UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE

UNIVERSITY COURT

A meeting of the Court was held on Monday 24 October 2011.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (in the Chair), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr D Cathcart, Mr J Elliot, Mr M Kendrick, Dr LI McLellan, Dr H Marriage, Dr AD Reeves, Dr AM Roger, Professor J Taylor, Mr IDM Wright

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Information Services, Director of Human Resources, Director of Strategic Planning, Director of Research & Innovation Services (Item 11), Director of External Relations and Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs

Apologies: Mr M Arnott, Mr R Burns, Mr IA Kennedy (President, Students’ Association), Lord Provost Dr J Letford, Dr J Lowe, Professor GJ Mires, Ms CA Potter, Mr KA Richmond, Mr KAC Swinley, Acting Director of Finance

2. MINUTES

Resolved: (i) to approve the minutes of the meeting on 13 June 2011;

(ii) to approve the minutes of the business meeting held as part of the Court Retreat on 2 September 2011, subject to minor amendment; and

(iii) to approve the minutes of the special meeting on 3 October 2011.

3. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Senior Appointments (Minute 77)

(a) Director of Finance

The Principal reported that it was anticipated that the University’s newly appointed Director of Finance, Mr Andrew Hewett, would begin work on 5 December 2012.

(b) Vice-Principal & Head of the College of Art, Science & Engineering

The Principal noted that interviews for this post were to take place on 25 October 2011.
The Principal reported on discussions he had had with colleagues in the constituent Schools of the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing in relation to the appointment of a new Vice-Principal & Head of College to succeed Professor IM Leigh, whose decision to step down from the role had been intimated to the Court at its meeting on 2 September 2011. As a result of these discussions, the Principal was recommending to Court that it approve a sole candidate interview for the appointment.

Resolved: to approve the proposal that there be a sole candidate interview for the post of Vice-Principal & Head of the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing; and further to approve that, subject to his agreement, Mr Andrew Richmond be the Court’s representative on the interview panel.

[NB Mr Richmond has now given his agreement.]

(d) Deputy Principals

Court members discussed the appointment of Deputy Principals, noting that unlike Vice-Principals, which were Court appointments, the appointment of Deputy Principals was a power delegated to the Principal. The Principal confirmed that the recent appointment of a Deputy Principal (Learning & Teaching) was an interim measure, explaining that, in his view, responsibility for learning and teaching should ideally be allied to a Vice-Principal appointment.

(2) Governance Instruments (Minute 78)

The Court received a paper from the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs explaining that, in light of the Scottish Government’s ongoing review of higher education governance, the Privy Council had delayed consideration of the changes to the Charter and Statutes (submitted by the University in July 2011), pending the outcome of that review. Nevertheless, the University had been invited by the Privy Council to resubmit for consideration in advance of the review any of those proposed changes which the University felt did not fall within the remit of the Scottish Government’s review. The paper set out for Court members those changes which it was felt could be resubmitted in this way.

The Court decided: to approve for submission those changes to Charter and Statutes as presented.

4. CHAIRMAN’S BUSINESS

The Chairman reported that he had attended the Welcome Ceremony for new students in September. This had been an uplifting experience, and it had been good to see other members of the Court in attendance. The Chairman had also recently
attended the opening ceremony of Dundee College’s new campus at Gardyne Road, at which the First Minister gave a speech.

Since the last meeting of Court, the Chairman had also attended both UK and Scottish meetings of the Committee of University Chairs (CUC). The UK Minister for Universities and Science, David Willetts, spoke at the UK CUC meeting on the future of the UK higher education sector, and in particular on student fees and likely demand for higher education. The Scottish meeting had included discussion of the recent request from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) that the Universities of Dundee and Abertay meet with the SFC to consider merger.

5. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

The Court received a report from the Principal (Appendix 1). In presenting the report, he highlighted the positive press coverage of the University’s announcement of the development of new three-year degrees in response to the introduction of fees for students from the rest of the UK. The University was now, he said, finalising arrangements for a package of bursaries to support financially students from the rest of UK.

He drew members’ attention to the University’s shortlisting in the Times Higher Education (THE) University of the Year award, the winner of which would be announced at a dinner in London later in November, and he also highlighted the University’s continued appearance within the top 200 of world universities in both the THE list and the QS rankings (Quacquarelli Symonds).

The Principal encouraged Court members to attend both the winter graduation ceremonies on 16 November 2011 and the Discovery Day presentations on 12 and 13 January 2012.

The Court decided:

(i) to congratulate Professor Abboud on his election as an Honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of England;

(ii) to extend its best wishes to Mr Peter Evans, former Clerk to Court, on his retirement from the University after more than 30 years’ service; and

(iii) to ask that officers prepare a paper for the next meeting of Court on the University’s performance in league tables.

6. DISCUSSIONS WITH THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL

The Principal provided the Court with an oral report of his meeting with the Chief Executive of the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), which had been convened in response to the letter from the SFC inviting the Universities of Dundee and Abertay to consider merger. Local reaction to the letter had been strong, and, in light of recent ministerial statements on the issue of University mergers, it was now clear that the insistent tone of the original communication had softened to one in which the two
universities would be asked for their views on the setting up of a review of higher education provision in the region. The SFC would be arranging a joint meeting with both universities to consider the terms of reference for such a review.

**The Court decided:** to await further updates from the Principal in due course.

7. **FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE**

The Court received a report of the meetings of the Committee on 22 August 2011 (Appendix 2) and 3 October 2011 (Appendix 3). The Chairman of Court drew members’ attention to the agreement by the Committee of the issuance of a letter of comfort to Dundee University Press Ltd (DUP), confirming the University’s continued support, and therefore allowing DUP’s accounts to be signed off.

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

8. **SPENDING REVIEW AND DRAFT SCOTTISH BUDGET**

The Court received a paper from the Acting Director of Finance. In presenting the paper, the University Secretary highlighted the comparably very favourable settlement for the higher education sector in contrast to the further education sector. Universities could expect a cash increase of around 15%, whereas Colleges would see a cash reduction of over 13%. In capital terms, however, the combined higher and further education sector would see a reduction to £60.7m in 2012-13 from £91m in 2011-12. Of course, it was not yet clear how these top-line figures would translate into institutional allocations by the SFC, and there were continuing concerns about reductions in funded student numbers in controlled subjects (medicine, dentistry, nursing and teaching), with a cut of 16% recently announced for medical students.

The Secretary also set out some of the main issues arising from the Cabinet Secretary for Education & Lifelong Learning’s letter of guidance to the SFC, which set out the Scottish Government’s priorities for 2012-13. This letter emphasised the Government’s commitment to a ‘coherent spread of provision’ and a desire to ‘reduce duplication’, whilst at the same time requesting that SFC ‘create a more differentiated set of funding allocations in order to reflect the diversity of the sector’.

In discussion, members acknowledged the positive outcome of the budget settlement for higher education, but recognised that in order to be able to deliver capital investment, the University would need to create a sufficient surplus, since there would be very little Government capital funding.

9. **PUTTING LEARNERS AT THE CENTRE: DELIVERING OUR AMBITIONS FOR POST-16 EDUCATION** (Pre-Legislative Paper of the Scottish Government)

The Court received an invitation to contribute to the University’s draft response to the Scottish Government’s pre-legislative paper. It was noted that Universities Scotland would be likely to submit a comprehensive response on behalf of the sector, and that therefore the University need only restrict its response to those areas of critical importance to it.
The Court decided: to ask members to forward any comments on the paper to the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, Dr NJ Laker.

10. AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Court considered a report of the meeting of the Committee on 4 October 2011 (Appendix 4). The Committee had recommended that Court approve a revised institutional risk register (Appendix 5), which had been developed as a result of input from the internal auditors as well as from comments from Court members themselves at the Court Retreat on 2 September 2011. It was suggested that Court should receive more regular updates on individual risk management issues throughout the year, and in particular on risks such as health and safety, which did not figure among the priority strategic risks in the register.

The Court decided:

(i) to approve the risk register;

(ii) to ask officers to consider how best to present risk management issues regularly to Court; and

(iii) otherwise, to approve the report.

11. STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK – AIMS 4 AND 5: RESEARCH, COLLABORATION & KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER

The Director of Strategic Planning, along with the Director of Research & Innovation Services (RIS), presented a report which provided an update on progress towards meeting the requirements of the Strategic Framework with regard to research, collaboration and knowledge transfer. The Director of RIS highlighted the impact of the economic downturn on the available funding for research and that this would have an effect on the University’s ability to meet research overhead recovery targets in the current year and into the foreseeable future. As a result RIS was turning to European funding initiatives as an alternative and supplementary source of funding. She emphasised the importance to the University of large contracts with industrial partners and cited the success of existing collaborations with pharmaceutical companies.

In discussion, Court members raised concern at the relatively low numbers of research students, noting that the University’s Research Committee had recognised this as a serious issue and was considering how best it could be addressed.

The Court also sought views from the Director on the proposals from the Scottish Government to establish a central Knowledge Exchange Office for Scotland. Important factors for this issue were the time and energy required to build and maintain relationships with potential partners, something which would be difficult for a central office to do effectively. There was also a good degree of scepticism about the degree to which access to intellectual property could be pooled. The major danger was that a central office would not relieve entirely the need for universities’ own teams and this could lead not only to wasted effort and confusion but also to a situation where intellectual property was not exploited to best effect.
The Court decided: (i) to ask that officers prepare a paper for Court on the University’s internationalisation strategy and activity; and (ii) otherwise, to note the paper.

