comment.

3. UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC REVIEW

The University Secretary highlighted that a status report on Strategic Review would be considered at the February meeting of Court and progress with programmes identified under Strategic Review would be given including cost savings accrued to date through the Voluntary Severance Scheme and other mechanisms.

Communication relating to Strategic Review was ongoing; the Principal had written to all staff before Christmas and a recent HERMES message had been sent out from the Director of Human Resources. In addition a series of open meetings were to be held around the University, led by the Heads of College, commencing 14 February 2011.
The Director of Change and Project Management was able to provide an overview of some of the activities taking place across the University in support of Strategic Review and it was noted that these would be incorporated in the report presented to Court. It was confirmed that academic leaders were looking at the allocation of research time for academics, focusing on opportunities to increase research activity and excellence. Staff workloads were being re-aligned where appropriate to support the excellence in teaching agenda and reviews were taking place on a number of levels relating to the curriculum and programme delivery.

In addition a number of initiatives were taking place to increase the effectiveness of support services, with consideration being given to any areas of duplication in terms of provision of service, ensuring core systems were fit for purpose and considering options to upgrade where there was an opportunity to increase functionality. The development of the Data Warehouse was highlighted and the benefits that this would bring in linking all the University’s corporate systems. Work was on-going relating to identifying a system to support the REF return and details of this were discussed.

Resolved: (i) to recognise that a significant amount of work was being undertaken throughout the University to support Strategic Review and that this was to be commended.

(ii) to request that progress reports continue to be provided to future meetings of the Committee.

4. HR STRATEGY TO SUPPORT THE STRATEGIC REVIEW

A report on the Voluntary Severance Scheme was discussed. The report detailed, by College/ SASS, the number of applications at formal stage and the number which had been formally approved. Information on FTE savings by College/ SASS were also provided. The interest in the Scheme was seen as positive, but it was recognised that more cases would have to come forward for the targets to be achieved. It was noted that communication had gone out to remind staff that the scheme would close on 28 February 2011. A suggestion was made that publishing the numbers of approved cases may help staff to make an informed decision about whether to apply.

Resolved: (i) to amend the VS report to include an additional column detailing the formal applications not approved.

(ii) to note that Court would be provided with more detailed information relating to actual savings associated with approved cases.

5. FINANCIAL UPDATE / PENSIONS

The Director of Finance confirmed that the University’s financial position was as expected for this financial year with a surplus of £1.7m despite an anticipated shortfall of £1.5m in the projected income from tuition fees. It was believed that this shortfall could be balanced through savings in other areas. It was acknowledged that SFC funding for the next financial year would result in a £7m reduction in the University’s budget mainly due to an 11% cut in funding for teaching which had been applied uniformly across the sector.

In relation to pensions it was highlighted that the consultation period on the proposed changes to USS came to an end on 22 December 2010. The responses were currently under consideration by the Trustees and any changes proposed would be discussed at the Joint Negotiating Committee (JNC) and implemented for 1 April.

It was noted that proposed changes to the UoD Scheme were currently being discussed with the Trustees. Consultation with members over proposed changes would take place from March and any changes to the scheme would take place from 1 August.

Resolved: to note the position.

6. HUMAN RESOURCES

(1) National Pay Negotiations

It was reported that the concluding position of the 2010/ 11 pay round was that three Trade Unions – Unite, GMB and UNISON had accepted the 0.4% ’reluctantly’, but UCU and EIS had
not. Advice from UCEA to all HEIs participating in the collective negotiations was to implement the 0.4% settlement. Arrangements had therefore been made for uplifted salaries to be paid from 1 February and the backdated payment to be paid with the March salary.

Resolved: to note that the 0.4% pay settlement would be implemented from 1 February backdated to 1 August 2010.

