A meeting of the Court was held on Monday 11 June 2012.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (in the Chair), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud, Mr M Arnott, Professor SM Black, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr R Burns, Ms SC Campbell, Mr D Cathcart, Mr J Elliot, Mr M Kendrick, Mr IA Kennedy (President, Students’ Association), Dr J Lowe, Dr H Marriage, Professor GJ Mires, Mr KA Richmond, Mr KAC Swinley, Professor J Taylor, Mr IDM Wright.

In Attendance: Vice Principal & Head of the College of Medicine Dentistry & Nursing; Dean of the School of Nursing & Midwifery (minutes 69-75); University Secretary; Director of Finance; Director of Human Resources; Director of Strategic Planning; Director of External Relations; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; Ms Sheila Krawczyk (Court Member-elect); Ms Sophie Warburton (President, Dundee University Sports Union) (minute 69); and Clerk to Court.

Apologies: Lord Provost, Dr AM Roger, Ms CA Potter, Dr AD Reeves

The Chairman welcomed Ms Sheila Krawczyk to her first meeting of Court, following her election to Court by the non-teaching staff.

69. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SPORTS UNION

The Sports Union President, Ms Sophie Warburton, presented the Union’s annual report. In doing so, she highlighted how the relocation of the Dundee University Sports Union office from the Students’ Association (DUSA) to the Institute of Sport & Exercise (ISE) had been a successful move, and that the Sports Union had benefited from the new relationship with ISE.

Ms Warburton also pointed out a number of milestones during the year, including: the delivery of seven campus sport events, two ‘give it a go’ sessions, the Sports Fayre, a charity relay, and a one-off London 2012 inspired event. She reported that the Sports Union’s relationship with DUSA had continued to grow, with the two bodies working together on a number of projects. Ms Warburton also reported a 21% increase in attendance at training sessions, and a 15% increase in Sports’ Union membership since 2010-11.

Turning to finance matters, Ms Warburton reported that the Sports Union was set to complete the year within budget thanks to fundraising activities, but that it had been a difficult financial year with large expenditures on kit and coaching. As with previous years, transport issues remained of financial and logistical concern to the Union. Ms Warburton asked the University to consider allowing the Sports Union to carry over unspent funds from year to year as a development fund which could be used to offset high equipment costs and vehicle maintenance costs. The University Secretary agreed to investigate options for this request.
Court praised the work of the Union, and reaffirmed its commitment to the importance of sport within the University. Through discussions on the report, members noted that facilities compared well to other Scottish Universities.

The Principal highlighted to Court support from the Senatus Academicus for the Sports Union proposal to keep Wednesday afternoons free from teaching as far as possible.

**The Court decided:** to thank Ms Warburton for her report, congratulate her on a successful year and to wish her well for the future.

### 70. DUNDEE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATION – ANNUAL REPORT

The Court received a report from the President of the Students’ Association (DUSA). He drew to the attention of Court the continuation of the practice of producing a DUSA Executive Manifesto, pulling together the individual election manifestos of the executive members.

The report also set out the major achievements and milestones of the 2011/12 session. Significant events during the year included: the lobbying of the Cabinet Secretary for Education & Life-Long Learning, the Chief Executive of the Scottish Funding Council, and the Principals of the Universities of Dundee and Abertay Dundee with regard to the proposed merger between the Universities; development of a close working relationship with the University of Abertay Student Union Executive; a joint event with the Sports Union to build anticipation for the forthcoming Olympic Games through sporting and cultural activities; and the introduction of a Raising and Giving (RAG) week, which raised over £2,500 for charity.

Turning to financial matters, the President highlighted that DUSA was expected to achieve a surplus for 2011/12, but that the financial situation was subject to year-on-year variation. He commented that the DUSA Executive was working to improve their organisation and professionalism in order to ensure continuity, and that they were seeking to establish a more formal process with the University for determining the annual block grant. The President expressed the importance of long-term financial planning in ensuring that DUSA remained the number one students’ union in Scotland (number 3 in the UK) in the Times Higher Education (THE) Student Experience Survey.

The President informed Court that DUSA had been working with the University to improve the provision of advice and guidance for students. He proposed the creation of a Joint Management Group to coordinate and improve welfare and pastoral care support, and to streamline processes through which decisions relating to pastoral provision were made. The suggestion was welcomed by the University Secretary and members of Court.

The Principal highlighted the importance of the contribution from DUSA in the University being named number one in the THE Student Experience Survey, and confirmed that the working relationship with DUSA had been excellent throughout 2011/12.
During discussions, the President confirmed that DUSA wished to review the Memorandum of Understanding between DUSA and the University over the course of the next session to clarify further the relationship and safeguard the existing good relationship into the future.

**The Court decided:** to thank the President for his report and, moreover, to congratulate him and his executive team on a successful year.

71. **MINUTES**

**The Court decided:** to approve the minutes of the meeting on 23 April 2012.

72. **MATTERS ARISING**

(1) **Update on Outcome Agreements with SFC (Minute 56)**

The Principal informed Court that a meeting had taken place with Professor Paul Hagan from the Scottish Funding Council (SFC), and that the outlined strategy and framework for discussion of the outcome agreement had been received positively. It was, however, expected that discussions would become more challenging as the process continued and the focus turned to target-setting. The Principal told Court that the University had received a lengthy preliminary draft prepared by SFC, which would be discussed at a meeting later that week, and a degree of concern was raised over the level of detail required.

The Principal and the Chairman confirmed to Court that SFC wanted the outcome agreements to be agreed by the end of July 2012. The Principal proposed that, given the nature of such agreements, it was his view that the Court should formally approve the Dundee agreement. He intended to raise this issue with the SFC during an upcoming meeting, with a view to requesting that any agreement reached was ‘in principle’ subject to formal approval of Court at the September retreat. Should this not be acceptable, he proposed that an extraordinary meeting of Court be organised.

Court noted that the SFC would ideally aim in future to have outcome agreements drafted by spring to enable alignment and approval alongside financial and strategic planning elements.

**The Court decided:** to request that the Principal discuss with the SFC options to enable ratification of the agreement by the Court.

(2) **Additional Information on Strategic Aims 1,2, & 3 (Minute 63)**

The Director of Strategic Planning provided supplementary data relating to Key Performance Indicators (KPI) 2 (employability) and 3 (progression rates), with the data presented by College and School as requested by Court at the meeting of Court on 23 April 2012.
Members of Court thanked the Director for the additional information and requested that a contextual narrative be prepared at an early stage which took account of the number of returns completed (regarding employability), comparison with other Universities, and linkages to the underpinning strategies.

Looking to the future, members of Court highlighted the usefulness of the inclusion of a breakdown of KPI 2 & 3 by domicile and RUK fee status.

The Court decided: to look forward to detailed discussions when Learning and Teaching KPIs 1, 2 & 3 were next reported to Court.

73. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

The Chairman updated Court on his activities since the last meeting. With regard to the development of a Scottish Code of University Governance, the Chairman reported that the Cabinet Secretary Mike Russell had been supportive of the initiative, but that he also appeared to remain committed to certain of the recommendations expressed within the report of the Review of Higher Education Governance in Scotland. The Chairman had been asked to participate in the group being assembled to develop the Scottish Code of University Governance, alongside two other Scottish University Chairs, Professor Elish Angiolini (former Lord Advocate) and a student representative in the form of Mr Simon Pepper (former Rector of the University of St Andrews).

The Chairman also reported that he had attended the HEPI annual lecture, which had proved to be an interesting event.

The Chairman highlighted to Court the recommendation from the Governance & Nominations Committee that the review of the effectiveness of the Chairman of Court be postponed until the September retreat due to the lengthy agenda for the June meeting of Court.

The Chairman informed Court that he would be a signatory to a letter from the Committee of Scottish Chairs of Courts (CSC) to the UK Border Agency (UKBA) highlighting the specific difficulties facing Higher Education as a result of UKBA policies.

In turning to his first annual report, the Chairman asked members of Court to comment on the suitability of the report and additional items which they would like to be included in future years. Court members welcomed the report and, noting that this was the first annual report, resolved to submit suggestions for future reports to the Chairman directly, or to the Clerk to Court.

The Court decided: (i) to postpone the annual review of the effectiveness of the Chairman of Court until the September Court Retreat; and

(ii) otherwise, to note the report
74. **PRINCIPAL’S REPORT**

The Court received a report from the Principal. The Principal informed Court that Professor Stephen Decent had been appointed as Vice-Principal & Head of the College of Art, Science & Engineering. Professor Decent was the current Head of the School of Mathematics at the University of Birmingham, and was highly regarded both in his field, and by his Vice-Chancellor. He was expected to arrive at the University at the start of September, and the Principal looked forward to Professor Decent joining the Senior Management Team.

The Principal summarised 2011/12 as a year of transition, where the University reset its standards of excellence, focused on impact, and achieved a positive financial outcome against a very tight budget. He confirmed that as a result of a tough budget-setting round, and the positive settlement from the Scottish Government, the University was in a position to make selective investment in academic staff appointments to support key strategies as discussed at Court in February 2012.

Following the announcement at the last Court meeting that the University had been named ‘best in UK’ in the THE Student Experience Survey, the Principal brought to the attention of Court the recently published Guardian league table where the University had slipped from 23 to 46 in the ratings. This was he said, a stark reminder of the unpredictability of league tables, as well as of the dangers of complacency. Above all, the Principal highlighted to Court the importance of remaining true to the values, core purpose and ambitious goals which drove individual and institutional performance.

The Principal highlighted to members of Court the dates for summer graduation, and encouraged members to attend where possible. He also highlighted the University’s annual lecture on religion, which was this year being delivered by His Holiness the Dalai Lama, noting that this represented a significant honour for the University.

The Principal brought to the attention of Court the award of the first Scottish Dental Lifetime Achievement award to Professor Bill Saunders, and the £14.4m 4-year agreement between the Division of Signal Transduction Therapy and AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, GlaxosmithKline, Janssen Pharmaceutica NV, Merc-Serono and Pfizer. The latter would make the agreement the longest running academic collaboration in the world with the pharmaceutical industry, amounting to around £50m over 18 years.

Court members asked if additional information could be included in future reports to highlight when items reported as having been discussed at Senior Management Team (SMT) meetings were completed.

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

75. **STRATEGIC MATTERS**

(1) **University Vision**

Court received a presentation from the Principal on the new University Vision.
The Principal told Court that the new Vision ‘to transform lives locally and globally through the creation, sharing and application of knowledge’ had resulted from a desire to introduce an inspiring and compelling rationale to underpin the development of future strategies. It represented a modernisation of the principles, precepts and goals that had driven the University’s history since its inception and which had been enshrined in the Charter. It also focused on key attributes and values that had always been central to the institution. He told Court that in considering the mission statement, core purpose, and core values of the University, the new Vision aimed to create an inspiring goal which applied to the whole University - demanding confidence, commitment and focused effort.

The Principal went on to highlight the goal of the new Vision - for the University ‘to become Scotland’s leading University, celebrated internationally for the quality of its graduates and the impact of its research’. The key global challenges identified in the new Vision centred on those areas where the University was able to make the strongest impact, deliver tangible benefits and take the lead on transformational change: the sustainable use of global resources, innovative design that would shape the future and the improvement of social, cultural and physical wellbeing.