12. NINEWELLS CANCER CAMPAIGN (NCC) AND THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

The Court considered a paper from the Dean of Medicine, which proposed the renaming of the Translational Medicine Research Collaboration (TMRC) laboratories in honour of Jacqui Wood, former Chair of the Ninewells Cancer Campaign Chair, who had died earlier in the year. Since the ending of TMRC, it had been agreed that the School of Medicine would begin to relocate some of its research activity into the TMRC laboratories, and it had been proposed that the majority of the School’s lab-based cancer research would be housed there. It was therefore fitting that the building be named for Mrs Wood. Additionally, the NCC steering committee wished to establish a fundraising campaign in Mrs Wood’s memory. Court was greatly supportive of both proposals.

The Court decided: (i) to approve the renaming of the TMRC laboratory building in honour of Mrs Jacqui Wood; and (ii) to approve also the establishment of a fundraising campaign in Mrs Wood’s honour with a target to raise £2m to assist in the refurbishment of the laboratories.

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

The Court received the University’s annual statement to the SFC detailing the subject reviews that had been carried out over the past year. The report had been submitted to the SFC by its deadline of 30 September 2011.

The Court decided: to endorse the report.

14. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

The Court received a report of a special meeting of the Senate on 21 September 2011 (Appendix 6) and of a routine Senate meeting on 12 October 2011 (Appendix 7). The Court noted that the special meeting had been convened to allow the Senate to comment on the proposed approach to the introduction of fees for students from the rest of the UK.

The Court decided: (i) to approve the recommendations concerning conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus; and (ii) otherwise, to note the report.
15. **HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

The Court received a report of a meeting of the Committee on 13 September 2011 (Appendix 8).

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

16. **STAFF**

(1) **Professorial and Other Grade 10 Appointments**

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

Rod Jones  
Personal Chair of Civil Engineering  
1 June 2011

Pieter Bekker  
Chair in International Law  
28 September 2011

(2) **Statute 16 – Grievance Procedures**

**The Court decided:** to approve the composition of a Committee, as set out below, to hear a grievance from an unnamed member of staff, noting that no member of the Committee was a member of staff from the same College as the member of staff bringing the grievance.

Professor MC Smith (Convener)  
Ms CA Potter (Court Member)  
Professor MR Jones (Senate Nominee).

(3) **Secretary to the Colleges of Life Sciences and Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing**

In response to a question relating to the appointment of Mr Ian Leith as Secretary to both the Colleges of Life Sciences and Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing, the University Secretary reassured the Court that he was satisfied that such an appointment was both sustainable and agreeable to both Colleges, adding that Mr Leith’s role in the College of Life Sciences was being supported by an Assistant College Secretary.

17. **COURT RETREAT 2012 – CHANGE OF DATE**

**The Court decided:** to note that the original date for the 2012 Court Retreat (31 August 2012) was no longer convenient, and that members would be canvassed for a suitable alternative in due course.

18. **UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE SUPERANNUATION SCHEME (UoDSS)– LETTER FROM UNISON**

The Court acknowledged a letter received from the University of Dundee branch of Unison, one of the campus unions, in relation to alleged unfairness in the way
changes to the UoDSS had been proposed and agreed. In response, the Director of Human Resources set out the process that had been followed throughout the negotiations on potential changes to the scheme. The implication in the letter was that University officers, and therefore members of the rival national Universities Superannuation Scheme, were making decisions on the separate UoDSS and that their decision-making was thereby compromised. Court noted, however, that it had itself set up a Pensions Sub-Committee, comprising three lay members, which had sought advice from external consultants and had overseen and agreed proposals to be brought to the Trustees. Further, it was noted that the Trustees of the scheme had negotiated a position whereby all of the savings to the University arising from the changes were going into paying off the deficit in the Scheme. Thus the changes were financing an improvement in the scheme’s overall funding and not, as asserted, cross-subsidising USS members. The Court accepted that there were differences between UoDSS and USS, but that these had arisen from well-informed decisions and with full and open consultation with scheme members and Trustees.

The Court decided: to ask officers to draft a response to Unison, to be reviewed by the lay members of the Pensions Sub-Committee.

19. BRUCE JOHNSTON BEQUEST

The Principal announced to Court the nature of Dr Johnston’s bequest to the University. It was anticipated that this would be in the region of £1m, although detailed discussions with the executors of Dr Johnston’s estate had still to take place. The terms of the bequest were that it should be used to initiate an endowment fund to provide scholarships and one-off grants to undergraduate and access students to enable them to embark upon or continue their studies at the University.

The Court decided: (i) to formally record its posthumous thanks to Dr Johnston for the scale of his generosity, acknowledging the great affection that he had displayed in life for the University; and

(ii) to ask officers to consider how Dr Johnston’s contribution to the University might be honoured by a more permanent tribute.
APPENDIX 1

PRINCIPAL’S REPORT
(Minute 5)

There are three matters in particular that I want to discuss with Court, and each has its own spot on the agenda: my discussion with the Scottish Funding Council about collaboration in Dundee; the publication of the Scottish Government’s spending review and draft budget; and the publication of the ‘pre-legislative’ paper: Putting Learners at the Centre. We shall have plenty of time later in the meeting to discuss each of these fully, so I shall rein in my comments in my routine report here, and discuss other issues briefly.

RUK Fees

The University made its formal announcement on its RUK fees position on 26 September 2011; and as I mentioned at the special meeting on 3 October 2011, the reaction to the proposals to develop a suite of three-year degree options has been gratifyingly positive, with some commentators praising the decision as innovative and bold. Of course, it remains to be seen what effects these proposals will have on our ability to recruit RUK students to Dundee, but the proposals have a wider appeal than to just that constituency, and it is to be hoped that they will begin a new debate in Scotland about articulation routes and the coherence of the learner journey, particularly if Scottish students also opt for the three-year route. Work is well under way to design, develop and package these new programme options, and alongside this the Director of Student Operations is busy drawing up an attractive bursaries package to support RUK students facing the new fees.

Graduation and Discovery Days

16 November 2011 sees our second winter graduation; and again there will be two ceremonies providing occasions to celebrate the achievements of our students. As always I would encourage as many of you who can attend to do so.

This session’s Discovery Days, where we celebrate the achievements of our staff, take place on the afternoon of Thursday 12 January and all day on Friday 13 January 2012. The new professors appointed during 2011 will provide a glimpse into the academic work that makes them tick, and our award-winning teachers will have the chance to demonstrate their teaching excellence. You will of course receive further information in due course, but I would ask you to make sure the dates are in your diary.

Peter Evans

Some of the longer serving members of Court will remember Peter Evans, who was Clerk to Court for ten years before taking up the post of Secretary to the College of Medicine, Dentistry & Nursing in 2006. After more than thirty years’ service to the University, Peter is retiring from the University at the end of October. I am sure all members would wish to join me in wishing him well in his retirement and in thanking him for his tireless and dedicated service for the University.

Professor Pete Downes
Principal & Vice Chancellor
Senior Management Team Meetings (SMT)

The SMT formally met on 1 June and 5 July 2011. Minutes of each of these meetings are available online via the intranet.
Visit: http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/court/com/smt/welcome.htm

In addition the Senior Management Team met for briefing meetings on the following dates: 8, 15 and 28 June, 13 and 27 July, and 3, 10 and 17 August 2011. A note of any resulting actions from these briefings is appended to the minute of the preceding formal SMT meeting.

From 24 August 2011 onwards, the Senior Management Team has been meeting on a weekly basis and has decided to make monthly formal reports for publication on the intranet. The September report (which will comprise also business from the last two meetings in August) will be approved at the Team meeting on 19 October 2011, and will thereafter be available on the web as above.

Since the last report to the Court, the Senior Management Team considered a number of issues, including the following:

- The development of a new University Strategy
- Strategic Review Follow-up and the development of academic themes
- Rest of UK Fees
- The Review of Higher Education Governance
- Preparations for the Research Excellence Framework
- Strategic Framework: performance against benchmarks
- Arrangements for the Court Retreat
- Student Recruitment: 2011 Entry
- Review of nursing & midwifery education in Scotland
- A report on the performance of the Centre for Environmental Change & Human Resilience (CECHR)
- A review of biomedical teaching
- Organisational change proposals relating to the Institute of Medical Science & Technology, the Dental Health Services Research Unit, the UNESCO Centre for Water Law, Policy & Management
- Approval for the establishment of a new University prize for public engagement
- Student and Staff Email Project
- Dundee University Press Ltd
- The use of the Bonar Hall
- Employability
- Admissions and recruitment issues, including changes to UKBA requirements
- The adoption of a University Gifts & Hospitality Policy
- Human Resources issues
  - National pay negotiations
  - HERA maintenance round
  - Pensions
  - Holiday entitlement in recognition of the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee
  - Academic Staff Annual Review and contribution-related points
  - Compliance in the implementation of Objective-setting and Review (OSAR)
- Routine Matters:
  - Research grants and contracts
  - Monthly Management Accounts;
  - Consideration of proposals for the award of Honorary Professorships for endorsement by the Senate;
  - Consideration of applications for Voluntary Severance;
  - Staff recruitment cases.
Annex B