(2) Phasing out of Default Retirement Age

The UCEA guidance on the phasing out of the Default Retirement Age highlighted key aspects of implementation in respect of the new legislation. It was noted that the legislation commenced on 6 April 2011 but that there was a transition period until 1 October 2011 for this to take full effect. From 1 October 2011 there would be no default retirement age as at present. Up until 6 April 2011 it will still be permissible to give notice of retirement but after this date it will not. It was reported that the legislation would be reviewed in 5 years and specific impacts on employers and employees and any unintended consequences arising from the policy initiative would be examined at that time. This would include the impact on performance management systems and levels of dismissal disputes. Advice from legal experts and ACAS is that employers need to have regular conversations with all staff about future plans, discussing short, medium and long-term aspirations.

In addition to reviewing the contents of existing employment contracts and employment policies and procedures it was also recognised that it will be important to have a Capability Procedure in place applicable to all staff irrespective of age.

There was some discussion about whether the University would have an Employer Justified Retirement Age (EJRA) for some roles if there was felt to be a Health and Safety risk. It was agreed that this would have to be considered further but that for the vast majority of roles an EJRA would not be justified.

Resolved: to note that phasing out of the Default Retirement Age was a significant legislative change and that implementing the legislation would present a number of challenges.

(3) Ballot for Industrial Action

The Director of Human Resources reported on the position regarding ballots for industrial action both locally and nationally. The Committee was advised that, locally, DUCU were currently in dispute with the University over two issues; firstly over the University’s unwillingness to make a guarantee of no compulsory redundancies during the Strategic Review process and secondly in not being able to reach agreement on an Avoidance of Redundancy Policy. It was noted that DUCU had held a local ballot and had received a mandate to take industrial action. The Director of Human Resources confirmed that a series of meetings had taken place with DUCU and the UCU full-time official, Mary Senior, in an attempt to avoid a local dispute; however no agreement had been reached as yet. DUCU had formally requested an extension to the 4 weeks allowed between ballot and notifying the employer of what action would be taking place. The University had agreed to this and meetings were still ongoing with DUCU and the full-time representative over this matter with a view to avoiding local action.

At a National level it was confirmed that all Universities had received notification on two areas of dispute. These related to (1) pay and job security and (2) pensions and the proposed changes to the USS pension scheme. The ballot would open on 3 February 2011 and will run for three weeks.

Resolved: (i) to note with regret the national ballot

(ii) to encourage resolution of the local dispute

(4) Statute 16&17

The Director of Human Resources confirmed that good progress had been made with UNISON and UNITE in terms of reviewing the University policies for Discipline and Grievance, Avoidance of Redundancy and the Use of Fixed-Term Contracts. It was noted that there was still some work required on the Capability and Ill-Health procedures but both UNISON and
UNITE were engaging fully with the process. Unfortunately the same engagement had not been taking place with DUCU. On the back of the local dispute, more formal meetings had taken place with DUCU and good progress was now being made in relation to the Avoidance of Redundancy and the Fixed-Term Contract policies. However, there had been little progress with regard to the other policies. It was reported that DUCU and the full-time official had been asked to confirm whether they would enter into discussions in the belief that agreement could be reached or whether they had no intention of agreeing to the policies and the dissolution of Statute 16. No response had been received back as yet.

Facility Time had been discussed with each of the unions and it had been proposed that a consolidated period of time could be agreed to allow policy work to be carried out. UNITE and UNISON had entered into further discussions about what might be possible but it was noted that DUCU had not done so to date.

The issue of ensuring the University had a set of legally compliant policies in place was discussed at length. It was agreed that it was important to try and seek agreement from all the unions on the set of policies that would replace those in Statute 16, but it was recognised that the current situation could not continue indefinitely.

The Committee felt that it was reasonable to spend a further two months trying to reach agreement with the unions. If, however, there was no evidence of DUCU engaging in the process with the purpose of reaching an agreed position on Statute 16 and the policies, it was recommended that the suite of policies should be submitted for consideration to the April meeting of Court.