Court was wholly supportive of the new Vision, which it felt was compelling. Through discussion, the Principal confirmed that far from precluding partnerships, the goals would require the University to continue to develop strong collaborations, and indeed would raise the desirability of the University as a preferred partner for collaboration.

Court members asked about the strategy for communicating the Vision to all staff members and for engaging them. It was confirmed that a series of events were planned to roll-out the Vision to all Schools and Directorates, and that the new University Strategy (see minute 75(2)) would incorporate the core values - thus ensuring that the roll-out became embedded in all processes from recruitment and induction, to promotion and performance management.

Court members commented that the description of the core values presented had an emphasis on staff, and suggested parallel consideration of how those values related to students and to the city of Dundee.

The Principal highlighted the debate at Senate as to the definition of ‘leading University’ and the manner in which the achievement of this goal would be measured. In response, Court members suggested that the focus should not be about the size of the institution or its financial success, but rather on its academic reputation, impact and transformational role.

The Court decided: to note widespread support for the Vision as presented.

(2) University Strategy

The Director of Strategic Planning introduced papers outlining the strategic process, and the new University Strategy to 2017. The new Strategy provided a plan for the first five years of the journey towards achieving the new
University Vision, defining roles and responsibilities as well as targets. Composed of nine sections, each with an enabling strategy that developed objectives and key performance indicators (KPIs), the Strategy to 2017 complemented the three global challenges of the University Vision.

The nine enabling strategies were grouped into three areas: core activities – Learning and Teaching, Research and Wider Impact; two cross-cutting themes of Internationalisation and Employability, Enterprise and Entrepreneurship; and four enabling themes in the areas of Human Resources, Information, Estate and Financial Sustainability.

The Director reported that more detail concerning the implementation of the Strategy would be developed over the summer but asked that Court approve in principle the new Strategy, and in particular comment upon the role envisaged for Court within it. In response to comments regarding perceived gaps in the KPIs presented, the Director confirmed that this small group of high level key performance indicators would be underpinned by a larger number of performance indicators (PIs) with wider coverage. He also confirmed that the final version of the Strategy to 2017 would contain a preamble which clearly linked the strategy to the Vision (see Minute 75(1)).

Court members commented upon the need to ensure that all KPIs were wherever possible measurable and able to be benchmarked against competitor institutions, and that thought must be given to ensuring that policies, objectives and actions linked the aims to the KPIs. They also commented that the themes from the Vision appeared clearer for research than for learning & teaching, and asked that the Learning & Teaching section be enhanced.

The Court decided: (i) to approve in principle the new University Strategy, subject to the redrafting described; and

(ii) otherwise to confirm that Court was content with the role of Court as envisaged within the Strategy.

(3) Internationalisation Strategy

Professor Margaret Smith (Deputy Principal for Internationalisation and Dean of Nursing & Midwifery) introduced a paper outlining the enabling strategy on internationalisation. In doing so she highlighted initiatives and developments across the University, while outlining the need for a strategic management approach to ensure the sustainable development of internationalisation.

The enabling strategy was supported by four strategic aims: to build Sustainable high-level international partnerships; to bring the world to Dundee; to take Dundee to the world; and to develop and resource the strategy itself.

Professor Smith noted Court members’ desire for the prominence of due diligence and risk assessment to be increased. Court members also highlighted the importance of identifying clear leaders for the implementation
of the strategy at all levels, along with the potential added benefits of encouraging Colleges and Schools to collaborate on international projects.

Professor Smith confirmed that a committee of Senate would oversee internationalisation, and would begin by documenting current activities, best practice and areas for improvement or expansion.

Members of Court commented that the strategy should be linked to the core values of the University, such as equality and freedom of thought and speech, in the form of an ethical engagement policy for the screening of potential partners. Professor Smith confirmed that it was planned that this would be included within the due diligence processes but that in light of comments, she proposed to enhance this area.

The Court decided: (i) to invite Professor Smith to present the finalised strategy, structure and process to Court at a future date;

(ii) to request that officers produce a summary of statistics on current student numbers by fee status; and

(iii) otherwise, to thank Professor Smith for the report.

76. FINANCE MATTERS

(1) Finance & Policy Committee

The Court received a report of the meeting of the Committee on 14 May 2012 (Appendix 2). The Chairman of Court drew members’ attention to the proposal for procurement of a fourth Combined Heat and Power (CHP) engine, a review of the 3% return on income target and the discussions of the Committee relating to the 2012/13 budget and capital plan.

In discussion of the review of the 3% return on income target, the Director of Finance confirmed that the proposal to increase the target from 3% to 6% was achievable, and would be required to maintain the University’s ability to make future investments. The Director provided clarification regarding the revised 6% target, and Court noted that this target represented both a core surplus and a figure for expected discretionary investment within the financial year. The Principal confirmed that, with regard to a proposed review of the sustainability of teaching, financial considerations would constitute only one element of any decision-making process.

The Court decided: (i) to approve the proposal for the procurement of a fourth CHP engine;

(ii) to approve the proposal to increase the target return on income from 3% to 6%; and
(iii) to request a note be circulated with further explanations of annex 2 to the paper on target return of income.

(2) Budget 2012/13

The Director of Finance set out the proposed budget for 2012/13, which had previously been discussed by the Finance & Policy Committee at its meeting on 14 May 2012. The underlying financial performance of the University budgeted for 2012/13 showed improvement over the predicted result for the current year. This had allowed significant investment in new academic posts to be planned for 2012/13 ahead of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) in 2014. Court members noted that the involvement of Schools, Colleges and Directorates in the development of the 2012/13 budget had been extensive.

The Court decided: on the recommendation of the Finance & Policy Committee, to approve the proposed budget for 2012/13.

(3) Strategic Plan Forecast for SFC 2011/12 to 2014/15

The Director of Finance provided a draft of the Strategic Plan Forecast return for submission to the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) at the end of June 2012. In doing so he highlighted to Court that the purpose of the document was to inform the SFC, and that more detailed forecasts would be developed for internal use.

The Court decided: to approve the draft of the Strategic Plan Forecast for submission to the SFC.

77. RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK

The Vice-Principal with responsibility for research introduced the Internal Framework for Engagement with REF 2014 including the Code of Practice on the Selection of Staff. In doing so, he reminded Court of the presentation at the last meeting of Court on 23 April 2012 (Minute 59) which had outlined the background to the Research Excellence Framework (REF), and work carried out so far.

The Vice-Principal confirmed to Court that the paper had been approved by the Research Committee on 10 May 2012, the Human Resources Committee on 21 May 2012, and had been subsequently endorsed to Court by Senate on 30 May 2012. The document had also been circulated to all academics across the University, with eleven responses being received. At each stage of approval, changes were made to the document as appropriate.

The Vice-Principal highlighted that a minimum threshold had been agreed which was uniform across the University, and that the threshold level reflected both the Principal’s emphasis since appointment on excellence, focus and impact, and the move by the SFC to fund only 3* and 4* Research. The Principal drew attention to the Senate report to Court (Minute 81), where a small number of Senate members had expressed views that there should be a variable threshold, no threshold or a lower threshold than advocated in the document. The vast majority of Senate members had,
however, rejected these suggestions, and had endorsed the document for submission by the end of July 2012.

The Director of Human Resources informed Court that the composition of the various groups involved in REF process was currently being examined in terms of equality and diversity. In response to questions, the Vice-Principal advised that the primary criterion for panels would be that members were research active, with the best qualified individuals being selected, but that equality and diversity issues were a significant point of consideration.

The Court decided: to approve the Internal Framework for Engagement with REF 2014, including the Code of Practice on the Selection of Staff, for submission to the REF Equality and Diversity Panel.

78. REMUNERATION COMMITTEE REMIT AND PROCESS

At the meeting of Court on 12 December 2012, the Remuneration Committee proposed a review of its remit and operations. The Committee had subsequently developed a revised remit and process (Appendix 3), consulting with the Human Resources and Governance & Nominations Committees to refine the proposals.

The Court decided: to approve the revised remit and process subject to minor amendment.

79. AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 23 May 2012 (Appendix 4). The Convener highlighted to Court the revised Business Continuity Management Policy and revised Risk Register which included a dynamic commentary and updated risk calculations. He also highlighted the recent internal audits on DUSA, Information Security, Workload Planning and Efficiency Savings.

Court noted that the Audit Committee had also reviewed a report from the panel convened to investigate a health and safety incident which occurred in the Sir James Black Centre on 21 February 2012. The panel had made a number of recommendations, and a management response from Campus Services would be reported to the Audit Committee in September 2012. Members of Court commended the thorough report and investigation and looked forward to future updates via the Committee regarding the implementation of the recommendations. The University Secretary reported that information gathered during the investigation had already been used in health and safety training for Deans and Directors.

The Convener of the Audit Committee highlighted the report of the review of Audit Committee Effectiveness, and he invited comments and questions from Court regarding the process and the recommendations. Court members noted that the review had been a thorough process, and supported the recommendations made. The merit of including an elected member of Court on the Audit Committee as either a member, or in attendance was discussed. It was however noted that the Audit Committee had recently introduced the practice of inviting audit sponsors to attend the meetings where the audits were presented to provide context where appropriate
and to respond formally to audit recommendations. After discussion, Court agreed that the practice of not having an elected member of Court on the Audit Committee should be continued.

The Court decided:  
(i) to approve the revisions to the Business Continuity Management Policy;  
(ii) to approve the revised Risk Management Strategy;  
(iii) to approve the revised Institutional Risk Register;  
(iv) to note the Review of Audit Committee Effectiveness, and to approve the recommendations contained within the report; and  
(v) otherwise, to note the report

80. GOVERNANCE

(1) Governance & Nominations Committee

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Committee on 14 May 2012 (Appendix 5).

The Court received confirmation of its membership for 2012/13 as well as the proposals from the Governance & Nominations Committee relating to the memberships of individual Court Committees. The Chairman noted that unfortunately not all membership preferences could be met due to the need to balance the membership of lay members, elected members and their expertise.

The Chairman drew the attention of Court to the proposal that Mr Ian Ball (Dean of the Graduate School) be appointed as an employer-nominated trustee of the University Superannuation Scheme (UoDSS). Mr Keith Swinley, Chair of the University Superannuation Fund Trustees was supportive of this suggestion.

Court also noted the discussions of the Committee relating to the review of Remuneration Committee remit and process as discussed in minute 78 above, and the recommendation from the Committee that officers begin a recruitment process to replace those Lay members of Court who would complete their terms of office within the next two years.

The Court decided:  
(i) to approve the decision to delay the annual discussion on the performance of the Chairman of Court until the September retreat;  
(ii) to approve the proposed memberships of the Court Committees (Appendix 5 refers);  
(iii) to approve the appointment of Mr Ball as an employer-nominated trustee of the University Superannuation Scheme; and
(iv) otherwise, to note the report

(2) Emergency Committee

The Court decided: in accordance with accepted precedent, to remit the transaction of any urgent Court business over the summer to an Emergency Committee, comprising the Principal or a Vice-Principal (Convener), two lay members (normally the Chairman of Court and the Convener of the Finance & Policy Committee) and one other academic member; the precise composition would be subject to availability. A report on any action taken would be submitted to the first business meeting of 2012/13.