Major Grants and Awards

- **£2.8m from the Wellcome Trust to Professor Jason Swedlow** for the Open Microscopy Environment: Image Informatics for Biological Sciences (Joint with Imperial, Oxford, Louis Pasteur, Carnegie-Mellon, Wisconsin, Harvard and Edinburgh)
- **£1.5m from the Wellcome Trust to Professor Alan Fairlamb** for Target Assessment for Drug Discovery against the Kinetoplastida
- **£1.4m from the European Framework 7 Programme to Professor Sir Alfred Cuschieri** for Colonic Disease Investigation by Robotic Hydro-colonoscopy (joint with Leeds)
- **£0.8m from Cancer Research UK to Professor Ron Hay** for the Promyelocytic Leukemia Protein as a Target in Cancer Therapy
- **£0.8m from Cancer Research UK to Professor Irene Leigh** for Non-Melanoma Skin Cancer from the Laboratory to the Clinic

Annex C

People & Prizes

- The University of Dundee has been shortlisted as University of the Year in the prestigious Times Higher Education Awards 2011;
- Two World Rankings:
  - The University of Dundee has been ranked in the top 200 of universities worldwide in the QS (Quacquarelli Symonds) World University Rankings, which placed Dundee at 199 in the table, up from 201 last year. In a previous announcement, the University of Dundee was named by QS as one of the top 100 universities in the world for Medicine and Biological Sciences, ranking the subject at the University at 58th;
  - And in the THE world rankings, Dundee likewise placed within the world’s top 200 universities at 176 overall; in these rankings Dundee placed at 140 in 2010;
- The University of Dundee has once again been voted the UK’s ‘Best Place to Work in Academia’, and one of the world’s best, in the annual worldwide survey compiled by The Scientist magazine;
- The inaugural Sir James Black Awards for Outstanding Achievement were won by: Michail Vanis (CASE), Ashley Bell (CASS), Katarzyna Kozyrska (CLS) and Gregory Ekatah (CMDN);
- The Wimberley Award for 2011 was won by Euan McTurk for his student representation work;
- Filipa Oliveira of DJCAD was named as the 2011 winner of the New Designers Goldsmiths’ Company Jewellery Award;
- Amy Capes, a PhD student in the Division of Biological Chemistry and Drug Discovery, has won the Medical Research Council’s 2011 Max Perutz Science Writing Award for her article ‘Putting Sleeping Sickness on the Radar’;
- Alan Robb, Emeritus Professor of Fine Art and former Head of the School of Fine Art at Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design, has been elected a member of the Royal Scottish Academy;
- Professor Dario Alessi has been appointed Director of the MRC’s Protein Phosphorylation Unit, to succeed Professor Sir Philip Cohen who steps down in April 2012;
- Professor Rami Abboud (CMDN) has been elected an Honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of England;
- Professor Tracy Palmer (CLS) has been appointed a Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit Award holder;
- Dr Victoria Cowling (CLS) has been awarded one of three Lister Research Prizes for 2011;
- Kengo Kuma’s design for the V&A at Dundee building has received a prestigious award from leading architecture journal World Architecture News, which named the project as best 'Unbuilt' project in its 2011 Awards Civic Buildings sector.
APPENDIX 2

FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE

(Minute 7)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 22 August 2011.

Present: Mr R Burns (Convener), Mr IA Kennedy (President, Students’ Association), Dr J Lowe, Dr AD Reeves, Mr KA Richmond, Mr EF Sanderson, Mr IDM Wright

In Attendance: Dr H Marriage, University Secretary, Acting Director of Finance, Directors of Strategic Planning, Estates & Buildings, and Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs

Apologies: Principal Professor CP Downes

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 16 May 2011.

2. MATTERS ARISING

Pension Schemes (Minute 2(1))

The Acting Director of Finance reported the implementation dates for the recent agreed changes to the two pension schemes affecting staff at the University. Changes to the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) would come into effect on 1 October 2011, and those affecting the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (UoDSS) had come into effect on 1 August 2011.

3. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 12 (INTERIM)

The Acting Director of Finance tabled provisional, interim accounts for 2010-11. The accounts had been produced earlier than in previous years and had also not yet been subject to audit; the Committee therefore noted that it was likely the figures would change as the overall picture became clearer. At the time of the meeting, the accounts indicated an operating surplus of £6.2m, representing 2.7% of turnover. After provisions for voluntary severance and gains from disposals the bottom-line figure showed a surplus of £3.3m, which was slightly ahead of budget. Overall tuition fee income was lower than had been budgeted, but this had been offset by careful management of the staff budgets in the areas affected. The research overhead recovery target had been met. On capital expenditure, there had been some slippage in current projects, with a lower than budgeted expenditure of £11.6m. Net funds had increased by £12m over the year, with the expected negative working capital movements, predominantly in research funding, not materialising in the timeframe that had been expected.

Resolved: to note the current position and await the audited accounts in due course.

4. YEAR-END TIMETABLE

The Acting Director of Finance provided the Committee with an outline of the intended timetable for carrying out the audit of the accounts for the year ended 31 July 2011. It was expected that the external auditors, PricewaterhouseCoopers would be on site from late September 2011. Draft accounts would be presented to the Committee meeting on 21 November 2011, and thereafter to the Audit Committee on 28 November 2011, and to Court on 12 December 2011 for final approval and sign-off.

5. TUITION FEES

(1) Rest of UK Fees: 2012-13

The Committee considered a paper setting out the progress made to date on setting fees for students from the rest of the UK (RUK). The Scottish Government had introduced proposals, yet to be passed by the Scottish Parliament, which would allow universities in Scotland to charge full fees to students from elsewhere in the UK. Total funded places would as a result be reduced, and funding would be redistributed to institutions. The Scottish Funding Council had also announced changes to the teaching funding price groups, which had been proposed two years ago but not implemented.
The paper set out the current thinking of the Senior Management Team on the level of fees to be charged and the strategy to be adopted in implementing the fees. It also provided members with statistical information on current RUK student intakes, entry requirements and entry tariffs. Committee members were reminded of their obligations under Competition Law not to discuss the fee-setting strategy outside the University.

Members provided helpful comments and suggestions on the shape the proposals were taking, and officers agreed to develop thinking in preparation for the Court Retreat, which would take place on 2 September 2011.

Resolved: to await with interest the presentation of more detailed information at the Court Retreat.

(2) UK Borders Agency (UKBA) and Overseas Fees

The Committee received a paper from the University Secretary, which provided an update on developments at the UKBA. It was noted that the requirements imposed on sponsors by the UKBA presented a risk to the University’s ability to recruit overseas taught postgraduate students from some of our key markets. The University’s focus was on mechanisms to ensure sponsored students came to the University. It had therefore been agreed that the required deposit would be raised to 50% of the total tuition fee. The Director of Student Operations along with other senior officers would monitor the situation closely, but the possible risks to the University’s capacity to meet its target international student numbers was noted.

Resolved: to await further updates in due course.

6. RESEARCH INCOME TRENDS

The Committee considered a paper which provided statistical information on the success of applications for research grants and contracts from a series of different types of research funding organisation. The Committee noted that research funding bodies had less funds with which to make awards, and as a result, the decision making process for funding applications had become slower, thus creating some uncertainty. Against this background the paper set out the total awards won during 2010-11. Since research grants were profiled over a number of years, the effects of fewer successful awards would be felt over the medium term. The Committee noted that effort was being put in to ensuring academics across the institution were aware of the range of funding sources available, particularly those of the European Union.

The Committee congratulated the University on the recent prestigious award of the leadership of one of four grants for knowledge exchange hubs for the creative economy from the Arts & Humanities Research Council.

7. DUNDEE UNIVERSITY PRESS (DUP) LTD

The Committee received a business plan from DUP Ltd, which set out its current position and its priorities and opportunities over the medium term. The development of the plan had followed an in-depth review of the press’s strategy. The Committee noted that the plan had been considered by the Senior Management Team earlier in August, and the Team had been keen to stress the intangible benefits for the University in having its own academic press.

The Committee heard from the Acting Director of Finance that the financial performance of DUP Ltd was likely to be disappointing for the period to 31 July 2011 and that the University was extending credit to the press in the short term. The plan highlighted where opportunities for increased income might be made and in particular emphasised a possible imminent contract which would help to reverse the current financial position if successful.

Resolved: (i) to approve the issuing of a letter of comfort to DUP Ltd, confirming the University’s continued support for 12 months from the date the accounts are signed; and

(ii) to await an update at the Committee’s next meeting on 3 October 2011.
8. WEST PARK CONFERENCE CENTRE (WPCC) LTD

The Committee considered a brief update paper on developments at WPCC Ltd. The Committee learnt that WPCC’s trading position continued to be challenging with, in particular, a disappointing result for the summer period. The working group set up by Dundee Student Villages Ltd (DSV) to examine the current business plan and fee structure had met on a number of occasions in recent months. Proposals for a revised fee structure would be presented to the DSV board meeting in September, and it was hoped that these revisions would create a properly incentivised structure to drive better performance on the part of WPCC.

The Committee noted its concerns at the continuing relatively poor performance of WPCC, but acknowledged that the new proposals, as set out in the paper, provided a sensible approach to the current difficulties. Members emphasised the need for WPCC to concentrate on improving its marketing activity, and importantly to publicise the availability of WPCC across the University.

Resolved: to note the position in relation to WPCC and to await the annual DSV report at the meeting on 3 October 2011.

9. GIFTS & HOSPITALITY POLICY

The Committee received from the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs a draft policy for consideration and recommendation to Court and made some helpful comments. It was noted that the draft policy, whilst somewhat harsh in a private sector context, was entirely appropriate for a public sector body and in tune with models in operation elsewhere.

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

10. CAR PARKING CHARGES

The Committee received a note setting out changes to fees and to the method of payment for pay & display permits, such that charges would be paid by mobile phone or over the internet rather than by coin-operated ticket machines and explaining the introduction of a salary sacrifice scheme for the payment of annual permits.