The University Secretary confirmed that for any change to Statute 16 to take place before the new Academic Year, a Special Resolution would need to be considered at the April and June meetings of Court. The Privy Council would then consider the matter in July.

The Committee was advised that Procedural Agreements were in place with each of the unions and if there was a disagreement over a change to a contractual term that could not be resolved, the union could request the involvement of ACAS to resolve the dispute.

It was noted that there had been no feedback or comments back objecting to the proposal to repeal Statute 17 and it was recognised that providing the opportunity of a member of staff to work until 30 September following their 65th birthday would in any event be superseded by the phasing out of the default retirement age in October 2011.

Resolved:

(i) to recommend that further discussions take place with the unions with the purpose of reaching agreement on the suite of HR policies and procedures to replace those in Statute 16.

(ii) to accept the offer of mediation from one member of the Committee in an attempt to reach a resolution.

(iii) in the event that no agreement is reached support the proposal that the policies will be escalated to the April meeting of Court for consideration as part of the reform of Statute 16.

(iv) request the Director of Human Resources notifies the UCU full-time official of the proposed course of action and timescales.

(v) request that Court approves the repeal of Statute 17.

(5) Strategic Framework: Aims 6 & 7 (Support Services and Sustainability)

The Director of Strategic Planning reported on progress with the objectives and performance indicators relating to Aims 6 and 7 of the Strategic Framework. It was noted that the report had been considered by the Senior Management Team and the Finance & Policy Committee and would be presented to the February session of Court. Attention was drawn to three particular measures, namely the cost of support services, developing more efficient support services and progress in embedding staff performance management. It was noted that the cost of support services as a proportion of total costs (PI 6.1.1) increased slightly; however the cost was still low.
compared with benchmark institutions. It was noted that the figures did include support staff based in Colleges and Schools and the increase was mainly in the area of academic support. It was confirmed that these costs would continue to be closely monitored. In relation to PI 6.1.2 (progress in developing efficient, effective support services) it was highlighted that the internal audit programme and various reviews of support services had provided an opportunity to consider further the effectiveness of support services and reduce costs; but there were also opportunities for enhancing staff and student feedback on the quality of the services they receive. It was noted that a number of initiatives were being taken forward as part of the Strategic Review implementation and it was anticipated that efficiencies would be gained through the greater use of common information systems, improved reporting software, more streamline business processes and standardisation of procedures.

The last performance indicator considered by the Committee related to progress embedding staff performance management (PI 7.3.1). It was noted that there was a slight dip in completion rates for senior staff this year, but this was attributed to the process coinciding with the rollout of the scheme to all other staff and ensuring that training requirements were met for both reviewers and reviewees over this period. The Director of HR was confident that following this transition year the review year 2010/11 would illustrate high percentage of objective and review meetings conducted across all relevant staff groups.

Comments were invited from the Committee relating to the development of future performance indicators and it was agreed that it would be useful to have indicators relating to effectiveness not just efficiencies and also to have some correlation between indicators such as cost and income generation.

There was some discussion relating to the internal communications indicator (PI 7.3.2) and the Committee recognised that significant improvements had been made in the area, particularly in support of the Strategic Review Process. It was however noted that overall there was still a lack of structure for internal communications but that the new Director of External Relations would be bringing forward proposals relating to this in the near future.

Resolved: to note the report from the Director of Strategic Planning.

(6) Concordat

The Committee received the report from the Concordat Group. The Committee commended the work of the group and felt that there had been good progress in ensuring that opportunities for early career and post doctoral researchers were enhanced and that staff from these groups did have the opportunity to be fully involved in College/University procedures and activities.

7. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

The Committee was pleased to note that the numbers undertaking the equality and diversity training modules was continuing to increase. The importance of having staff trained in equality and diversity matters was stressed and Heads of College, Deans, Directors and Senior Managers were asked to continue to promote this activity with their staff.