(3) Non-Teaching Staff Election

Court noted the election of Ms Sheila Krawczyk to Court by the non-teaching staff. Ms Krawczyk’s period of office on Court would be 1 August 2012 to 31 July 2016.

81. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS

The Court received a report of a meeting of the Senate on 30 May 2012 (Appendix 6). The Chairman drew the attention of Court to the discussions at Senate on the University Vision, University Strategy, Internal Framework for Engagement with REF 2014, including the Code of Practice on the Selection of Staff, and the policy on Wednesday afternoon teaching and sport.

The Court decided: (i) to approve the recommendations concerning the conferment of the title of Professor Emeritus; and

(ii) otherwise, to note the report

82. HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Court received a report from the meeting of the Human Resources Committee on 21 May 2012 (Appendix 7). Court noted the changes to the University Health & Safety Policy.

The Court decided: to note the report

83. STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK – BENCHMARKING REPORT

The Court received a report from the Director of Strategic Planning, which set out the University’s performance across a selection of performance indicators in comparison with a number of other universities. There had been little change in areas relating to teaching and learning, and despite absolute improvements in entrance standards and graduate employment these remained in many cases behind the comparator group.
There was improvement in research and commercialisation indicators, and efficiency in support services continued to be at a high level by the measures used. The quality of buildings and efficiency of space usage was shown to be improving relatively, however both indicators were noted to show scope for absolute improvement.

**The Court decided:** to note the trends identified through the report.

84. **UPDATE ON STUDENT RECRUITMENT**

A paper was provided by the Director of Student Operations updating Court on undergraduate application numbers for 2012/13. Information on awards from bursary and scholarship schemes and applications to the new three-year degree programme was also provided.

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

85. **STAFF**

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

The Court noted the appointment of the following:

Graeme Martin  Chair in Management  20 August 2012

(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 John Connell (Convener)
Ms Christina Potter (Lay Court Member)
Professor Carol MacKintosh (Senate Nominee)

86. **DATES OF MEETINGS IN 2012/13**

The Court received a paper outlining dates of meetings of the Committees of Court for 2012/13.

**The Court decided:** to note the dates contained within the paper.

87. **ENDOWMENT RESOLUTIONS**

Court received a paper outlining proposed changes to a number of endowments to enable expenditure from bequests which had seen little or no expenditure for some years. In each case the changes involved broadening the original terms to ensure that
better use could be made of the available funds while retaining the original spirit of the award.

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

88. **FAREWELLS**

The Chairman paid tribute to the work of Mr Cathcart and Mr Kendrick who had reached the end of their terms of office. The Chairman noted the significant contributions made by both during their time on Court in representing the non-teaching staff and students respectively, and he wished them well in their future endeavours.

89. **CONDOLENCES**

The Court formally learnt of the death in early May of its former member Lt Col. Denis Naulty. Court members asked that their condolences be passed on to his family.
APPENDIX 1

PRINCIPAL’S REPORT
(Minute 74)

Round–up

As is often the case at the June meeting of Court, we have a mighty agenda with some meaty issues: University Vision and Strategy; the 2012/13 budget; the Code of Practice for the REF; Remuneration Committee remit and more, and so it would be wrong of me to take up too much time here with additional issues.

We can take some pride in our achievements in 2011/12, with a positive financial out-turn against a very tight budget. We had to take tough decisions, around investment and capital expenditure, but these will provide the basis for the University’s continuing growth as an institution of excellence in research and teaching, and in the background we have been developing a positive vision for the future which we will be discussing later in the agenda.

The budget-setting round was perhaps a little tougher than might have been imagined given the positive settlement from the Scottish Government, and as a result next year’s budget is a tight one, without much room for manoeuvre, but the investments highlighted at the previous meeting, along with the work to create the headroom to enable it, will mean the recruitment of 55 new academic staff ranging from lecturers to professors across the University’s research strengths, and these appointments will help to ensure that we are in the best possible position in terms of 3* and 4* research as we approach the REF. The success of this strategy will be seen not just through theREF but also in the academic and financial contributions these new staff can bring to the University, and we have already undertaken not to recruit where we do not believe that applicants come with the requisite levels of excellence. These investments will be crucial if we are to begin the journey towards the new University vision. Alongside all of this, we have also managed to maintain a solid performance in research funding grants, perhaps against expectation, given the difficult economic situation.

At our last meeting you heard that the University had come top in the Times Higher Education Student Experience Survey. But the publication recently of the Guardian’s league table in which we have slipped from 26 to 43, is a stark reminder of the vagaries and unpredictability of league tables like this, and also of the danger of complacency, although there were individual disciplines, such as civil engineering, medicine and pharmacology, which were placed in the top ten. It is also a mistake to place the importance of league tables above our enduring values, core purposes and ambitious academic goals as drivers of both individual and institutional performance.

Graduation

Our annual summer graduation ceremonies take place in the week after the Court meeting. Not only will we be celebrating the achievements of our graduands, at undergraduate and postgraduate level across the University, but we will also be conferring degrees on a host of deserving honorary graduands: Former Director of the V&A Sir Mark Jones; celebrates pianist Murray McLachlan; renowned South African human rights lawyer Albie Sachs; record breaking long-distance cyclist Mark Beaumont; and, as you can see from the table below, an impressive array of scientists, medics and clinicians, including our former Deputy Principal Professor Peter Howie.

I do hope as many of you as possible will be able to join me at one or more of the ceremonies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Honorary Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Tues 19 June</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>DoJ College of Art and Design</td>
<td>Sir Mark Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering, Physics and Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm Tues 19 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am Wed 20 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Business Environment Graduate School</td>
<td>Murray McLachlan Mark Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm Wed 20 June</td>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Education, Social Work &amp; Community Education Education Law</td>
<td>Albie Sachs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am Thurs 21 June</td>
<td>CMDN CLS</td>
<td>Nursing &amp; Midwifery Life Sciences Teaching and Research</td>
<td>Prof Ann Marie Rafferty Dr Bernard Pecoul Prof Iain Mattaj Dr Malcolm Skingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm Thurs 21 June</td>
<td>CMDN</td>
<td>Dentistry Medicine</td>
<td>Prof Stephen O’Rahilly Prof Peter Boyle Prof Peter Howie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It only remains for me to wish you all a very pleasant summer.

Professor Pete Downes  
Principal & Vice Chancellor
Senior Management Team Meetings (SMT)
http://www.somis.dundee.ac.uk/Court/smt/welcome.htm

Since the last report to the Court, the Senior Management team has met as follows: 18 April; and 9 and 23 May 2012; it considered a number of issues, including the following:

- University’s Vision and the Strategy to 2017
- Budget 2012-13
- Collaboration between the Schools of Law, Business and Natural Resources, Law, Policy & Management
- Appointment Process of VP and Head of CASE and Dean of EPM
- Research Excellence Framework and Code of Practice
- ESWCE and Greek School Collaboration
- PG Degrees Governance Arrangements
- Health & Safety Internal Audit Report
- The Wilson Review on Business/University Collaboration
- Innovation Centres – Scottish Funding Council
- Offshore Renewables
- Arrangements for a Robot Exhibition and the Dundee Science Centre
- Research Grants and Contracts Performance
- UK Borders Agency
- Management Accounts
- Human Resources Issues:
  - National Pay Negotiations
  - Remuneration Committee remit
  - Review Procedure for Probationary Lecturers
  - Objective-setting and Review
  - Voluntary Severance cases
  - Honorary Professorships
Annex B

Major Grants and Awards

- £14.4m collectively from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen Pharmaceutica NV, Merc-Serono and Pfizer to the Division of Signal Transduction Therapy
- £0.9m from the NHS National Institute for Health Research to Dr Miles Witham for ‘Does Oral Sodium Bicarbonate Therapy Improve Function and Quality of Life in Older Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease and Low-grade Acidosis?’ A Multicentre Randomized Controlled Trial (Joint with Aberdeen, Kings College and NHS Dumfries and Galloway)

Annex C

People and Prizes

- Dr David Robb (English) and Dr Linda Morrise (Life Sciences Learning & Teaching) have been named winners of the Chancellor’s Awards for Lifetime Contribution to Teaching
- Lynne Boyle (ESWCE) and Christine Kingsley (DJCAD) have been named joint winners of the Senate Award for Excellence in Teaching
- Honorary Graduates’ Awards have been conferred on:

  Honorary Graduates’ Award for Innovative Teaching
  Dr Neil Burford & Joseph Thurrott, SES (Architecture), CASS
  Maureen Campbell & Gillian Howatson, Nursing & Midwifery, CMDN

  Honorary Graduates’ Award for Inclusive Practice
  Angela Dunsire, CEPMLP, CASS

  Honorary Graduates’ Award for Academic Practice
  Dr Jon Dowell & Adrian Husbands, Medicine, CMDN

- The University was named as number one in the UK in the recent Times Higher Education Student Experience Survey
- Arthur Watson (Senior Lecturer, DJCAD) has been elected President of the Royal Scottish Academy of Art & Architecture
- Professors Julian Blow and Dario Alessi (both in the College of Life Sciences) have been elected Fellows of the Academy of Medical Science
- The winner of the Dundee Graduate Skills Award 2012 has been announced as Julia Wiles, a 5th year student, studying Medicine
- Luke Fowler, a graduate of DJCAD, has been nominated for the Turner Prize 2012
- Professor Bill Saunders has received the first ever Scottish Dental Lifetime Achievement Award, nominated and votes on by fellow dental professionals
- Madeline Mackay, a graduand of Fine Art at DJCAD, has won the top prize in the Young and Wild Category at the 2012 David shepherd Wildlife Foundations’ Wildlife Artist of the Year competition.
APPENDIX 2

FINANCE & POLICY COMMITTEE
(Minute 76(1))

A meeting of the Committee was held on 14 May 2012.

Present: Mr R Burns (Convener), Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor SM Black, 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, Director of Finance, Director of Strategic Planning, Director of Campus Services, Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs and Mr PBP Copeland.

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 26 March 2012.

2. ESTATES & BUILDINGS

(1) Estates & Buildings Report

The Director of Campus Services presented a routine report setting out current estates business of interest to the Committee as well as progress on capital projects. He highlighted that work was in progress with Colleges on increasing awareness of energy efficiency initiatives and also that it was hoped that energy meters would be installed in most buildings by August 2012.

On capital projects, he noted that sufficient funding was in place for phase 3 of the Ninewells teaching accommodation refurbishment to allow progress to the design phase for Lecture Theatre 1. Work was also progressing on Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art & Design, with work on phases 1 and 2 expected to be completed during the summer, before work on phase 3 could begin. The refurbishment of the Centre for Anatomy & Human Identification was now fully complete, and tenders had been received for the Centre for Translational & Interdisciplinary Research and discussions were in train with the preferred bidder.

Resolved: to endorse the strategy.

(2) University Strategy to 2017 – Supporting Strategy: Estate

The Director of Campus Services presented a draft of the proposed estates section of the developing University Strategy. The previous Estates Strategy, which was approved by Court in 2008, had focused on the growth and development of the campus. The new strategy was more focused on consolidation and the best use of the buildings and facilities that the University had. The strategy would also be geared more explicitly to supporting the achievement of the University’s academic goals. There was in addition a focus on reducing the University’s carbon footprint.