Resolved: to note the changes.

11. ESTATES & BUILDINGS REPORT

The Director of Campus Services presented a report to the Committee setting out current initiatives and priorities for Estates & Buildings as well as updating members on the progress of current capital projects. In particular, the Director highlighted work to address energy management, fleet management, business continuity planning and space management.

12. ENDOWMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report of the Sub-committee’s meeting on 16 May 2011.

Resolved: to approve the report.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 3 October 2011.

Present: Mr R Burns (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Mr IA Kennedy (President, Students’ Association), Dr LI McLennan, Dr AD Reeves, Mr EF Sanderson, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: Dr H Marriage, University Secretary, Acting Director of Finance, Directors of Strategic Planning, Campus Services, and Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs.

Apologies: Dr J Lowe, Mr KA Richmond.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 22 August 2011, subject to minor amendment.

2. MATTERS ARISING

Dundee University Press Ltd (DUP) (Minute 7)

The Acting Director of Finance reported that the contract alluded to at the previous meeting had now been signed, and that therefore the position of DUP appeared more financially secure in the medium term; although in the short term there would be a requirement for the University to provide continued financial support. The Committee noted that DUP had also won a contract to publish the corporate history of a large locally-based business, and it was suggested that this genre might represent a niche market opportunity.

Resolved: to note that the Committee would be invited to consider a paper setting out the required financial support at its next meeting on 21 November 2011.

3. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 1

The Acting Director presented the accounts for the period to the end of August 2011. These currently showed a projected operating deficit for 2011/12 of £1.7m. This was chiefly as a result of an expected shortfall in tuition fees, although it was made clear that the position on tuition fees was as usual at this time of year provisional, as September intake figures were not yet finalised and January not yet known. In addition, there was an expectation that the research overhead recovery for the year would be less favourable than budget. The Colleges were currently working on strategies to mitigate these income shortfalls and thereby bring the budget back into balance. The accounts showed a small projected bottom line deficit after disposals; however, it was unlikely that the planned disposals would be achieved, creating further pressure on the bottom line.

The current cash position was positive, although potential negative working capital movements of around £15m in respect of research funding were included in the forecast cash flows for the year.

4. DRAFT SCOTTISH BUDGET

The Acting Director provided the Committee with a brief analysis of the implications of the draft Scottish budget. In comparison to other sectors, in particular further education, the higher education sector had fared remarkably well in the draft budget. Higher education would experience a 14.6% cumulative increase in cash terms from 2011-12 to 2014-15, whereas taken as a whole the budget for Scotland would increase by just 1.9% and further education funding would decrease by 13.6%. The 14.6% cash terms increase for Higher Education would equate to 6% in real terms. Capital funding would, however, be reduced by a half in a joint allocation to both HE and FE.

5. REST OF UK TUITION FEES 2012-13

The Committee received for information the paper previously circulated to Court members setting out the proposed fees for students from the rest of the UK for the session 2012-13. The Committee noted that
the proposals had been formally announced in a statement to the press on 26 September 2011. Press coverage of the proposal to introduce three-year degree options had been extremely positive and the University would now concentrate on developing a coherent bursaries package which would focus primarily on providing support for living costs.

Resolved: to await with interest the development of the University’s bursaries proposals in due course.

6. DUNDEE STUDENT VILLAGES (DSV)

The Committee received a routine report on the performance of DSV along with its subsidiary, West Park Conference Centre (WPCC). The Committee learnt that DSV was continuing to perform above expectations and ahead of the business model. Nominated occupancy for 2011-12 was once again 100%, well ahead of the model, and actual occupancy levels were high, currently running at around 99%. In discussion, the Committee considered the optimum nomination strategy and whether there were benefits in nominating a lower percentage.

In relation to WPCC, the Committee noted the revised fee structure, approved by the Board of DSV, to provide an appropriate incentive for Sanctuary Management Services (SMS). One member of the Committee, who had recently stayed as a guest at WPCC, provided some feedback on the quality and standards of service delivered.

Resolved: to note the report

7. ESTATES & BUILDINGS REPORT

The Director of Campus Services presented a routine report outlining current issues within the Directorate as well as providing an update on capital projects. In discussion, the Committee considered progress on achieving carbon reduction targets, and it was agreed that the Carbon Management Group needed to consider relevant information as a matter of urgency, particularly given the reduction in capital funding announced in the draft Scottish budget. The Committee also discussed the issue of space on the Ninewells campus, and the Principal praised those involved in ultimately successful negotiations with HM Revenue & Customs on the VAT status of the Centre for Translational & Interdisciplinary Research.

8. FINANCIAL STRATEGY

The Acting Director of Finance presented a draft financial strategy for the University, which would also serve as the basis for the sustainability statement in the developing University Strategy. The Committee was invited to comment on the draft, which would then be shared with the Senior Management Team, Directors of support services and Deans before a final version was brought back to the Committee for approval.

Resolved: to encourage members to provide additional feedback direct to the Acting Director.

9. TREASURY ANNUAL REPORT

The Committee received the annual treasury report for 2010/11. Amongst other things, the report showed the new borrowing facility of £34m which the Court had approved at its meeting on 21 February 2011. In respect of cash deposits and investments the Committee commented on the low interest rates available in the market. The Acting Director indicated that management of exchange rate risk remained an area for potential improvement. In response to a question about the variance in net depreciation, the Acting Director noted that this was essentially caused by high value items of research equipment with short asset lives.

Resolved: to approve the report, noting that counterparty limits were in the process of being reviewed, and any proposed changes would be submitted to the Committee for approval in due course.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 4 October 2011.

Present: Mr J Elliot (Acting Convener), Mr JE Barnett, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Dr H Marriage (by teleconference), Mr I Stewart, Mr KAC Swinley.

In Attendance: Mr R Burns, University Secretary, Acting Director of Finance, Mr S Reid and Ms A Taylor (KPMG), Ms L Paterson (Pricewaterhouse-Coopers [PwC]), and Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 25 May 2011.

2. EXTERNAL AUDIT

In presenting what the auditors referred to as their ‘Interim Management Letter’, Ms Paterson was keen to point out that this was part of PwC’s routine external audit arrangements, and did not indicate any particular cause for concern. In preparation for the audit of the annual accounts, the auditors had reviewed the financial performance and systems of financial control of the University along with the assumptions around FRS17. As a result of this work, a series of recommendations had been made for improvement and an agreed action plan had been developed with officers. Ms Paterson highlighted one particular recommendation in relation to the use of the cash suspense account, which at the point of review had shown an unusually large balance. The Committee noted that the perhaps higher than usual levels were a result of the nature of the University’s business, where the University inevitably receives considerable amounts of funds without invoice, which subsequently require to be identified and allocated.

The Committee was satisfied that the audit of the accounts was progressing smoothly and looked forward to receiving draft financial statements and the final audit report at its next meeting.

3. INTERNAL AUDIT

(1) Financial Governance & Planning

Ms Taylor introduced the report which had as its focus the University’s ability to respond to changes in the current external funding environment, and in particular in relation to tuition fees, research grants and overhead recovery. On the whole the report was positive about the degree of collective ownership of individual budgets, and there was praise for the annual meeting of College accountants, which was felt to provide a clear basis for planning and discussing institutional priorities and which enabled subsequent discussions in Colleges and Schools to be fully aware of those priorities. In total, eight recommendations were made in the report, although none was graded as high risk. The auditors highlighted the issue of accurate and sensitive budget phasing, which officers had been monitoring and working to improve for some time. Another highlighted recommendation was that identified efficiency savings needed to be properly planned to ensure the savings were realised. The Committee was satisfied with the management responses.

(2) Fraud

The auditors presented a report which had considered the overall culture of fraud prevention as well as the response mechanisms for alleged cases of fraud. The report had also examined arrangements to prevent fraud, impropriety and misconduct. Four recommendations were made, one of which had been graded as high risk and involved controls in relation to suppliers. All recommendations were accepted by officers. In discussion, the Committee suggested that fraud policies should be expanded to include academic fraud explicitly and also that some thought should be given to promoting more widely the University’s whistle-blowing policy.
Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA)

The Committee received a report on the finance arrangements in place at DUSA. The focus of the report was on financial controls and in particular financial forecasting. A range of minor recommendations had been suggested, but on the whole it had been recognised that DUSA was well managed. In discussion it was suggested that the next review of DUSA should take a more commercial focus.

Follow-up Report

The auditors presented a report setting out the University’s progress in implementing internal audit recommendations from previous years. The findings showed that a significant number of recommendations remained outstanding. Officers acknowledged weaknesses in their approach to monitoring the implementation of recommendations, and reported that revised procedures were being put in place. It was suggested that progress against implementation could be presented by officers at each meeting of the Committee, rather than rely on the auditors’ own follow-up report. This would help to reassure the Committee that officers were tackling issues raised through internal audit responsibly and quickly.

Resolved: to ask officers to present an outline of the new monitoring procedures at the next meeting.

Status Update

The auditors presented their final status report on the audit plan for 2010-11. All work had been completed. One review, on the advice of officers, had been deferred, and as a result an additional 6 days of audit work would be available for the 2011-12 plan.

2010-2011 Annual Internal Audit Report

The Committee received the auditors’ annual statement on the effectiveness of internal controls. The auditors’ assessment was that the ‘University’s systems provide a reasonable basis for maintaining control’ and ‘the control framework provides reasonable assurance regarding the effective and efficient achievement of strategic objectives’. The report drew the Committee’s attention to the major recommendations from the year’s audit work, particularly in the areas of objective-setting and review, project management, risk management and audit follow-up.