It was reported that the University was currently participating in a project led by the Higher Education Academy on equality and diversity in the curriculum and that a small working group had completed a self evaluation toolkit. The Committee considered that this was a very thorough document and although it was recognised that it was primarily aimed at the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate it was felt important to note any action points identified in relation to staff.

The Dignity at Work and Study Statistics for 2010 were considered and the Committee was pleased to note a downward trend in cases. It was recognised that it was difficult to attribute the downward trend to anything specific but it was felt that initiatives such as mediation and equality and diversity training would be contributory factors.

It was noted that the newly established LGBT Staff Network would be formally launched on 2 February 2011. The Committee welcomed the addition of this to the existing support network groups.

Resolved: that the Director of Human Resources would consider how any staff related action points from the self evaluation toolkit on equality and diversity in the Curriculum could be taken further.
8. **PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Reports from the Director of Management and Personal Development, the Assistant Director of Educational Development and the Acting Head of Generic Skills were received.

There was some discussion over the proposed merger of ‘Generic Skills Dundee’ and ‘Management and Personal Development’. It was acknowledged that Christine Milburn and Terry Vickers had done a significant amount of work to identify whether a unified programme of training could be established that would meet the Strategic aims of the University, improve efficiency and cost effectiveness in addition to meeting the needs of University staff and research students. All aspects of the programmes in both units had been carefully considered and they were confident that a single Staff Development Unit could be established which was clearly aligned with University aims and objectives.

The Committee was advised that the funding stream that supported the Roberts’ agenda for the development of transferable skills training for Research Post-graduates and Early Career Research Staff has now ceased. However it was noted that University was fully committed to continuing to support this agenda.

Resolved: to note that a review of Staff Development was taking place.

9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

A report from the Head of Safety Services and minutes from the Health and Safety Sub-committee were received. The Committee considered the accident statistics for 2010 and were pleased to note a downward trend. Statistics on work-related ill health were discussed and the number of staff with mental health issues noted. It was felt that initiatives such as the Healthy Working Lives Initiative were very positive and of benefit to staff. It was noted that the University’s H&S Policy had been re-launched and had been supported by a series of training sessions delivered to School/Support Service Safety Representatives.

Resolved: (i) to approve the revised Safety Policy arrangements.

(ii) to invite the Head of Safety Services to attend the next meeting of the Committee to present his report and to highlight Health and Safety priorities for the coming year.

10. **LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

(1) **University/ UNITE Local Joint Committee**

Approved minutes of the meeting held on the 14 January 2011 were received.

(2) **University/ UNISON Local Joint Committee**

Draft minutes of the meeting held on the 14 January 2011 were received.

(3) **University/ DUCU Local Joint Committee**

It was noted that minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2011 were still to be finalised and that they would be circulated to the next meeting of the Committee.

The Committee noted that the issue of the Public Holiday for the Royal Wedding had been discussed at each of the Local Joint Committees.

The Director of Human Resources reported that this matter had been discussed by SMT in December and a decision had been taken that the University would not be closed on that particular day, as that date lay within a period of student assessment, and that staff would not be granted an extra day’s leave. If staff wished to observe the wedding they would be able to request annual leave on that day and this would come out of their normal leave entitlement. Factors taken into account by SMT were: an additional days holiday would take the annual leave entitlement for academic and related staff to 8 weeks (40 days); the University does not recognise public holidays and there was no contractual obligation to give public holidays; the
current financial position of the University; the fact that DUCU were in dispute with the University.

It was noted that a number of other institutions including some HEIs were giving staff the public holiday. However it was recognised that the circumstances for each institution were different, with some being able to close on the day.

One member commented that the communication of the decision of SMT regarding the Public Holiday had been poor and suggested that there should have been a message released from the Centre. It was confirmed that the announcement had been cascaded out from SMT to the Deans, Directors, Heads of College and also to the Local Joint Committees.

Resolved: to note that a range of views were expressed regarding the Public Holiday for the Royal Wedding and to request that SMT review its decision in light of the various representations made regarding this matter.