In discussion, it was noted that in general in approving capital requests, there was a tendency to think first about the build costs and only later of the consequences of any additional running costs for the University. The Committee discussed in brief the principles which should underpin any mechanism to include a space charging element in budgets: it was essential that some incentivisation was built into any such mechanism.

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 26 March 2012.

(3) Increasing Combined Heat & Power (CHP) Capacity

The Director of Campus Services and Mr Copeland presented a proposal to install a 4th CHP engine in the existing facility, originally set up in 1996. The University’s heat and power requirements were considerable and there was concern that the existing facility could not deliver the required power, particularly in the face of new buildings coming on stream. To meet this demand and to avoid having to import power from the national grid and, more importantly, to remain beneath the threshold for the Climate Change Levy (or ‘carbon tax’), officers strongly supported the proposal. The total projected cost of the proposal was £1.3m,
but under a range of scenarios set out in the proposals, this cost was expected to be recouped through savings on fuel costs within 3 years. Without the 4th engine it was expected that the University could additionally face a Climate Change Levy of up to £400k. If approved, the proposal would see the new engine become the lead engine so that refurbishment of the existing three engines could take place at a cost of £300k. The proposal would also see the University purchase the new engine outright through Dundee University Utility Supply Company Ltd (DUUSCO).

Resolved: to recommend to Court that it approve the proposals.

3. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS – PERIOD 8

The Committee received the management accounts for the period to the end of March 2012. In comparison to period 7, there was little change to the figures and the year-end forecast was steady at £2.2m. The Director of Finance reported that the year-end figure was expected to be around £1.1m higher than forecast as a result of the release of a provision related to EU exchange rates.

Resolved: to note the accounts.

4. REVIEW OF 3% RETURN ON INCOME TARGET

The Director of Finance presented a paper which set out the rationale for the University’s reconsidering its optimum target return on income (or surplus). For a number of years this had been set as 3% of income, but it was clear in the current environment and in the face, in particular, of dwindling public capital funding that this was insufficient if the University was both to maintain and invest in a healthy academic community and the physical assets to facilitate and support that community, and that as a result a target of 6% was more realistic. The paper provided a summary of performance at other institutions where larger surpluses had been achieved, and it also set out areas of activity, for instance in the delivery of teaching provision, that appeared on the face of it to be less efficient than at comparator institutions.

The Committee welcomed the paper as a clear explanation of the need to generate funds for investment, although it was acknowledged that it would be difficult to achieve the 6% return that was proposed. Some members wondered whether the increased target was simply unachievable, but it was generally accepted that if the University was going to make the required investments in staff and infrastructure, a return on income of this magnitude was necessary.

It was noted that investments made as a result of the proposals would need to be monitored carefully to ensure they brought the required returns. It was also made clear that, if there was evidence that progress was being made on the achievement of the target, then investments could be made using the loan facilities available to the University, in the full knowledge that the positive financial trajectory would be able to cover the costs at a later date.

The Committee was broadly supportive of the proposals and endorsed the commitment to create headroom for investment, whilst at the same time understanding the significant challenge presented. Thinking would be taken forward by the Senior Management Team during the summer.

Resolved: to endorse to Court the proposals set out in the paper.

5. BUDGET 2012/12 & CAPITAL PLAN

The Director of Finance set out the proposals for the 2012/13 budget including plans for capital expenditure. The budget had been agreed through a series of meetings with College and SASS teams and endorsed by the Senior Management Team at its meeting on 9 May 2012. One of the main features of the budget was the significant investment being proposed in new academic roles at a cost of £2.1m.

The Committee noted that the capital expenditure plans included two additional projects: refurbishment of the library, including the move of the Law library, and the installation of a 4th Combined Heat and Power Engine, as discussed elsewhere on the agenda.

The Director set out the risks in the budget. In prior years there had been a significant degree of cautious under-budgeting, allowing the University to post positive variances in previous years against the budget forecast. The danger with this was that it could create a false sense of security, especially...
when the economic climate was less certain. With the 2012/13 budget there had been a conscious effort
to reduce this as much as possible and provide a more accurate, although still prudent, budget.

Resolved: to endorse the budget to Court for approval.

6. THREE-YEAR FORECASTS FOR THE SCOTTISH FUNDING COUNCIL (SFC)

The Committee received an outline of the projections and underlying assumptions for the annual three-
year forecasts for submission to the SFC. There was discussion around some of the assumptions which
had been used particularly in the likely trend in staff costs over the period.

Resolved: to request the Director of Finance to rework the forecast to reflect different
assumptions on the trend in staff costs.

7. SIX-MONTH ACCOUNTS FOR DUNDEE STUDENT VILLAGES LTD

The Committee received a routine report on the financial performance of Dundee Student Villages (DSV)
and its subsidiary, West Park Conference Centre (WPCC). The Director of Finance introduced the
report, remarking on the 100% occupancy rate achieved by DSV for the fourth year in a row. Rents
continued to be increased annually in line with the October rate of the retail prices index (RPI) plus 1%.
It was noted that, particularly in the current climate, it was necessary to benchmark this increase against
the local market to ensure DSV was not out of line with other providers.

The report showed once again that WPCC’s performance was disappointing. Total turnover for the year
was unlikely to surpass the previous year’s figure of £1m, and thus would be £0.4m less than budget.
Despite this there was some good news in that a large summer school looked likely to use WPCC this
year. The performance of WPCC would continue to be monitored closely by DSV.

The Director reported on Governance changes for DSV. Following the resignation of the two directors of
DSV appointed by the Bank of Scotland, the remaining directors (two each from Sanctuary Housing and
the University) had decided to appoint a fifth independent director. The Committee advised that this
arrangement should be monitored carefully.

Resolved: to note the report.

8. PROCUREMENT REPORT

The Committee considered the annual procurement report. The importance of completing the roll out of
PECOS to all parts of the University was emphasised as a priority action.

Resolved: to note the report.

9. ENDOWMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE

The Convener provided the Committee with an oral report from the Sub-Committee meeting which had
taken place earlier that morning. The value of investments had increased by £1m to around £15m, but
the return on the portfolio over both six months and one year were poorer than the benchmark, although
the return on equities was slightly better. Nevertheless, in the Sub-Committee’s view there was no cause
for concern at the moment.

Resolved: to note the oral update and await the full report in due course.
APPENDIX 3

REMUNERATION COMMITTEE REMIT AND PROCESS
(Minute 78)

Introduction

1 The Remuneration Committee has undertaken a review of its remit and operations over the course of the current session. This paper sets out the findings of that review and makes proposals for the future operation of the Committee, which have been refined by the Committee itself and the Governance & Nominations Committee and HR Committee at their most recent meetings.

2 The proposals are now submitted to Court for discussion and approval if Court is so minded.

Context

3 The Scottish Funding Council (SFC) requires that the University follows the principles of the Financial Reporting Council’s UK Corporate Governance Code (FRC Code), insofar as they apply to the University sector. The University is also required to follow the guidance to institutions set out by the Committee of University Chairs in its Guide for Members of Higher Education Bodies in the UK (CUC Guide).

4 Both those guides require the University to establish a Remuneration Committee to determine and review the salaries, terms and conditions (and, where appropriate, severance payments) of the head of the institution and such other members of staff as the governing body deems appropriate. They also emphasise that the composition of the Committee should be of independent/lay members, with best practice suggesting that the Chairman of the governing body should not chair the Committee.

5 The CUC Guide states that the reports of the Remuneration Committee to the governing body should provide sufficient detail of the broad criteria and policies against which decisions have been made. However, the FRC Code requires the production of a tabulated report setting out Directors’ remuneration, covering salary, severance payments, benefits in kind, pension contributions and individual pension fund valuations. For private companies, the regulations require that the report is published in the company’s annual report and is subject to an advisory vote at the annual meeting.

6 The SFC imposes specific requirements on Remuneration Committees in respect of setting policy statements on severance and overseeing severance arrangements. The SFC annual accounts direction also gives guidance on what information should be disclosed in an institution’s annual financial statements about the Principal’s remuneration and any severance payments made to staff earning over £70,000 per annum.

Current Position

7 The current remit of the Remuneration Committee is: ‘To review on behalf of Court the remuneration of professorial and equivalent staff and the Principal’. Court’s Schedule of Delegation sets out the Committee’s authority as follows:

- To define salary increases for professorial and equivalent academic-related staff, including the Principal;
- To determine early retirement and voluntary severance terms for members of staff, except the Principal;
- To approve exceptional removal & other expenses where the amount is greater than £5k;
- To determine maximum levels of management responsibility payments for Deans and Associate Deans (or equivalent).

8 Currently, the Remuneration Committee approves salary increases for the appropriate categories of staff, in relation to which it has available a range of information including sophisticated sector-wide benchmarking information from UCEA. It also undertakes a consideration of equality issues. In terms of process, the Heads of College and University Secretary put recommendations to the Committee regarding salary increases for senior staff for whom they have responsibility, with the Principal making recommendations in respect of the Heads of College/University Secretary and the Chairman doing so in relation to the Principal.
9 In practice, the Committee relies heavily on the understanding of the Heads of College and University Secretary in relation to their areas of responsibility, and the input of the Principal, as members have insufficient knowledge or familiarity with many of the staff concerned. The focus of the Committee has therefore been on ensuring the fairness and consistency of the process and analysing the outcomes to ensure equality. However, in relation to members of the Senior Management Team and key professorial staff, the Committee is much better placed to be able to comment directly on performance.

The case for change

10 For the foreseeable future, the remuneration of senior staff in both the public and private sectors will undoubtedly remain under political and public scrutiny; and the pay of the Principal and senior staff will always be likely to be a sensitive issue both within the University and externally. The recent review of Higher Education Governance noted ‘...it has been suggested that the processes for determining (remuneration) have not been transparent or robust...’ and recommended that no further pay awards be made to Principals until the processes had been reviewed.

11 The Remuneration Committee has not been reviewed for some time, during which there has been an expansion in the number of staff (mainly professors) whose remuneration falls within the remit of the Committee.

Proposals

The Role of the University Court

12 While Court has the ultimate responsibility and accountability for the remuneration of the Principal and other senior staff falling within the purview of the Remuneration Committee, it has formally delegated authority to the Remuneration Committee through its Schedule of Delegation and Decision-making. It is suggested that this approach remains appropriate.

13 It is proposed that the decisions made by the Remuneration Committee should continue to be reported to Court in general terms insofar as the core professoriate and SASS Directors are concerned, but with some enhancements to the level of reporting to provide greater transparency around the numbers of staff receiving awards and the range of levels of award made. However, details of individual cases and awards should continue to remain confidential to the Remuneration Committee.

14 Given the increased scrutiny paid towards the most senior managers/directors in universities and other public and private sector bodies, and the fact that disclosure of their remuneration in organisational annual reports is becoming commonplace, it is proposed that a ‘Remuneration Report’ is produced annually for scrutiny by the Court. This would provide, in a transparent manner, details of the salaries and other appropriate remuneration information relating to the individuals holding the following roles:

- Principal & Vice-Chancellor
- Heads of College & Vice-Principal
- University Secretary
- Director of Finance

15 The format of the report would be in line with the requirements of the UK Code and it would be considered by the Remuneration Committee and the Governance & Nominations Committee before being submitted to Court. Given that there is currently no requirement for universities to publish such information, it is proposed that this report should at present remain confidential to members of Court.