2011-12 Internal Audit Plan

The auditors set out the proposed plan of work for the 2011-12 session for approval by the Committee. The plan had been developed in consultation with officers and with the convener of the Committee. It was noted that the review of anti-bribery policies and procedures would take place towards the end of the year. The original plan had seen a specific review of overseas agency arrangements, but the Committee agreed that this could be removed from the current cycle, noting that aspects of this review would feature in other proposed reviews, such as bribery, UK Border Agency, etc. The Committee made a number of suggestions for improvement of the proposed scopes of the reviews, and also suggested that in the subsequent plan for 2012-13 it might be appropriate to review organisational and professional development activity.

Resolved: to approve the plan, subject to minor amendments.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs presented a revised institutional risk register which focused on key strategic risks. To accompany the register, a graphical representation of the effects of internal control actions on gross risk was presented, which members thought useful. The Committee discussed the degree to which the Court itself should be concerned with risk issues, and a number of helpful suggestions were made in this area, in particular that risk management could be embedded within the structure of Court and committee meetings by the inclusion of key risk items on relevant agendas at an appropriate frequency.

Resolved: to approve the register and commend its presentation to the next meeting of the Court.
5. **MEDICINES & HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS REGULATORY AGENCY (MHRA)**

The Committee received a note of the positive outcomes of the inspection by the MHRA of the University’s clinical trials. The note had previously been received by the Court at its meeting on 13 June 2011.

Resolved: to welcome the positive results of the inspection.

6. **HEALTH & SAFETY SUB-COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report of the meeting of the Sub-Committee on 19 September 2011.

Resolved: for its part, to note the report.

7. **LEGAL MATTERS**

The Committee received a routine update on legal matters and expressed concern at the recent judgement surrounding allergies.

Resolved: to note the report.

8. **CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL (SFC) REGARDING DISCUSSIONS WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERTAY**

The University Secretary provided an update to non-Court members of the Committee on the recent correspondence received from the SFC inviting the University to discussions about the possibility of merger with the University of Abertay. A special meeting of Court had been convened on 3 October 2011 to discuss this matter in detail.

9. **PERFORMANCE OF THE INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AUDITORS**

The auditors having left the meeting, the Acting Convener invited members and officers to comment on the performance to date of both the internal and external auditors. No areas for concern were raised and officers praised the working relationships with both sets of auditors.
### APPENDIX 5

**INSTITUTIONAL RISK REGISTER**

(Minute 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Risk Cause(s)</th>
<th>Risk Consequence</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
<th>Inherent Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Residual Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Actions for further control</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Action Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loss of PGT and overseas income</td>
<td>Failure to recruit; Effects of national immigration policies</td>
<td>Would lead to reductions in income and would constrain ability to expand in an uncontrolled market</td>
<td>HoCs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lobbying of UKBA and Scottish and UK ministers; Tightly controlled admissions procedures.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loss of research related income</td>
<td>Failure to achieve research grants; Reduction in available research funding overall (SFC and RCS)</td>
<td>Inability to achieve research overhead targets; Inability to fulfill research potential.</td>
<td>HoCs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Institutional steering of research strategy to maximise REG income; Support from RIS to maximise success of grant applications Objective-Setting and Review (OSAR)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inability to achieve stated savings or income generation targets</td>
<td>Inadequate resource management; Failure to recruit students; Failure to win research contracts, Insufficient income to meet requirements leading to overspends and/or deficits.</td>
<td>Close senior management oversight of Strategic Review project</td>
<td>HoCs and DF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loss of RUK income</td>
<td>Introduction of fees for RUK students leads to failure to recruit from key English/Welsh and NI markets; failure of 3-year degrees to attract students.</td>
<td>Would lead to reduced income in key areas reliant on these markets; Failure to plug the funding gap between Scotland and England; Reputational impact.</td>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Monitoring of programme attractiveness and market testing; 3-year degree pilot projects in DJCAD and Life Sciences.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LIKELIHOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Insignificant (&lt;£50k)</td>
<td>1 = Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Minor (&lt;£50k &lt;£500k)</td>
<td>2 = Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Moderate (&lt;£500k &lt;£2M)</td>
<td>3 = Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Major (&lt;£2M &lt;£5M)</td>
<td>4 = Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Catastrophic (&gt;£5M)</td>
<td>5 = Almost Certain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

DCS = Director of Campus Services  
DER = Director of External Relations  
DF = Director of Finance  
DHR = Director of Human Resources  
DIS = Director of Information Services  
DPGLA = Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs  
DPL(T) = Deputy Principal (Learning & Teaching)  
DRIS = Director of RIS  
DSO = Director of Student Operations  
HoC = Head of College  
HoSS = Head of Safety Services  
VP(R) = Vice-Principal with research responsibility
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Key Actions/Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Loss of reputation arising from cases of, for example: Student indiscipline; Staff grievances; Student complaints; QA failures; H&amp;S and other core policy failures. Loss of staff with high calibre/expertise. Poor League Table Performance.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td>Periodic review of student discipline procedures; Maintenance of and compliance with a range of policies, incl: Health &amp; Safety; Human Resources; Misconduct in Research; Governance; Effective management of external relations. Continued focus on quality of student experience.</td>
<td>DFR  Planning Officer, Secretary</td>
<td>January 2012, Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Loss of high calibre staff Key staff attracted to other institution(s) through enhanced financial incentives and packages</td>
<td>HR Strategy</td>
<td>4 5 20</td>
<td>HR Strategy addresses reward mechanisms, staff development etc; strong corporate ethos in high-performing research areas; critical mass in key research areas makes Dundee highly competitive; Remuneration Committee considers key staff salaries; ongoing upgrading of estate makes Dundee a good place to work</td>
<td>HRF  Planning Officer, Secretary</td>
<td>Report by April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Failure or poor performance of subsidiary/associated companies</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>4 4 16</td>
<td>University membership on subsidiary and associated company Boards; robust business planning; attention paid to the model of operation.</td>
<td>DF  Planning Officer, Secretary</td>
<td>Annual review, Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Failure to maximise income potential from teaching and other activities</td>
<td>HoCs</td>
<td>4 3 12</td>
<td>Programme approval process requires consideration of funding/finance; ASRS advises on market research.</td>
<td>DF  Planning Officer, Secretary</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Loss of staff with specialised knowledge Staff with unique skills and expertise leave the University through career advancement or retirement etc or are unavailable through prolonged illness.</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>3 4 12</td>
<td>Provision of succession/back-up training; identification of key activities in College/Services Business Continuity Plans; consolidation of Schools and Services provides increased resilience; implementation of sickness absence management policies.</td>
<td>DPGLA  Planning Officer, Secretary</td>
<td>June 2012, Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2: Non-Priority Strategic Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Risk Cause(s)</th>
<th>Risk Consequence</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
<th>Inherent Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Residual Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Actions for further control</th>
<th>Action Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inability to manage capital programme within budget</td>
<td>Project over-run; poor project/programme management; projects approved without finance in place.</td>
<td>Projects halted before completion; negative impact on University’s financial position; University breaches bank facilities</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Monitoring of cashflow and borrowing requirements; Contractor approval process</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3: Sector Threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Risk Cause(s)</th>
<th>Risk Consequence</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
<th>Inherent Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Existing Controls</th>
<th>Residual Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Actions for further control</th>
<th>Action Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Public Funding Reduction</td>
<td>Change of Government priorities</td>
<td>Recurrent income cut</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lobbying via UUK/US</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Loss of HUG teaching income</td>
<td>Failure to recruit; Changes in funding methodology by SFC; Reductions in controlled numbers;</td>
<td>Would lead to reductions in core teaching income; affecting ability to deliver core UG courses</td>
<td>DIP(L&amp;T)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lobbying via UUK/US; Continual enhancement of student experience; Monitoring of programme attractiveness and market testing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
<td>Risk Causes(s)</td>
<td>Inherent Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Residual Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Action(s) for further control</td>
<td>Action Owner</td>
<td>Action Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Disruption caused by failure/loss of single external provider</td>
<td>Failure to deliver service; provider goes out of business and ceases trading</td>
<td>Head of Procurement</td>
<td>Minimise areas where delivery reliant on single provider(s)</td>
<td>Keep under continued review; develop BCP for all areas that remain reliant on single provider</td>
<td>Head of Procurement</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Data systems compromise and/or information loss</td>
<td>Breach of IT security/Firewalls; Theft of loss of laptops/memory sticks, etc and/or sensitive data or research.</td>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>Implement Information Strategy and recommendations internal audit</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>Annual report on progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Disruption through significant level of staff absence (disease/epidemic)</td>
<td>Disease epidemic or act of god reduces availability of staff</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>Document a BCP for pandemic influenza.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DHR HoSS</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Disruption caused by catastrophic loss of buildings or equipment</td>
<td>Unforeseen event such as fire, flood, accident.</td>
<td>DCIS</td>
<td>Implement recommendations from internal audit review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPGLA/Secretary</td>
<td>October 2011 September 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Disruption through significant level of staff absence (Industrial Action)</td>
<td>National or local policy or other decision(s) result in industrial action</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>Continued engagement with campus unions; Investigate alternative means of determining student achievement and progression</td>
<td></td>
<td>DHR HoCs</td>
<td>Ongoing December 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fraud, impropriety or misconduct</td>
<td>Internal and/or external individuals and/or groups gain financial or other advantage through weaknesses in the University’s systems of control.</td>
<td>DF Secretary</td>
<td>Increased staff awareness of rules and guidelines surrounding financial regulations and procurement procedures; Revised policy framework associated with the Bribery Act 2010. Improved training.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DF Secretary</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Loss of or poor budgetary control of financial resources</td>
<td>Poor financial controls; Poor financial management both central and devolved; Lack of financial leadership.</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Improved training; Improved focus on target-setting with individual academics during OSAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DF HoCs</td>
<td>January 2012 Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
<td>Column 5</td>
<td>Column 6</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Failure of health and safety mechanisms</td>
<td>Preventable death or serious injury to students/staff or visitor</td>
<td>Litigation; Action by H&amp;S Executive; prosecution of senior managers/governing body; impact on reputation.</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Legal non-compliance</td>
<td>Failure to comply with regulatory or legal requirements.</td>
<td>Prosecution or litigation; impact on reputation</td>
<td>DPGALA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Theft of equipment and damage to buildings</td>
<td>Internal and/or external individuals and/or groups target the University to steal equipment and other belongings and/or cause damage to property through vandalism.</td>
<td>Financial loss; increased insurance claims and cost of premiums.</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>External claims for breach of contract</td>
<td>Failure to deliver against contractual terms</td>
<td>University subject to litigation; damage to reputation</td>
<td>DPGALA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Terrorist or similar Strike (animal rights activists or other)</td>
<td>Disruptive action taken by individuals or groups with particular campaign focus or simply through disaffection</td>
<td>Disruption teaching, research and other activities; damage to buildings and property; injury/serious injury/death of one or more staff or students.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Theft of material for terrorist or other criminal purposes</td>
<td>Individual or group targets the University as a source of material with/from which they are able to commit a terrorist or other criminal act.</td>
<td>Impact on reputation as source of material; possible legal consequences if controls to prevent acquisition of material shown to be inadequate.</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. REST OF UK TUITION FEES: PROPOSALS