11. ANNUAL REVIEW

Minutes from CASS (annex a) and CMDN (annex b) Annual Reviews were received.

Resolved: (i) to note the comments made by the CASS Annual Review Group regarding the importance of having clear criteria for promotion and

(ii) to note that a working group was currently working on the development of a set of criteria for promotion and probation, lead by Professor Calderhead.
ACADEMIC STAFF ANNUAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES

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

Present:
Professor Christopher Whatley, Vice-Principal and Head of College
Professor Yolande Muschamp, Dean, School of Education, Social Work and Community Education
Professor Alan Page, Dean, School of Law
Professor Nicholas Davey, Dean, School of Humanities
Professor Mark Bennett, Dean’s Representative, School of Psychology
Professor Rob Duck, Dean, School of Environmental & Social Sciences
Professor Christine Helliar, Dean, School of Accounting & Finance
Mr Ian Ball, Dean, Graduate School of Natural Resources Law, Policy & Management
Professor Peter Davies, External Representative, College of Science & Engineering

In attendance:
Ms Lesley Potter, College Secretary
Mrs Karen Gray, College HR Officer (Minute Secretary)
Ms Leonie Poor, College HR Officer

Professor Whatley welcomed the College Staff Annual Review Group (CSARG) and thanked Professor Peter Davies for attending as the external college representative.

Professor Whatley confirmed that the meeting would be fair and transparent as well as being rigorous in its identification of excellence. Professor Whatley also stated that it was important for probationary staff that identification of support was recognised/provided as early as possible from their recruitment and through their probation.

PROBATIONARY ANNUAL REPORTS (not in penultimate or final year)
Resolved:
(i) to note annual reports for 6 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)
(ii) to note annual reports for 4 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)
(iii) to note annual reports for 4 fixed-term Lecturers (Teaching & Research)
(iv) to note annual reports for 7 fixed-term Lecturers (Teaching & Scholarship)
(v) to note annual reports for 2 fixed-term Teaching Fellows

PENULTIMATE YEAR ANNUAL REPORTS
Resolved:
(i) to note annual report for 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research)
(ii) to issue a warning letter to 2 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)
(iii) to note annual reports for 5 permanent Teaching Fellows

EARLY CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT
Resolved: to approve early confirmation for 3 Teaching Fellows

CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT
Resolved:
(i) to approve the confirmation of appointment for 8 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research) subject to the completion of the LTA module
(ii) to approve the confirmation of appointment for 1 permanent Lecturer in (Teaching & Scholarship) rather than (Teaching & Research) subject to the completion of the LTA module
(iii) to extend the probationary period for one year for 2 permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)
(iv) to note no decision made pending further information regarding 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research)
(v) to approve the confirmation of appointment for 1 permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship) subject to the completion of the LTA module
(vi) to approve the confirmation of appointment for 1 Academic Fellow subject to the completion of the LTA module
(vii) to approve the confirmation of appointment for 1 permanent Teaching Fellow/ Associate Tutor subject to the completion of the LTA module
(viii) to approved the confirmation of appointment for 1 permanent Teaching Fellow subject to the completion of the LTA module

REGRADING TO GRADE 7

Resolved: to approve the regarding of 1 member of staff to Lecturer (Teaching & Scholarship) Grade 7

PROMOTION TO GRADE 8

Resolved: to decline promotion to Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 8 to 1 existing permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research)

PROMOTION TO GRADE 9, SENIOR LECTURER

Resolved:
(i) to approve promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 9 to 2 existing permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)
(ii) to decline promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 9 to 4 existing permanent Lecturers (Teaching & Research)
(iii) to decline promotion to Senior Lecturer (Teaching & Research) Grade 9 to 1 existing permanent Lecturer (Teaching & Research) who submitted a self-nomination

Other Points

1. As raised at last year’s meeting, it was agreed that work needed to be done on the criteria for scholarship at the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer levels in Teaching & Scholarship. It was agreed that it would be necessary to define scholarship, what contribution was expected of staff on Teaching & Scholarship contracts, and progression criteria for each category of staff. It was recognised that although there were HERA Role Profiles for these staff, further criteria was required. It was noted that there was a group currently discussing this matter which was led by James Calderhead. Further guidance was required.