Scope of the Remuneration Committee

16 The Remuneration Committee should continue to approve salary increases for all professorial and equivalently graded staff, including the Principal. No member of staff should be considered for an award unless their performance has been reviewed through participation in the University’s Objective-Setting & Review process.

17 Consideration should be given over the course of session 2012/2013 to the introduction of revised arrangements for professorial and senior SASS salaries below the level of Heads of College and University Secretary in line with emerging practice across the sector (see paragraph 25).

18 Feedback suggests that some staff in these categories remain uncertain about the current process and feel it lacks transparency. The current process is available on the University website and is attached as annex. It is
proposed that this be reviewed by the Remuneration Committee prior to the next remuneration round and then widely communicated.

**Budget**

19 The financial parameters and general context under which the Remuneration Committee is required to operate should be considered each year by the Finance & Policy Committee as part of the annual budget discussions, with subsequent recommendations being made to Court for approval.

**Composition**

20 The Remuneration Committee should be made up of lay members of Court only. However, the Governance & Nominations Committee, in making its recommendations on committee membership to Court, should take into full account the necessary skills balance and equality issues when considering an appropriate membership. In particular, it should ensure that at least one member of the Committee has significant public sector knowledge and experience. The Chair of the Remuneration Committee should be a lay member of Court other than the Chairman of Court and the Committee should meet at least once each year.

21 The quorum for the Committee should be three out of the four members and it should normally undertake all of its business through formal meetings rather than by circulation or teleconference.

**Proposed Remuneration Committee Policy**

22 The University aims to ensure that, within prevailing financial and managerial constraints, the remuneration of staff in the professorial grades reflects the need to recruit, reward and retain staff who will lead, shape and sustain its achievements in teaching and research. Equally, it is committed to ensuring that the same considerations underlie pay practice for staff in the professorial equivalent (academic related) grades who fulfill the key professional specialisms and support roles which are essential to enable that academic effort to succeed.

23 The following key principles support these policy objectives:

- The need to establish and maintain competitive pay levels and ranges which provide the capacity both to recruit effectively and reward appropriately;
- The desire to avoid paying more than is necessary for the purpose of attracting, retaining and motivating senior staff of the required quality;
- The absolute requirement for fairness and equality of opportunity.
- That decisions about individuals’ salary progression should reflect an awareness of personal worth and a reflection of institutional values;
- The need to be sensitive to pay and employment conditions elsewhere in the University when determining salary increases;
- A commitment to providing staff with appropriate and transparent information about both policy and process in respect of remuneration;
- The requirement for a strong link between performance and the OSAR process, which must be evidenced in recommendations coming forward to the Committee;
- That all decisions in relation to awarding remuneration to staff to compensate for changes in personal tax status are reserved to the Court.

**Suggested Remit of the Remuneration Committee**

24 It is proposed that the remit of the Committee should be amended to read as follows:

- To ensure that the performance of the Principal, as head of the University, is assessed on an annual basis by means of a review annually by the Chair of Court using the University’s Objective-Setting & Review process.
- To approve salary increases for professorial and equivalently graded academic-related members of staff, including the Principal.

- To take an overview of requests for salary increases recommended by each College and SASS, which shall include consideration of amounts being awarded and equality issues particularly in relation to gender and other protected characteristics. The purpose of this and any other analyses will be to ensure that the Committee can assure itself and the Court of the fairness and consistency of the process and its outcomes.

- To benchmark where to position the University and individual roles relative to other institutions, paying particular attention to information provided by the UCEA senior salary survey, but to use such comparisons with caution in view of the risk of an upward ratchet in remuneration levels;

- To recommend to Court a University policy on senior staff severance that sets out general principles regarding all severance packages; and, if required, to approve under delegated authority early retirement or severance terms for the Principal, Vice-Principals, University Secretary or Director of Finance within clear boundaries determined by that policy.

- To consider any requests by senior staff to undertake consultancy, other paid work or serve as a non-executive director or similar where remuneration exceeds £5,000 per annum, and in any instances relating to the senior management team; and to have due regard to issues of the time demands, remuneration and possible impact on reputation associated with such activities when reaching a decision.

- To approve exceptional removal and other expenses where the amount is greater that £10,000.

- To determine maximum levels of management responsibility payments for Deans, Associate Deans and Deputy Principals.

- To maintain an overview of emerging and best practice in relation to remuneration policy and practice in higher education, and the public and private sectors more generally, so as to be able to make recommendations to the Governance & Nominations Committee and the Court on future enhancements to the University’s approach to senior staff remuneration.

**Future Developments**

25 Across the sector a number of institutions have introduced a more structured system of pay banding for professorial and senior administrative staff. UCEA is currently undertaking a review of these emerging systems and will publish a report on them in the near future. It is proposed that the Remuneration Committee keeps this issue under review over the course of the next session.

**Recommendation**

26 The Court is invited to discuss the proposals set out in this paper and, if so minded, formally approve them for implementation.
Policy Statement

The University aims to ensure that, within prevailing financial and managerial constraints, the remuneration of staff in the professorial grades reflects the need to recruit, reward and retain staff who will lead, shape and sustain its achievements in teaching and research. Equally, it is committed to ensuring that the same considerations underlie pay practice for staff in the professorial equivalent (academic related) grades who fulfill the key professional specialists and support roles which are essential to enable that academic effort to succeed.

The following key principles support these policy objectives:

1. The need to establish and maintain competitive pay levels and ranges which provide the capacity both to recruit effectively and reward appropriately.
2. That the decisions about individuals’ salary progression would reflect an awareness of personal worth and a reflection of institutional values.
3. A commitment to providing staff with appropriate information about both policy and process in respect of remuneration.
4. A commitment to fairness and equality of opportunity.

Equal Opportunities Employment Policy

To become an Equal Opportunities organisation, the University will promote equality of opportunity in the recruitment, promotion, appraisal, education, training and development of its staff and students and otherwise treat them on the basis of their relative merits and abilities (extract from University’s General Policy Statement on Equal Opportunities). This also requires that no members of staff will receive less favourable treatment on the grounds of the part-time status of their job.

Timetable for the Annual Review of Professorial Salaries and Equivalent Academic Related Grades

Each year, paperwork will be distributed to all staff coming under the annual review process.

The Remuneration Committee will meet each year, sometime during the first semester, and any increases awarded to staff will be effective from 1 October of the same year. A report from the Remuneration Committee will go to the immediately following meeting of Court.

Procedure

The Remuneration Committee will review all professorial and equivalent academic related grades annually. The Director of Human Resources will administer the review process. As part of the decision making process a form, as outlined in Annex 1, will be completed as follows:

- The Deans will complete a form for each professorial member of staff in their School to be considered for a review of salary, which will then be forwarded to the Vice Principal and Head of College.
- The Vice Principal and Head of College will complete a form for each of the Deans in the College to be considered for a review of salary.
- The University Secretary will do likewise for academic related grade 10 staff.
- The Principal will complete forms for the Vice Principals and Heads of College, the University Secretary and the Finance Director.
- The Chairman of Court will be asked to consider the salary level of the Principal and to advise the Committee accordingly.

The Principal reserves the right to identify individuals for recognition who have not been recommended by their Dean, Vice Principal and Head of College or the Secretary.
As the policy statement indicates, the Committee’s decisions are intended to reflect a balanced view of individual performance and contribution to the Unit/School/College/University. In attempting to achieve this balance, the following factors are among those to be considered:-

**Individual Performance**

Areas requiring the evaluation of individual distinction in his/her academic discipline in which some of the following indicators may be relevant:-

- Internal contribution in the form of especially effective leadership of successful research groups or, administrative units, effective leadership of teaching or quality initiatives, generation of research or other income.
- External recognition in the form of membership of learned societies and distinguished bodies, etc. or other honours eg honorary degrees, FRS, FBA, FRSE, Feng., etc.
- Academic distinction in the form of publications, lectures to external bodies, some forms of external appointments, etc.

**Contribution to Unit/School/College**

Areas relating to individual contribution to his/her Unit/School/College in which distinguished, high quality contributions in some of the following ways may be examples of indicators:-

- Effective leadership of a Unit/School/College.
- Outstanding contribution to College wide initiatives or goals.

**Institutional Contributions**

Areas relating to individual contribution to institutional goals in which distinguished, high quality contributions in some of the following ways may be examples of indicators:-

- Managerial leadership, especially in difficult areas or circumstances.
- Convenerhip of, or contributions to, University of Dundee committees or groups.
- Leadership of or contribution to cross College or University wide initiatives or goals.

The forms will be returned to the Director of Human Resources.

All members of professorial and academic related staff, who receive a salary increase as a result of the review, will be informed of this in writing.
Annex 1

Review of Professorial and Academic-Related Equivalent Staff

Dean’s/Vice Principal and Head of College’s/Secretary’s Report

Name: .................................................................................. School/Directorate: ……………………………………………

Current Salary: ..............................................................

Individual Performance

Contribution to /School/College/Directorate

Institutional Contributions

Dean’s/VP & HoC’s/Secretary’s Signature: .......................................................... Date: ..........................................

Principal’s Comments
APPENDIX 4
AUDIT COMMITTEE
(Minute 79)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 23 May 2012.

Present: Dr H Marriage (Convener), Mr JE Barnett, Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr J Elliot, Mr I Stewart,

In Attendance: University Secretary, Director of Finance, Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, Director of Human Resources (items 4(1), 4(3),4(5) and 9), Director of Information Services (item 4(2)), Director of Student Operations (item 4(1) and 4(5)), Mr M Reid (PricewaterhouseCoopers), Mr S Reid (KPMG), Mr G Scott (KPMG) (item 4(1)), Ms A Taylor (KPMG), Mr M Timar (PricewaterhouseCoopers) and Clerk to Court

Apologies: Mr R Burns, Mr KAC Swinley

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 6 March 2012;

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Dundee University Press Ltd (DUP) (Minute 2(1))

The Director of Finance updated the Committee on the previously noted book deal. Negotiations were continuing, however the agreement would now be on a commission basis and as a result was likely to be less lucrative than originally predicted. He also confirmed that DUP was reviewing its current staffing.

Resolved: to request further updates at future meetings of the Audit Committee.

(2) Incident at Knockhill Racing Circuit (Minute 4)

The University Secretary informed the Committee that Fife Council had met with the Procurator Fiscal, and that the car had been returned. No additional information was available regarding the likelihood of further action, but an update would be provided once the outcome was known.

Resolved: to await a further update at the next meeting of the Audit Committee

3. EXTERNAL AUDIT PLAN 2011/12

The Committee received a paper from the University’s external auditors outlining the approach to be taken in carrying out the audit for the year ending 31 July 2012. In it the auditors set out the focus areas and materiality thresholds as well as explaining recent legislation and accounting developments which might have an effect on the audit work in future.

The external auditors went on to highlight their expectations in terms of the Committee’s awareness of issues of fraud. It was expected that a fraud risk assessment, an anti-fraud programme (including whistleblowing) and a report of the extent of potential and investigated cases of fraud should be reviewed by the Audit Committee. Members indicated that they would welcome additional updates on any incidents uncovered.