The Senatus received a paper from the SMT prepared for the Court setting out proposals for the University’s approach to setting fees for students from the rest of the UK from 2012/13 onwards.

In his introduction, the Principal reported that the proposals contained in the paper had received the approval of members of the Court with one or two minor questions concerning matters of detail outstanding. Consultation with the Senate was primarily for comment upon the academic issues arising from the fee proposals. Members noted that the main rationale for the proposed fee level should reflect the University’s view of itself in relation to its principal comparators but that discussion about fairness was inevitably limited by the parameters set by the Scottish Government.

Concern was expressed by some members about the lack of options and alternative fees which might have been charged and whether a variation across subject groups could have been possible in the light of differences in market positions. While an iterative approach looking at variable fees in future years could not be ruled out, it was stressed that the University was not in a ‘real’ market situation so there was little potential for subtlety: our actual comparators were the other research intensive universities in Scotland. In that connection it was noted that those universities charging lower fees admitted students with approximately 80 UCAS points below Dundee’s own average.

In terms of fee income it was noted that a reduction in RUK students was expected to be cost neutral as the unit of resource for Scottish students was expected to rise. On bursaries for RUK students, members expressed a preference for taking a family income based approach in relation to supporting living costs.

On the proposal to introduce new, bespoke three year degrees, members expressed concern in particular about the resources available to develop and teach such degrees along with a more general disquiet about the future of the traditional four-year Honours degree though tempered to some degree by an awareness of the Scottish Government’s views on the need for post-16 reform. In that connection members were reminded of the lack of success with attempts to encourage previous direct-entry to 2nd year for well-qualified RUK students.

In terms of RUK recruitment it was noted that the major universities were expecting to be able to offer very attractive bursary rates which Dundee was unlikely to be able to match. Even if RUK recruitment was sustained any additional income might justify the Scottish Government reducing its contribution to university income in the future and push forward with reducing the generality of degree programmes from four to three years. Such an eventuality was inherently antagonistic to the wider access agenda and to the Scottish Credit and Qualification Framework.

From the student perspective, DUSA officers expressed their opposition to all fees and, while sympathetic to the situation which had been forced on the University, stressed that the quality of the student experience should be maintained and felt that fee costs should be moderated by the potential for substantial bursaries. The students were particularly concerned that the proposal to offer bespoke three year degrees was dealt with in a manner that promoted integration and did not prove divisive and counter-productive.

The Principal thanked the Senatus for its views and requested members to observe confidentiality on the proposals until the University issued a press release at the end of the week.
APPENDIX 7

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

(Minute 14)

1. PRINCIPAL’S REPORT

The Senatus received a report from the Principal on issues arising from the most recent meetings of the Senior Management Team.

On the draft Scottish budget, the Principal reported that the proposed outcome for the HE sector seemed relatively favourable although he noted a further 50% reduction in the capital budget which made it all the more important for the University to achieve annual surpluses in order to be able to manage building maintenance and capital equipment as well as to finance any new projects.

On RUK tuition fees, he indicated that the University’s proposals seemed to have found favour with commentators, in particular the proposal to introduce three-year degrees in selected areas. He noted the importance of retaining our proportion of UK students from outwith Scotland currently running at around 15 to 17%.

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

2. CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SFC CONCERNING POSSIBLE MERGER WITH ABERTAY UNIVERSITY

The Senatus received correspondence from the SFC dated 22 September 2011.

In his introduction to this item, the Principal reported that there had been a special meeting of the Court (prior to his meeting with the SFC) which had noted that the University had a history of successful collaborations and had taken the view that any engagement with Abertay could only be undertaken on the basis of enhancing this University’s reputation and being academically and financially in its interests.

He indicated that the SFC had changed its position from merger to an exploration of collaboration; that it had acknowledged the very different missions of the two universities and accepted that the manner in which the correspondence was leaked to the press prior to its receipt by the University was deplorable.

The latest position was that there would be a joint meeting of the two universities with SFC officials and that he expected the outcome to be a review of provision at, and role of, Abertay in the context of regional HE provision.

The Senatus decided: for its part, to endorse the view of the Court with regard to any possible merger.

3. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received a communication from the meeting of the University Court held on 13 June and the Court Retreat on 2 September 2011.

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

4. FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE

The Senatus received the Minutes of a meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee held on 22 August 2011 for information.

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

5. HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

The Senatus received the Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 20 September 2011 (annex).

The Senatus decided: to approve the report.
6. UNIVERSITY STRATEGY 2012-2018

The Senatus received a draft, consultative document entitled ‘University Strategy to 2018’ which will be made available shortly to all staff to offer comments.

The University’s Director of Strategic Planning, Mr G McKee, presented the document noting that it carried on from the previous strategy which had a timeline to July 2012. The fundamental intention for this iteration was for there to be a high-level vision document backed up with strategy documents for key areas of the University’s activities connecting with specific, operational plans in the Schools and support directorates.

The current version of the Strategy was very much a starting point and members were invited to consider the questions posed and to send detailed comments and proposals for additions or deletions to Mr McKee by the end of October so that they could be incorporated into the next stage of the process.

In the course of discussion, the following main points were made:

(i) some members were doubtful about the emphasis upon interdisciplinarity believing that this downgraded the importance of research in specific disciplines;

(ii) the importance of the four stated academic ‘themes’ was questioned with some areas of the University feeling only marginally connected to them;

(iii) apropos of both points above, it was noted that the themes were not intended to replace disciplines but to indicate areas where the University might have particular external impact through inter-disciplinary working. The core of much activity is likely to be discipline based but working together across disciplines to look at complex problems would be encouraged. This approach was also seen as a means of counteracting some of the issues which arose from small scale disciplines;

(iv) it was suggested that the Strategy might usefully include a statement about reinvigorating staff participation in governance;

(v) greater concision was thought by some to be an improvement along with a rather more inspirational tone although it was recognised that this would develop through consultation as the document developed over the coming months;

(vi) it was noted that the document implied an endorsement of existing managerial structures and it was suggested that there should be acknowledgement of the need for a ‘special’ group to examine potential projects and to bring them on-stream quickly and effectively;

(vii) there was no mention of ‘art’ or ‘humanities’ (although they were clearly encompassed by the academic themes) and insufficient recognition given to successes in TPG provision linked to specific markets;

(viii) it was suggested that rather more radical statements needed to be made about what the University would be like in 2018, in particular about focus and change in academic offerings.

In conclusion, members were thanked for their contributions and encouraged to write to Mr McKee with specific suggestions.

The Senatus decided: to note that a further draft would be circulated to the Senatus in the New Year.

7. STATUTE 16 – GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

The Senatus noted: that Professor Tom Inns will serve as the Senate representative on the Grievance Committee.

8. PROFESSOR EMERITUS

The Senatus decided: subject to the concurrence of Court, to confer the title of Professor Emeritus upon Professor David Balfour.
A meeting of the Committee was held on 20 September 2011.

Present: The Principal (Convener), Professor R Duck, Professor A Fairlamb, Professor P Ferguson, Mr I Kennedy (President, DUSA), Professor I Leigh, Professor M Rose and Mr W Wilson (vice Mr C Lovatt).

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

1. MINUTES

The Committee received the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2010 and subsequently approved by the Senatus.

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Honorary Degrees: June 2011 (Minute 3(i))

Resolved: (i) that no further approaches be made to Eddie Mair and Sylvain Chomet but that Queen Rania might be a possibility in future years;

(ii) to note that Dolly Parton and Janet Street Porter were still in discussion;

(iii) to note that no approach had been made to Prince Albert of Monaco and that the Principal would discuss the issue with the proposer;

(iv) to note that the following were to be conferred with the degree of LLD in June 2012:

Albie Sachs
Murray McLachlan
Professor Ann-Marie Rafferty
Dr Bernard Pécoul

3. NOVEMBER 2011 GRADUATION

Resolved: to note that the following will be conferred with the degree of LLD at the ceremony on 16 November 2011:

Professor Sir John Bell
Dr Andom Ogbamariam

(note: should Dr Ogbamariam be unable to attend, the degree will be awarded in absentia or at an associated ceremony in Eritrea)

4. FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

The Committee received a paper from the Director of External Relations setting out a strategy for the future management of Honorary Degrees.