2. It was suggested that we should have a Teaching Fellow category. Schools (especially ESWCE) required staff to engage in heavy teaching loads; therefore not much time could be allocated for other activities. There was also a suggestion that it be recognised that there may be differences between schools for Teaching & Scholarship.

3. It was agreed that staff on Teaching and Scholarship contracts need to demonstrate to the Committee (via their CV), that they were engaging in scholarly activity. There was a need to show that we had the highest quality teachers. Deans and Mentors should encourage probationers to demonstrate this activity.

4. It was noted that a stronger message should be given to probationary staff in their first year of appointment if they were not meeting expectations rather than wait until later in their probationary period. It was suggested that if they were unsatisfactory in their first year, that they should repeat the first year again (unless extenuating circumstances). This is not part of the current probationary procedures.

5. It was recognised that ESWCE were at a different stage of development for research compared with other Schools. Further guidance/ information required to better inform the committee of criteria for the roles within the School.

6. Clear criteria of the differences for advancement from Grade 7 to Grade 8 was required.

7. LTA module information was being held in a different way from previous years. Due to data protection rules, HR would request a copy of the certificate in order to confirm completion of this module. All confirmation of appointments for this year would be subject to completion of this module. For next year, a process should be in place to manage this information.

8. At next year’s annual review meeting, the meeting will start with a review of the progress reports which the Dean’s have to provide for particular members of staff.
ACADEMIC STAFF ANNUAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, DENTISTRY & NURSING

A meeting of the Committee was held on 27 September 2010.

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

ANNUAL REPORTS

Resolved: (i) to note annual reports for 3 permanent Lecturers.
          (ii) to note annual report for 1 permanent Senior Lecturer.
          (iii) to note annual reports for 13 fixed-term lecturers.
          (iv) to note annual reports for 1 fixed-term Teaching Fellow.

ELIGIBLE FOR CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT AT 1 OCTOBER 2011

Resolved: to note the penultimate annual report for 10 permanent Lecturers.

CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENTS 2010

Resolved: (i) to approve confirmation of appointment for 4 permanent Lecturers.
          (ii) not to confirm 1 permanent Lecturer.

PROMOTION FROM GRADE 7 TO GRADE 8

Resolved: to decline to promote 1 Lecturer who had self-nominated.

PROMOTION FROM GRADE 8 TO GRADE 9

Resolved: (i) to decline to promote 1 Lecturer who had self-nominated.
          (ii) to approve promotion to Senior Lecturer of 1 existing Lecturer.
APPENDIX 4

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS
(Minute 40)

1. SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT

In his introduction to the paper, the Convener noted that the immediate effect of the draft budget would be a reduction in our current projections of around £7M and, in consequence, that the University’s budget setting process for 2011/12 would be extremely difficult. He also reported that, while the Green Paper – ‘Building a Smarter Future’ – was somewhat disappointing, there was a feeling that the debates between the universities and politicians had been generally productive and that a Scottish solution to the funding crisis might be in place as early as 2012/13.

On the dispute with DUCU, the Secretary reported that there had been a number of recent meetings focusing on avoidance of redundancy and fixed-term contract policies which had made good progress towards resolution of the issues and that those talks were continuing.

The Senatus decided: to note the Senior Management Team’s report.

2. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received a communication from the meetings of the University Court held on 25 October and 13 December 2010 as well as a paper entitled ‘Strategic Options: Footprint Review’ prepared by the SMT in December 2010.