The external auditors also circulated a paper outlining current questions for Higher Education Audit Committees, highlighting in particular issues around international activity.

Resolved: (i) to request that officers look to develop an update report on incidents of potential fraud; and

(ii) otherwise to endorse the plan
4. INTERNAL AUDIT

The internal auditors presented a series of reports as outlined below.

(1) **Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA)**

The auditors presented their annual audit of the Dundee University Students’ Association (DUSA). The audit had focussed on DUSA’s commercial activities, with four moderate risk recommendations being made in the following areas: the capacity of DUSA to conduct external events, the implementation of the full capabilities of the external stock counter system, potential for growth in the area of media based revenue, and communication of financial forecasting analysis to the Board. The Committee noted the importance of DUSA moving from a one-year focus to a longer-term financial strategy.

Resolved: to note the report.

(2) **Information Security**

Mr George Scott (KPMG) presented the internal audit report into Information Security. The objective of the audit had been to identify and test University-wide information management and data security arrangements, including consideration of how sensitive data was managed and used. A high level assessment considering requirements against each of the eleven domains of the International Security Standard (ISO 27001) was performed, and the results were used as a guide. Five high risk and two moderate risk recommendations were made. The high risk recommendations related to: the provision of an overarching information security policy, of adequate governance processes to ensure risks were managed effectively and consistently, the need to improve University-wide training and awareness of information security risks, issues pertaining to the formal risk assessment of the Data Warehouse project and institutional level policies on information security - leading to the risk that sensitive data might not be subject to appropriate handling and storage at a local level.

In discussion with the internal auditor, it was noted that the University of Dundee compared well with other Scottish Institutions, but that improvement in this area should be an objective.

In response to questions, the Director of Information Services confirmed that the mitigation of risks associated with information security was a priority for Information Services, and that the level of incidents was low. He went on to highlight the practically-oriented training which was being rolled out, along with areas of best practice and time-lines for implementation. The Director also provided an overview of the environment in which users were accessing data, highlighting that information security was a staffing and cultural issue as well as an IT issue, with access to sensitive data often depending on an individual in a trusted position.

The five recommendations had been graded as high risk due to the reputational risk, and the Committee requested regular updates on progress toward implementation of the recommendations. The Director of Information Services proposed providing a draft of the Institutional Information Security Policy to the next meeting of the Audit Committee.

Resolved: (i) to note that a draft Institutional Information Security Policy would be provided at the next meeting; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

(3) **Workload Planning**

The auditors presented a report on the control environment around workload planning and the degree to which the University obtained maximum benefit from available staff resources. It was noted that the responsibility for workload planning was devolved to Colleges and Schools, and as such the recommendations would be taken forward by Heads of Colleges and Deans of Schools. Four moderate risk recommendations were made relating to: the need to keep workload models up-to-date with evolving requirements and practice, the identification of all time commitments to ensure equality in allocations, additional risks to planning for each College arising from joint teaching across Colleges, and opportunities to improve workload planning through central review and sharing of devolved workload planning models.
In discussion with the Director of Human Resources, the links between workload planning and performance management (the annual Objective Setting and Review (OSAR) process) were discussed, with the auditors and the Director commenting that the practices should work in tandem. The Director also highlighted the need for consistency in the approach to workload planning, noting that high-level discussions with Heads of Colleges were required.

Resolved: (i) to note that a follow-up to the 2010 Performance Management audit report would be provided at the next meeting; and

(ii) otherwise to note the report.

(4) Efficiency Savings

The auditors provided an overview of the report into efficiency savings. The report focused on an assessment of those efficiency savings that were being delivered on a recurring basis. Three high risk and one moderate risk recommendation were made, with the high risk recommendations being related to: the formal monitoring of efficiency savings, the reporting of future efficiency savings, and the requirement for a formal risk assessment for efficiency savings from the strategic review. The auditors commented that additional arrangements were required to drive the efficiency savings agenda.

The Director of Finance provided clarification as to the difference between cost savings and efficiency savings, commenting that the University of Dundee had improved efficiencies in an environment of rising costs. Going forward he confirmed that efficiencies in teaching and research would be key to delivering efficiency targets, and that controls were in place to prevent ‘slippage’ in savings made through Voluntary Severance. The Committee discussed the need to look for savings at a granular level as well as an institutional level, noting that efficiency savings differ from savings based on cost cutting. The Committee also commented on the need to monitor the impact of efficiencies on effectiveness, and to develop a mechanism to report and present savings for Court.

The University Secretary highlighted the importance of looking to the future given the new strategy, the changed financial environment and the fact that the University had now drawn a line formally under the strategic review.

Resolved: to note the report.

(5) Status Update

The Committee received a report on the progress with the internal audit programme to date and the plans for work during the remainder of the academic session. Ms Taylor confirmed that KPMG were on target to meet the planned schedule of work.

Ms Taylor confirmed to the Committee that an extended scope for the UK Border Agency (UKBA) audit had been agreed with officers, which would focus on UKBA requirements for both Tier 4 students and Tier 2 staff. Each element was being thoroughly reviewed with the aim of enhancing processes through technical systems improvements. It was noted that UKBA processes were continually changing and that the system needed to be able to respond to these changes quickly.

The Director of Student Operations welcomed the opportunity for on-the-ground testing of enhanced controls by the auditors. She also provided a brief overview of some of the initiatives introduced by Student Operations to ensure that staff were up-to-date with UKBA requirements and University policies and practices. The internal and external auditors provided contextual information on UKBA issues across the sector, highlighting how both student and staff recruitment were affected when sanctions had been introduced at other institutions.

Resolved: to note the report
(6) Higher Education Sector Update

The internal auditor circulated a regular report summarising sector-wide matters of which management and the Audit Committee should be aware including: the Bribery Act, the Student Immigration rule, the Lord Woolf inquiry, Financial Reporting Council panel on-going concern and liquidity risks, international financial reporting standards, and taxation. The Committee welcomed the report and suggested that it would be useful for the report to be communicated to Court for its information.

The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs informed the Committee that a donations policy was currently being developed. Ms Taylor confirmed that the planned audit on bribery and corruption would be delayed given the extended scope of the UKBA audit.

Resolved: (i) to suggest the report be communicated to Court members; and
(ii) otherwise to note the report

5. FOLLOW-UP TO INTERNAL AUDIT

A report was provided which outlined the new process developed to track internal audit recommendations and summarised the implementation status of all recommendations which were beyond their initial implementation target date. The Committee commented that the report provided confidence that recommendations were being acted upon and requested that this report become a regular item. The Committee also requested that officers provide a report explaining the rationale for any recommendations deemed to be redundant by changes to circumstance or environment.

Resolved: (i) to request a report of redundant recommendations; and
(ii) otherwise to note the report

6. RISK MANAGEMENT MONITORING GROUP

The Committee received a report from the meeting of the Risk Management Monitoring Group on 2 May 2012. The Group had endorsed a new Business Continuity Statement (annex a) produced by Mr Gordon Davies (University Business Continuity Sponsor), noting that Mr Davies was working with Schools and Colleges to update and collate Business Continuity Plans from across the University. The Group also proposed updates to the Institutional Risk Register (see Minute 7), and revisions to its remit as defined within the Risk Management Strategy (annex b) to accommodate staff changes and introduce an additional risk appetite element.

Resolved: (i) to endorse the new Business Continuity Management Policy Statement;
(ii) to endorse the changes to the Risk Management Strategy; and
(ii) otherwise to note the report.

7. INSTITUTIONAL RISK REGISTER

The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs introduced proposed revisions to the Institutional Risk Register (annex c). Items within the register had been updated, and a commentary on the items had been provided. The Committee welcomed the approach, and members commented that the document was now more dynamic, and gave assurance of regular monitoring and updating as circumstances changed.

Resolved: to endorse the new Institutional Risk Register.

8. HEALTH & SAFETY SUB-COMMITTEE

The University Secretary introduced the report of the Sub-Committee’s meeting on 7 May 2011. He confirmed to the Committee that he would be reviewing the composition of the sub-committee and the potential use of deputes as a result of the level of non-attendance at the last meeting.

Resolved: for its part, to note the report.
HEALTH & SAFETY INCIDENT: SIR JAMES BLACK CENTRE

The Director of Human Resources introduced a draft of the investigating panel’s report into a health and safety incident occurring in the Sir James Black Centre (JBC) on 21 February 2012 when the wholesome drinking water supply became contaminated with ethylene glycol. The panel had investigated the sequence of events that led to the contamination, the reason for it occurring, any associated fault, and the response to the incident. While it had not been possible to determine precisely what had happened, the panel had determined how it was possible and the primary cause (changes made to the pipework installation). It had also produced a series of draft recommendations and praised the initial fast response to the incident by staff.

In discussing the report the Committee highlighted the requirement for accurate, detailed plans of buildings to be readily available, and questioned the degree of management control over the modification of systems (enhancements to which featured as recommendations in the report). The security of plant rooms, mechanisms for contacting staff when incidents arise, and the need to ensure that the training of the multi-skilled workforce was to the highest possible level were also discussed.

The Committee discussed a general Health & Safety Executive recommendation that drinking water be supplied directly from the mains and not via a tank, and questioned the nature of the installation at the JBC. (Secretary’s note: After the meeting it was confirmed that the drinking water was supplied directly from the mains, and no tank was involved for the storage of drinking water).

Resolved:  
(i) to request the panel strengthen recommendations 2, 5 and 6, in light of discussions and consider the issue of plant security;  
(ii) to recommend that responses and actions relating to the recommendations be sought from Estates and Buildings;  
(ii) otherwise to endorse the draft report subject to the amendments above

INFORMATION COMPLIANCE

The Committee received an annual report from the University’s Records Manager. The report set out the number and type of requests for information under current information legislation, and set this in the context of the Scottish higher education sector. It was noted that the number of requests continued to increase, with significant numbers of requests from anonymous sources.

Resolved: to note that the Committee was satisfied that the University was properly discharging its duties under relevant information legislation.

LEGAL MATTERS

The Committee received a routine report detailing the current legal cases involving the University, including updates since its last meeting. The Committee requested that information as to whether cases represented insured or uninsured risks be included consistently in the report. The Committee also requested that officers review whether other types of legal matters should be included in the report.

Resolved:  
(i) to review the content of the report; and  
(ii) otherwise to note the report.

WHISTLEBLOWING

The University Secretary provided a paper on recent Public Interest Disclosures (Whistleblowing) which was reviewed by the Committee.

Resolved: to note the report.

REVIEW OF AUDIT COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS

The Committee considered a paper summarising the review of Audit Committee Effectiveness. The paper outlined the process of the review, which had involved: completion of a detailed questionnaire by Committee members, management and auditors in attendance at meetings; completion of a practical
checklist for processes based on best practice; and a questionnaire for non-Audit Committee members of Court. Taking into account feedback received, a series of proposals for the improvement of the effectiveness of the Audit Committee were presented in the areas of: induction and professional development, reviewing the effectiveness of internal and external auditors, non-Court members of the Committee, risk management, and communications with Court.

The Committee members and auditors welcomed the report and the recommendations. The auditors commented that the quality of debate at the Committee meetings was an important factor in assessing effectiveness, and they felt that the Committee was performing well in that regard. The Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs commented that most of the issues highlighted by the review related to members seeking reassurance that they were performing well, and to the Committee’s own striving for excellence.