Resolved: (i) to invite members to send any comments to Ms Barnard as soon as possible; and

(ii) to forward the revised paper to the Senatus for approval (appendix).

5. CONFERMENT OF HONORARY DEGREES

The Committee received and considered 18 nominations for honorary degrees.

Resolved: (i) to recommend that the following be approached with regard to conferment of the degree of LLD honoris causa at academic ceremonies in 2011/2012:
Stephen O’Rahilly
Mark Beaumont
Peter Boyle
Jamie Byng
Peter Howie
Sir Mark Jones
Iain Mattaj
Mary McAleese
Val McDermid
Malcolm Skingle
Sir Nicholas Wright

(ii) to be considered for a future ceremony:

David Sibbald
Walter Smith

(iii) to note the following provisional allocation of Schools to ceremonies from Dr David Russell:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 10am, Wednesday 20 June</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>DoJ College of Art &amp; Design Engineering, Physics &amp; Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2.30pm, Wednesday 20 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Humanities Psychology Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 10am, Thursday 21 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Business Environment Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2.30pm, Thursday 21 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Education, Social Work &amp; Community Education Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 10am, Friday 22 June</td>
<td>CMDN CLS</td>
<td>Nursing &amp; Midwifery Life Sciences Teaching &amp; Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2.30pm, Friday 22 June</td>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>Dentistry Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This timetable is based on potential student numbers. There is always pressure on places in the academic procession from the Schools of Education and Nursing. This was a particular problem in the 2011 ceremony with some staff not being allowed to take part. This split will allow more staff to attend the ceremony.

The timetable will also allow the Registry to target Schools that have a low student uptake for attendance at the ceremony. A significant increase in attendance and registration was achieved in most schools but there is still a lot of work to do with some Schools and this grouping of Schools will allow the University to accommodate extra students.
HONORARY DEGREES – PROPOSED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Background

At the last meeting of the Honorary Degrees Committee in September 2010 it was agreed that a new strategy for managing the honorary degree process would be helpful.

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

The Director of External Relations was invited to consider these points and bring forward a draft strategy for discussion. This is attached, and the key recommendations set out below.

Recommendations

It is recommended that

- each honorary graduate should be allocated to an individual who will take responsibility for managing future relationships with the honorary graduate. This would most likely be someone from a relevant discipline, and ideally already with close links

- the opportunity for nominating individuals for consideration should be opened up to all staff, students and graduates of the University and that processes for managing this are developed and co-ordinated by the External Relations team

- the External Relations team should develop guidance for proposers, which will include a nominations form to prompt the proposer to give some thought to the ongoing potential relationship

- the Committee should review the Honorary Degree criteria and suggest any amendments or additions

- College Boards and Directorates should review their activities to identify opportunities to engage with honorary graduates on a regular basis, for example annually

- that the Committee should meet twice a year: to consider nominations in May, and then to review progress in October

Post meeting note:

The recommendations were agreed by the Honorary Degrees Committee, and the proposed management strategy is being passed to the Senate for approval.

Creating long term relationships for the University

There is concern that the University is not making the most of the relationships that are created through the awarding of an honorary degree. Our honorary graduates all report an extremely positive experience in coming to Dundee and appreciate the way in which they are treated. However, frequently the University very quickly loses touch with many honorary graduates, and the opportunity to engage with them in subsequent years is seriously hampered.

Where honorary graduates are relevant to a particular academic discipline, the College should nominate someone to continue to develop that relationship. Where the individual is related to a more general area, the relationship should be allocated to a relevant person within the Principal’s Office or SASS directorates. We would like to record details of ongoing activity or contact with honorary graduates on the External Relations’ contact management database on behalf of the Principal.

Wherever possible, we should build ongoing and lasting relationships with our honorary graduates so that in future years we are able to extend invitations for events and activities within the University or the city, or be able to ask them to assist us in other ways.
It is recommended each honorary graduate should be allocated to an individual who will take responsibility for managing future relationships with the honorary graduate. This would most likely be someone from a relevant discipline, and ideally already with close links.

Nominations process

Currently recommendations for the conferment of an honorary degree are made by a member of the Senate. A single proposer’s name is sufficient to support a recommendation. A proposal must bear the signature of a member of the Senate. This seems unnecessarily restrictive and is out of step with the vast majority of the rest of the sector.

It is important to ensure that we get a good balance of nominations across academic disciplines and people in public walks of life.

We should therefore consider whether opening up the nominations process more widely to include all staff and students would be beneficial. This may give us a wider range of suggestions to consider and help us identify people from national or international walks of life who may be excellent role models for our students and who might be useful points of contact to assist the University with its wider societal impact and goals.

If we open this up more widely and encourage people to make suggestions we will need a process to filter these ideas in some way. For example:

- For staff this could be managed through an internal process using School and College Board structures, and add in a process by which SASS directorates could provide nominations (e.g. via the Directors’ and College Secretaries’ Group);
- For current students this can be managed through DUSA;
- University graduates have the opportunity to contribute through the Graduates’ Council.

External Relations would be happy to sift preliminary ideas and suggestions from staff and students that could then be allocated to appropriate Colleges, Directorates or DUSA for consideration in advance of the annual Honorary Degrees Committee meeting.

It is recommended that the opportunity for nominating individuals for consideration should be opened up to all staff, students and graduates of the University and that processes for managing this are developed and co-ordinated by the External Relations team.

In making the nomination, the proposer should consider what the longer term benefits their nominee might bring to the University. For example, a leading academic could be invited to give a lecture – to students/staff or the wider public – or take part in a conference or symposium led by the University. This can be made clear through guidance to proposers and developing a pro forma for the nomination.

- It is recommended that External Relations should develop guidance for proposers, which will include a nominations form to prompt the proposer to give some thought to the ongoing potential relationship.

Criteria for nomination

Normally nominees should meet the majority of the following criteria:

1) be people who have made an exceptionally meritorious contribution to their chosen field whether that be commerce, education (by teaching, research, or administration), or other public service;
2) have an outstanding record of voluntary and selfless service to the community;
3) have relevance to the life and work of the University or have some connection to it or to the locality;
4) serve as an example of ambition and achievement to the University’s students and graduands;
5) enhance the University’s academic or general reputation; and
6) have the potential to act as a champion and supporter of the University.

- The Committee is asked to review these criteria and suggest any amendments or additions.
Relationship manager

Once nominations have been agreed the Committee should identify an appropriate individual to act as the ‘relationship manager’ to take this forward to the next stage. This may be the original proposer, someone with existing links to the nominee, or another agreed representative. The relationship manager will then work with External Relations to agree a strategy for approaching the nominee. Nominees should not be approached prior to their consideration by the Committee.

Following approval

The first stage will be an informal ‘sounding out’ of the nominee, to establish whether they would be happy in principle to accept an honorary degree from the University before any formal invitation is made. External Relations will work with the relationship manager, offering support in gaining addresses/contact details if required

Once soundings have been taken and the nominee has agreed, a formal letter from the Principal will follow. The External Relations team will assist in drafting that letter and agreeing the approach with the relationship manager and the Principal’s Office.

Once a formal letter of invitation has been sent and then accepted, the External Relations team will co-ordinate the logistical arrangements regarding attendance at the relevant graduation ceremony. This includes arranging accommodation and travel details (within Scotland/Dundee) for the purposes of the ceremony and Honorary Graduates Dinner.

The relationship manager should consider opportunities for the graduand whilst s/he is in Dundee and at an early stage discuss these with the graduand before detailed arrangements are made. An appropriate laureator should also be agreed at this stage, who may not necessarily be the relationship manager.

External Relations will act as a central co-ordinating point, ensuring all candidates on the approved list have been approached and charting progress of each case.

Attendance at Graduation Ceremonies

The External Relations team will manage the arrangements for honorary graduands’ attendance at the ceremonies for summer and winter graduations. They will liaise with relationship managers regarding any additional events and activities, but the responsibilities for organising and funding these will lie with the relevant College/School/Directorate and be managed by the relationship manager.

During Graduation Week it is hoped that strong relationships will be forged and a number of University members will develop links that can be built on in future years. However, it is important that the relationship manager continues to take responsibility for ongoing links with the University and that any activity or contact is noted and updated on a regular basis.

Post Graduation

In the months following Graduation each Honorary Graduate is sent copies of formal photographs and a printed copy of their laureation address.

Contact information will be held in External Relations, on behalf of the Principal, and any changes in this should be notified by the relationship manager, along with any other relevant information about the Honorary Graduate’s life and work that allow us to track their progress. In turn, the External Relations team will keep in touch with relationship managers and prompt them to make contact where appropriate.

It may be helpful once a year for College Boards and SASS Directorates to review potential opportunities to engage with existing honorary graduates and track any existing activities and developments.

- **It is recommended that College Boards and Directorates should review their activities to identify potential opportunities to engage with honorary graduates on a regular basis, for example annually.**

Honorary Degrees Committee

The Committee currently meets once a year in September to consider nominations for the next two years’ ceremonies. There is no opportunity formally to review progress.
It is recommended that the Committee should meet twice a year: to consider nominations in May, and then to review progress in October.