The Vice-Principal reported that the ‘Strategic Options’ paper had arisen from discussions at the Court away-day and as a follow on from the Strategic Review given the financial context which might require the University to make larger savings, and do so earlier, than envisaged in the Review. It was a discussion paper presenting emerging themes and principles which might be appropriate to use when attempting to deal with straitened financial circumstances by making rational and rigorous decisions about the future shape of the University.

In discussion of the paper the following points were made. On the reference in paragraph 31 to ‘a more top-down approach’, it was stressed that this was more about raising difficult issues for discussion rather than imposing decisions from the top. It was often difficult to discuss ceasing activities at, for example, the School level because, quite naturally, that might be alarming, encounter conflicts of interest and perceived as a hostage to fortune. However, a variety of options have to be considered and the process envisaged was one of raising such options for general consideration across the University.

On paragraph 17, while members from CASS were pleased to see the addition of the fourth ‘theme’, it was felt that the definitions of the themes in general required to be refined. In response, the Convener noted that it was part of Senate’s role to contribute to the shape of the themes as they were developed and discussed, although Senate went on to offer little comment in that regard.

On paragraph 26, it was reported that there was little definite information on the Scottish Government’s agenda but that attention might focus on the very significant proportion of HE provision in the FE sector. Additionally the SPC had raised informally the issue of how to deal with individual institutions cutting provision from a national perspective given its duty to ensure coherence of provision.

On paragraph 22, a member asked who was undertaking the review of the University’s portfolio of academic modules and programmes. It was reported that staff from Student Operations were gathering data to enable Schools and Colleges to analyse and review their offerings.

The Senatus decided: to note the paper and to invite the SMT to present updates on its elaboration to future meetings of the Senatus.

3. APPOINTMENT OF AN HONORARY PROFESSORSHIP ON A PERMANENT BASIS

The Senatus was reminded that the normal term of office for an Honorary Professor was three years in the first instance with the possibility of periodic renewals thereafter; an appointment on a permanent basis would therefore be exceptional.
The Senatus decided: subject to the concurrence of the Court, to appoint Dr Frederik Paulsen to an Honorary Professorship on a permanent basis recognizing that he was an exceptional candidate for whom such an appointment was appropriate.

4. CHANGE TO ORDINANCE 40 – STUDENT DISCIPLINE

The Senatus decided: to endorse to the Court the undernoted amendments to Ordinance 40:

(i) Change ‘Director of Student Services’ to ‘Director of Student Operations’.

(ii) Paragraph 2(2)

‘Director of Student Operations or nominees (in respect of misconduct in University Residences)’

(iii) As a result of an observation from the SPSO, to delete the word ‘Generally’ from paragraph 5(1). The new paragraph will now read:

‘5(1) Where, apart from section 4 above, any student denies the misconduct alleged, a Hearing should be held by the Authorised Officer to consider and to determine the matter. The Authorised Officer should decide, in the light of the seriousness of the alleged misconduct and all the circumstances, whether the Hearing should be formal or informal. The disciplinary allegations must be communicated in advance to the student(s), who has/ have the right to attend the Hearing and be heard by the decision-makers, to present evidence, to make representations and to present a defence countering the disciplinary case against the student(s).’

FOR INFORMATION

5. DRAFT JUNE GRADUATION TIMETABLE

The Senatus decided: to note the following draft graduation timetable from the Director of Registry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Time</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am, Wednesday 22 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm, Wednesday 22 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am, Thursday 23 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm, Thursday 23 June</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DoJ College of Art &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering, Physics &amp; Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am, Friday 24 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Education, Social Work &amp; Community Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm, Friday 24 June</td>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. DUSA ELECTIONS 2011

The Senatus decided: to note the following dates for DUSA elections:

Monday 31 January - nominations open
Friday 18 February – nominations close at 12 midday

Wednesday 9, Thursday 10 and Friday 11 March – voting days (polls close at 5pm on Friday).

See: http://www.dusa.co.uk for more information.