Resolved:  
(i) to accept the recommendations;  
(ii) to request that members communicate their ideas for the training session topics to the Clerk to Court; and  
(ii) otherwise to note the report.

14. DATES OF MEETINGS IN 2012/13

The Committee noted the following dates for meetings in 2012/13.

Tuesday 18 September 2012 at 12.30 pm, venue to be confirmed  
Monday 26 November 2012 at 2pm, venue to be confirmed  
Tuesday 5 March 2013 at 12.30 pm, venue to be confirmed  
Wednesday 22 May 2013 at 2pm, venue to be confirmed
BUSINESS CONTINUITY MANAGEMENT : POLICY STATEMENT

The University has no greater responsibility than to protect our people, our workplace and the continuity of our business.

There are already in place various College / Directorate Disaster Recovery Plans to manage the immediate effects of any incident or emergency. The purpose of this statement is to clarify responsibility for Business Continuity Plans, which are designed to manage the longer term process of getting business back to normal after any such emergency.

Heads of College and Directors are personally responsible for the application of Business Continuity Plans in their respective areas, and should achieve this by:

- Providing for the safety of our people and the security of our work environment and business assets.
- Complying with pertinent laws and statutory, regulatory and business requirements.
- Identifying and mitigating risks and vulnerabilities through communication, training and management.
- Empowering each employee to contribute to the success of the Plans.
- Monitoring and improving the implementation of this policy, investigating incidents, sharing information and applying the lessons learned.

Each plan should include:

- A process for identifying, and protecting against, the risks posed to people (staff, students and visitors), facilities, assets and systems.
- A crisis management process to provide for rapid and effective response to emergencies and for business continuation as soon as possible.
- A process for communicating, as appropriate, about prevention, emergency response and business continuation.
- Detailed consideration, where appropriate, of how it should be integrated with other overlapping plans (e.g. where two Colleges share a building).

Business Continuity Plans will be reviewed and developed to ensure that the University has in place the necessary structures and procedures to manage its risks.

This Policy will be reviewed at least every two years by the Risk Management Monitoring Group (RMMG).

Gordon Davies
Head of Estates

Last reviewed: January 2012
Next review: January 2014
Risk Management Strategy

Risk management may be defined as a means of reducing the risks of adverse events occurring which threaten an organisation’s core business, controls or infrastructure, by systematically identifying and evaluating such risks and then seeking ways to prevent their occurrence or minimise their likelihood or impact. Risks for the University may be associated with staff, students or visitors, buildings and equipment, finance and insurance, IT systems or operating arrangements and working practices.

The aims of the risk management strategy are:

(a) to engender and sustain a culture of risk management throughout the University;
(b) to motivate staff to take ownership of risks and undertake responsibilities that relate to risk management;
(c) to embed risk management in normal business processes;
(d) to ensure that the organisation’s approach to risk management is effective through the use of monitoring techniques; and
(e) to reassure the Court that the University is taking its responsibilities and duties for the effective management of risk seriously.

The strategy will be underpinned by awareness raising, staff development and training where required.

The prime responsibility for risk management, as an integral part of the institution’s internal control system, lies with the Court. In accordance with accepted best practice, the Court has delegated responsibility for the oversight of risk management processes to the Audit Committee. Detailed coordination of risk management activities at an operational level is the responsibility of the Risk Management Monitoring Group, which will submit biannual reports on its work to the Audit Committee and ensure that the Senior Management Team is suitably briefed on risk management. The Senior Management Team will be responsible for ensuring that the University’s risk profile is matched to the aims and objectives espoused in the institutional strategy.

The remit of the Risk Management Monitoring Group will be to:

(a) identify high-level strategic risks affecting or likely to affect the University as a whole;
(b) monitor performance at institutional level and at the level of individual Colleges and Student & Academic Support Services in identifying, evaluating and mitigating (or eliminating) key risks related to all aspects of the University’s activities;
(c) heighten awareness of risk management and promote standardised approaches to risk assessment as an integral part of business planning and project management;
(d) ensure that there are adequate and effective plans across the University for crisis management, disaster recovery and business continuity.
(e) advise the Audit Committee and Court in relation to institutional risk appetite.

The Monitoring Group will meet at least twice a year.

The membership of the Risk Management Monitoring Group will comprise:
• University Secretary (Convener)
• College Secretaries
• Directors of Campus Services; External Relations; Finance; Human Resources; Information Services; Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs; Research & Innovation Services; and Student Operations – or their nominees
• Finance Manager (Insurance)
• Head of Safety Services

Administrative support for the work of the Risk Management Monitoring Group will be undertaken by the Policy Officer (Corporate Governance) (who is also Clerk to Court and Secretary to the Audit Committee). The Directorate of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs will co-ordinate risk management activity, and specifically will:

(a) champion the aims of the risk management strategy;
(b) develop standardised procedures for identifying, evaluating and reporting on key risks;
(c) maintain and update an institutional risk register;
(d) liaise with the Director of Human Resources on risk-related staff development and training.
Heads of Colleges and Directors of all Student & Academic Support Services will take devolved responsibility for:

(a) identifying key risks associated with their particular activities;
(b) assessing the threat posed by each risk;
(c) defining and implementing the steps required to minimise or prevent risk;
(d) identifying areas where disaster recovery and business continuity plans are required, and developing and maintaining such plans;
(e) reporting on the above to the Risk Management Monitoring Group.

Risks associated with projects (including, for example, capital building or other infrastructure projects, collaboration and partnership agreements, business improvement and IT projects, etc) will be examined as an integral part of the authorisation process (in accordance with the HEFCE publication 99/21, *Appraising Investment Decisions*).

The purpose of this strategy is not to eliminate risk altogether, but rather to prevent or mitigate those risks that the University deems unacceptable in the context of its prevailing risk appetite in the area concerned. As an integral part of its work, and in consultation with the Court, the Senior Management Team and the Audit Committee, the Risk Management Monitoring Group will also identify those areas of activity where a degree of calculated risk to the University is considered acceptable and desirable.

Revised 2012
Annex C

Institutional Risk Register

Revisions to the existing register, as provided to the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs by the Risk Management Monitoring Group are highlighted in red, and an additional column has been added to the table to provide commentary to the changes made.
### University of Dundee
#### Institutional Risk Register
**June 2012**