Next steps

- Honorary Degrees Committee to agree recommendations
- External Relations to develop guidance for proposers and processes for staff nominations
- Timetable for nominations to be revised in line with recommendations
- Senate to approve revised process

Judith Barnard, Director of External Relations
September 2011
A meeting of the Committee was held on 13 September 2011.

Present: Dr J Lowe (Convener), Professor RJ Abboud, Mr I Leith, Mr H Marriage, Professor GJ Mires, Ms CA Potter, Dr AM Roger

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Human Resources, Acting Director of Finance, Deputy Director of Human Resources, Mrs M Davidson

Apologies: Professor CA Whatley, Mr D Cathcart

The Acting Director of Finance was welcomed to the Committee.

1. **MINUTES**

Minutes of the meeting of 23 May 2011 were approved.

2. **UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC REVIEW**

The University Secretary reminded the Committee that there remained a shortfall against the Strategic Review target of £1.3m. The Acting Director of Finance reported the year end figures showed a pre-audit operating surplus of approximately £5.5m which continued the upward trend over recent years. £4m had been invested in Voluntary Severance payments and £1m had been realised as a result of property disposal, resulting in a net surplus of £2.5m. At the financial year end 2010/11 the University was in a cash positive position to a greater extent than in 2009/10. There was a small improvement in research working capital compared to the 2 year forecast conducted in 2010/11 but this will require to be closely monitored. The Committee heard that the break-even budget for 2011/12 had been developed despite a cut of 11% in SFC teaching funding, but may prove challenging to achieve due to key risks, including those associated with overseas student recruitment and likely downturns in research grants awarded. To achieve a break-even position, replacement income or compensatory cost savings will be required. Details of the Comprehensive Spending Review will be released shortly which will be of significance in respect of the University’s finances.

The University Secretary confirmed that the College Structure was considered as part of the Strategic Review. There were no plans to alter the College structure although the School structures within CASS and CASE were to be reviewed.

Resolved: to note the position.

3. **VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE**

As a result of the Voluntary Severance Scheme, the University Secretary indicated that University staffing levels across the University were lower than for several years and there was a possibility of approving further Voluntary Severance requests if staff who were displaced elsewhere in the University could be identified to backfill certain posts from which staff could be released. In time IT reviews, current efficiency projects and improved working practices would have the effect of releasing further staff. The Committee noted that there were certain areas of the University which have had significant numbers of Voluntary Severance applications approved. Whilst this is positive from a financial perspective, attention should be given to the impact of reduced staffing levels on remaining staff and, in particular, to areas critical to the recruitment of overseas students.

Resolved: to monitor the impact of reduced staffing levels as a result of Voluntary Severance.

4. **HUMAN RESOURCES**

(1) **Draft Strategy for HR**

The Director of HR introduced the draft HR strategy by explaining that many of the major projects HR had been in the process of implementing had now been completed. The HR
Directorate team had met twice over the summer and the draft HR Strategy was the output of a team effort. It was recognised that the University Strategy was in the process of being developed and the HR Strategy may require some adjustment to ensure it is properly aligned. In the meantime it was considered appropriate to consult with HR’s stakeholders to obtain their input and identify priorities prior to developing HR’s action plan for the forthcoming year.

The Committee considered the draft HR Strategy document to be an excellent and well structured paper. The priorities discussed were attracting, recruiting, retaining and promoting staff. The Director of HR acknowledged that these were high priority items, as was the need to revise and modernise the probationary process. The Committee expressed the view that emphasis had been placed in the document on academic progression and believed there should be clarity about how support staff can fulfil their potential, accepting that opportunities for support staff are determined primarily by vacancies arising. It was important, therefore, that they had access to development opportunities that would allow them to progress their career and this should be reflected in the Organisational and Professional Development section of the HR Strategy. The Director of HR stated that cohort training was being considered for generic groups such as Deans, College Secretaries and School Secretaries. The Committee highlighted the need to create a positive working environment, ensure staff engagement and two-way proactive communication. A comprehensive staff survey encompassing all staff was recommended for the forthcoming year. Clarification was sought about equality & diversity issues arising from search committees. The Director of HR confirmed that advertising would take place but the networks built by particular disciplines can be useful to the recruitment process. The Director of HR commented that Organisational & Professional Development will continue to support the training and development of Contract Research Staff which is considered to be even more essential in the current challenging economic climate when research opportunities may be limited.

The discussion then moved on to the first year’s action plan. The Committee believed that the proposed action plan was overambitious and if the actions were spread over two years there would be created a greater sense of achievement for the HR staff involved rather than objectives being impossible to fulfil over a shorter timescale. It was suggested that the action plan be split into core HR targets and those which required the collaboration of College Staff and other stakeholders. The objective in relation to internationalisation was considered important in order to encourage continuing contact with international staff and the benefits that would accrue to the University as a result of their positive experiences. Research into the industrial practice of exit interviews was recommended to obtain real insight into retention issues. The Director of HR concluded by stating that the items in the HR Strategy could not be driven by HR alone, which was acknowledged by the Committee. The Convener summarised, commending the HR Strategy document and asking that the Director of HR convey to those involved in its development that it was well received and supported by the Committee.

Resolved: to note the draft HR strategy in its current form and the submission of a final version for formal approval in due course.

(2) Statute 16 and Associated policies

The Director of HR reported that Unison and Unite had now agreed the full suite of core HR policies. As required, a Special Resolution to amend Statute 16 had been made by the Court on 2 September 2011. Discussions had taken place regarding expediting the consultation process on the associated policies with DUCU and the Director of HR indicated that 3-4 months was the likely timescale for obtaining DUCU’s input to them. Separate discussions are taking place with DUCU in connection with the type of Court involvement they are seeking in respect of the end of fixed-term contracts and the expiry of fixed-term funding.

Resolved: to note the good progress made to date and the positive involvement of Unison and Unite in the development of the suite of policies.

(3) Concordat

The Director of HR was pleased to report that the University had received an award for HR Excellence in Research from the European Commission. The work had been overseen by Professor D Cantrell and driven in HR by Mrs Gillian Jones and Dr Christine Milburn. Mrs Jones had been presented with the award at the Vitae Conference. The Director of HR
emphasised that, having received the award, it was the role of Principal Investigators across the University to deliver the commitments as the process will be audited in approximately 2 years.

The Concordat Action Plan was presented as part of the solution to addressing the needs of Contract Research Staff as indicated in the draft HR Strategy.

Resolved: (i) to congratulate the staff involved in obtaining the award.

(ii) to note the Concordat Action Plan.

(4) **Generic Skills**

As Generic Skills had been incorporated within Organisational & Professional Development on 1 August 2011, the final reports on Generic Skills’ achievements were submitted to the Committee. Attention was drawn to the Contract Research On-line Survey (CROS) in which the University participated. The CROS survey enabled the results to be benchmarked against other Universities. The Committee commented on the disappointing response rate and discussed options to encourage greater participation. Members agreed that it was essential that prospective research staff were informed accurately about the challenging and demanding nature of research work and future prospects for work in the field of research in the present economic climate.

Resolved: to consider options for engaging research staff in development opportunities to prepare them for the future job market.

5. **EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

(1) **Report from Equality & Diversity Officer**

The Director of HR advised the Committee that the Equality & Diversity Officer would be involved in a major piece of work in preparation for REF 2014. Having previously been involved with the RAE this was not unfamiliar ground but it was essential that equality and diversity matters were given thorough attention in the REF process.

(2) **Equal Pay Audit**

The Committee noted that work had commenced on an Equal Pay Audit. A working group had been created and initial indicators from the reports produced to date showed that there were no major concerns immediately evident. Once the working group had an opportunity to consider the data, the outcome will be referred to the Committee for comment, prior to being published.

Resolved: to note the position.

6. **EARLY DISPUTE RESOLUTION/edr**

The Committee discussed the draft edr Strategy. It was noted that edr was a valuable facility for staff and students, take-up was increasing and usually the outcomes were positive. The main comment made by the Committee was to ensure sufficient attention was given to raising awareness and communication of the service.

Resolved: to note progress.

7. **ORGANISATIONAL & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

The Director of HR highlighted the major workload undertaken by the Organisational & Professional Development team over the summer to create a new development programme encompassing research and personal development and with greater emphasis on management training. The Organisational & Professional Development team was also in the process of introducing an on-line booking system for courses.

Resolved: to note progress.
8. **HEALTH & SAFETY**

The Director of HR reported to the Committee that the University had been awarded the Healthy Working Lives Scheme Bronze Award. It was explained that whilst pleased with the achievement, the process itself had been highly bureaucratic and serious consideration would be given to whether the resources required to attempt the Silver Award could be justified.

**Resolved:** to congratulate Ian Scrugg for the achievement.

9. **ANNUAL REVIEW/HERA MAINTENANCE PROCEDURE**

(1) The Deputy Director of HR advised the Committee that good progress had been made with the 2011 HERA Maintenance Procedure: 7 panels each considered 9 cases and the overall number of submissions were reduced when compared with previous years. The pre-appeal process was ongoing at present prior to the formal appeal panels being constituted.

**Resolved:** to note the outcome of the procedure and the confidence the Committee had in the increasingly streamlined process.

(2) The Director of HR tabled a confidential paper on professorial salary levels by College and according to various protected characteristics. It was explained that it was presented in a particular format to minimise the risk of individuals being identified, in line with Data Protection requirements. Following discussion, members agreed that the data gave broad reassurance in relation to the work of the Remuneration Committee insofar as equal opportunities matters were concerned.