**Section 1: 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 Owner</th>
<th>Action Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loss of PGT and overseas income</td>
<td>Failure to recruit; Effects of national immigration policies; Withdrawal of UKBA Tier 4 Licence</td>
<td>Would lead to reductions in income and would constrain ability to expand in an uncontrolled market</td>
<td>HoCs</td>
<td>4 5 20</td>
<td>Lobbying of UKBA and Scottish and UK ministers; Tightly controlled admissions procedures.</td>
<td>4 4 6</td>
<td>Increase awareness of effects of new UKBA policies; Improve monitoring of current overseas students in line with internal audit recommendations; Explore diversification of overseas markets to avoid difficult areas</td>
<td>DSO &amp; DPGLA</td>
<td>June 2012</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 4 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 4 1 6</td>
<td>Increasing diversification of research funding sources (in particular industrial collaborations, ERC and Framework Programme); Improved focus on target-setting with individual academics during OSAR; Monitoring of programme attractiveness and market testing; 3-year degree pilot projects in DJCAD and Life Sciences; Monitoring of programme attractiveness and market testing; 3-year degree pilot projects in DJCAD and Life Sciences.</td>
<td>VP(R) Deans</td>
<td>Routine reports at Research Committee and SMT; continual review.</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.</td>
<td>Insufficient income to meet expenditure requirements leading to overspends and/or deficits.</td>
<td>HoCs and DF</td>
<td>5 4 20</td>
<td>Close senior management oversight of Strategic Review project</td>
<td>4 4 1 6</td>
<td>Improved focus on target-setting with individual academics during OSAR</td>
<td>HoCs</td>
<td>Ongoing</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. Lack of clear position on (dual nationality) NI 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. Danger of exceeding consolidated limits as result of NI question.</td>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>3 5 15</td>
<td>Monitoring of programme attractiveness and market testing; 3-year degree pilot projects in DJCAD and Life Sciences.</td>
<td>3 4 1 2</td>
<td>Continual monitoring of the situation during 2011-12 and during recruitment cycle for 2012-13; Adjustments in offerings expected as a result; Anticipation of quick response to changing circumstances and market; Provision of bursaries. Seek legal advice on NI question.</td>
<td>DSO</td>
<td>Ongoing; Summer 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT (I)</th>
<th>LIKELIHOOD (L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Insignificant (&lt;£50k)</td>
<td>1 = Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Minor (£50k &lt;£500k)</td>
<td>2 = Unlikely</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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category/Issue</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Key Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Loss of reputation</td>
<td>Adverse publicity arising from cases of, for example: Student indiscretion; 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>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced recruitment of both staff and students; Reduced attractiveness to funders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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; Research Governance; Effective management of external relations. Continued focus on quality of student experience. Due diligence on partners/partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved communication with staff on policies and procedures. Review external data submissions to ensure best advantage in League Tables. Improved relations with the media.</td>
<td>DER Planning Officer</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved communication with staff on policies and procedures. Review external data submissions to ensure best advantage in League Tables. Improved relations with the media.</td>
<td>DER Secretary</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Loss of high calibre staff</td>
<td>Key staff attracted to other institution(s) through enhanced financial incentives and packages. Loss of tier 2 UKBA license.</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in reputation; impact on league table position; poor REF outcome; inability to exploit key teaching markets. Inability to teach overseas staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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. Increase monitoring of overseas staff in line with UKBA obligations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High achieving staff will always move on to other positions, however, additional controls could include: development of succession planning strategy; greater emphasis on obtaining staff feedback; greater focus on talent-spotting and development; consideration of better non-financial reward mechanisms to supplement financial processes.</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Failure of poor performance of subsidiary/associates/dailies</td>
<td>Company(ies) fail to deliver against business plan and/or cease trading.</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative impact on University financial position through requirement to cover debts/failure to deliver expected contribution/requirement to ‘buy back’ spun out business.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University membership on subsidiary and associated company Boards; robust business planning; attention paid to the model of operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DF Annual analysis and evaluation of performance on an annual basis by SMT and Finance &amp; Policy Committee; More scrutiny and analysis of terms of agreements on establishment of companies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Failure to maximise income potential from licensing</td>
<td>Lack of focus on income generation and contribution when considering academic developments</td>
<td>HoCs</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current and future academic activities and developments fail to generate a significant contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme approval process requires consideration of funding/finance; ASRS advises on market research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Loss of staff with specialisation and knowledge</td>
<td>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>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inability of the University to cover business critical or important areas of work in the Academic or Service areas of the University.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identification and elimination of single points of failure in BCPs and production of associated procedures manuals; Greater harmonisation of practice and procedure across Schools/Colleges and Central Service Directorates.</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inability to manage capital programme within budget</td>
<td>Project over-run, poor projects/programme management; projects approved without finance in place.</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projects halted before completion; negative impact on University’s financial position; University breaches bank facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear approvals process Monitoring of cashflow and borrowing requirements; contractor approval process; Ensure timely expenditure of external income to avoid SFC clawback; Package works to provide maximum flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved communication with staff on policies and procedures. Review external data submissions to ensure best advantage in League Tables. Improved relations with the media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Owner</th>
<th>Action Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Degradation of estate as a result of poor maintenance</td>
<td>Poor or lack of availability of funding means that estate is not maintained at satisfactory levels.</td>
<td>Inability to support teaching and research activities; loss of relative competitive position; increased future maintenance burden; increased likelihood of failure of key services, systems and infrastructure.</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>3 4 12</td>
<td>Prioritised and planned maintenance programme within Capital Plan; ring-fenced maintenance budget and reactive budgets.</td>
<td>3 3 9</td>
<td>Enhanced availability of data on backlog maintenance completion; Planned disposal of poor quality and/or uneconomic buildings as part of space reduction programme; Development of updated estate strategy. Development of asset plans for all buildings alongside a long-term plan for backlog maintenance.</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Failure of research pooling initiatives</td>
<td>Inability to secure future funding; Breakdown of partnerships</td>
<td>Additional cost of supporting pooling staff through core funding; Reputational damage</td>
<td>Appropriate HoCs</td>
<td>3 3 9</td>
<td>Rigorous appointments process; SFC, Government and Sector support for pooling as a success.</td>
<td>2 3 6</td>
<td>More scrutiny at application stage</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Failure to achieve commercialisation potential of research or other activity</td>
<td>Failure to spot/exploit potential targets; Lack of awareness among academics</td>
<td>Missed patent applications and loss of potential royalties or other commercialisation potential</td>
<td>DRRS</td>
<td>2 4 8</td>
<td>RIB Business Development Managers assigned to each College have good awareness of activities. Objective-Setting and Review (OSAR)</td>
<td>2 3 6</td>
<td>Improved focus on target-setting with individual academics during OSAR</td>
<td>Dears</td>
<td>Annual RIB report</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 Owner</th>
<th>Action Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 4 20</td>
<td>Lobbying via UUKUS</td>
<td>5 4 20</td>
<td>Increased Engagement with Scottish Ministers</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would lead to reductions in core teaching income, affecting ability to deliver core UG courses</td>
<td>DPL(L&amp;T)</td>
<td>4 3 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbying via UUKUS; Continual enhancement of student experience; Monitoring of programme attractiveness and market testing.</td>
<td>4 3 12</td>
<td>Planning alternative teaching scenarios</td>
<td>DPL(L&amp;T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Risk Description</td>
<td>Risk Cause(s)</td>
<td>Risk Consequence</td>
<td>Risk Owner</td>
<td>Inherent Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Existing Controls</td>
<td>Residual Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Actions for further control</td>
<td>Action Owner</td>
<td>Action Review Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<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 of provider to deliver service; provider goes out of business and ceases trading</td>
<td>Inability to deliver teaching, research or other key services</td>
<td>Head of Procurement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Minimise areas where delivery reliant on single provider(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Data systems compromise and/or information loss</td>
<td>Break of IT security/Firewalls; Theft or loss of laptops/memory sticks, etc and/or sensitive data or research.</td>
<td>Break of IT security/Firewalls; Theft or loss of laptops/memory sticks, etc and/or sensitive data or research.</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Firewalls Anti-virus procedures Network monitoring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</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>Inability to deliver teaching, research or other key services</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BCP developed for previous risk associated with pandemic influenza; Standing Group developed to oversee pandemic; ongoing scanning for likelihood of future outbreak.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Disruption caused by catastrophrophic loss of buildings or equipment</td>
<td>Unforeseen event such as fire, flood, accident.</td>
<td>Inability to deliver teaching, research or other key services</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fire prevention and safety officers; Disaster Recovery plans and procedures; Damage control capabilities; 24 hour emergency cover</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</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>Inability to deliver teaching, research or other key services</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ongoing dialogue with campus unions; record of managing previous disputes; contingency plans in place from previous disputes; political consequences mean settlement usually achieved before significant damage done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</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>Financial and/or reputational loss</td>
<td>DF Secretary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Financial procedures and policies; system of internal and external audit; adherence to key principles and good practice in corporate governance; Policy and procedures on Research Misconduct; Public Interest Disclosure Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</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>Potential overspends, leading to local and overall deficits; Potential for use of resource for purposes for which it was not intended; Loss of confidence in University (e.g. by SFC, banks, etc)</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Continual review through audit of financial controls; monthly monitoring of management accounts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Failure of health and safety mechanisms</td>
<td>Preventable death or serious injury to students/staff/visitors</td>
<td>Lack of financial leadership.</td>
<td>DHR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Policy; Training programmes; Network of local Health &amp; Safety Officers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Issue/Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Officer(s)</td>
<td>Year/Stage</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Legal non-compliance</td>
<td>Failure to comply with regulatory or legal requirements. Provision of specialist policies and advice in areas such as HR, Estates, Procurement, Health &amp; Safety etc; University Solicitor and availability of external legal advice.</td>
<td>DPGLA</td>
<td>Annual review reports for Procurement, Information, DPGLA &amp; University Solicitor</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. Financial loss; increased insurance claims and cost of premiums.</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>DPGLA</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Disruption teaching, research and other activities; damage to buildings and property; injury/sudden injury/death of one or more staff or students.</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. Impact on reputation as source of material; possible legal consequences if controls to prevent acquisition of material shown to be inadequate.</td>
<td>H&amp;S Services, DCS</td>
<td>HoSS</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

GOVERNANCE & NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE
(Minute 80)

A meeting of the Committee was held on 14 May 2012.

Present: Mr EF Sanderson (Convener), Emeritus Professor A Burchell, Mr R Burns, Mr M Kendrick, Dr J Lowe, Professor J Taylor, Mr IDM Wright

In Attendance: University Secretary; Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs

Apologies: Principal Professor CP Downes, Professor RJ Abboud

[Secretary’s note: Professor Abboud circulated comments to the Committee in advance of the meeting by email correspondence. These comments were considered and discussed by the Committee at relevant points in the agenda].

1. MINUTES

Resolved: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 20 February 2012.

2. MATTERS ARISING

(1) Corporate Governance: Chairman of Court (Minute 2(1))

The Committee noted the proposal that, because of the busy agenda for the June meeting of Court, the annual discussion of the performance of the Chairman should be deferred to the Court Retreat on 3 September 2012.

Resolved: to recommend to Court that the annual performance discussion of the Chairman of Court take place exceptionally at the Court Retreat.

(2) Review of Higher Education Governance (Minute 3)

The Convener reported on discussions with the Committee of Scottish Chairs (CSC) on the outcomes of the Review. The CSC was in the process of setting up a group to address the governance issues raised in the Review and oversee the drafting of a Scottish Code of Governance Best Practice. Lord Smith of Kelvin, Chair of Court of the University of the West of Scotland, would chair the group, and an independent member from outside the sector was currently being sought. The first meeting of the Group was likely to take place in the autumn, and the work was expected to take up to eighteen months.

3. REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

[Note: The Committee noted that the salaries of Professor Taylor, the University Secretary and the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs were all subject to consideration by the Remuneration Committee, and that therefore to a certain extent they might be seen to be conflicted on this issue.]

The Committee received a paper, prepared by the Director of Human Resources and the University Secretary, which had emerged from discussions within the Remuneration Committee on the revision of that committee’s remit and terms of reference. The Committee was asked for its views and comments, before the paper was discussed at the Human Resources Committee and then at Court. The Committee also received additional information from Mr Wright, which gave a corporate governance context in terms of the Financial Reporting Council’s UK Corporate Governance Code and the Committee of University Chairs’ Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies.

It was recognised that the Remuneration Committee was not in a position to judge individual cases of professors and other grade 10 staff put before it, because its members did not always know the individuals being put forward. The Remuneration Committee did exercise judgement, however, on the degree of consistency across the University in awarding salary increases, paying special attention to issues of equality. It was reported that the perceived lack of transparency about the work of the Remuneration Committee had given rise, anecdotally, to a lack of confidence in the Remuneration Committee’s work on the part of some professorial staff. The Governance & Nominations Committee
therefore agreed that increased transparency in the work of the Remuneration Committee should be introduced, and in particular that those subject to consideration by the Remuneration Committee should be fully aware of the processes whereby cases for salary increases were nominated and supported. There was also some discussion about the emerging idea of professorial salary banding, in particular that trying to introduce a system in advance of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) might be distracting and counterproductive.

There was further discussion on the degree to which benchmarking data on senior salaries was used by the Committee and also on the desirability of completed annual objective-setting and review as a prerequisite for consideration by the Remuneration Committee. It was also noted that some thought needed to be given to reviewing and modernising the approval of consultancy arrangements for senior staff.

The Committee also discussed the role of Court in determining whether any consideration should be taken of an individual’s tax status in deciding appropriate salary levels.

Resolved: to endorse the paper for presentation to the Court at its meeting on 11 June 2012, subject to a series of amendments, including reference to the nomination procedures for consideration of individuals by the Remuneration Committee, greater alignment with the principles of the UK Corporate Governance Code, increased transparency in the Remuneration Committee’s reports to the Court, and the introduction of a quorum.

4. COURT & COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

(1) Meetings of the Chairman of Court with Court Members

The Convener reported on his meetings as Chairman of Court with individual Court members. A number of meetings remained to be arranged, although the Convener was hopeful that these would take place before the end of the session. Members of the Committee suggested that it was perhaps a little ambitious to meet with each Court member on an annual basis, and that once every two years might be a more manageable frequency.

Resolved: acknowledging the challenge of meeting individually with 22 Court members annually, nevertheless to maintain this arrangement as the target, but with meetings taking place no less often than once every two years.

(2) Court and Committee Attendance 2011/12

The Committee received a report setting out the attendance of individual Court members at Court and Committee meetings as well as their involvement in additional activities such as investigations and Grievance Committees.

Resolved: (i) to agree that, in future, the report should include information relating to members’ involvement in interviews and attendance at graduation ceremonies; and

(ii) otherwise, to note the report.

(3) Court Membership 2012/13

The Committee received confirmation of Court membership for 2012/13.

Resolved: to note the membership.

(4) Succession Planning

The Committee received a paper from the Director of Policy, Governance & Legal Affairs, providing information on those lay Court members whose terms of office would be coming to an end in the next two years and proposing that the process be set in motion to identify successors. The Committee supported its previous process of an external advert accompanied by canvassing of existing Court members, staff and students.
Resolved: (i) to recommend that officers begin a recruitment process for three vacancies on the Court (two from 1 August 2013, and one from 1 August 2014), with an external advertisement to appear in September 2012;

(ii) for that process, to welcome applicants with a wide range of skills; and

(iii) to consider the question of a suitable successor to Dr Lowe as Chancellor’s Assessor at a future meeting following discussion with the Chancellor.

(5) Elections: Voting Information

The Committee received a report which set out the voting statistics for the three elections to Court which had taken place during the session: Academic Council Assessor, President of the Students’ Association (DUSA) and independent student Court member. The Committee expressed its disappointment at the low turnout of students in their elections.

The Committee also noted the appointment of the non-teaching staff member of Court, but was concerned that there had been just one nomination and that there had therefore been no election.

Resolved: to ask officers to consider how best to communicate with non-teaching staff to encourage a greater number of nominations for future elections.

(6) Committee Membership 2012/13

The Committee considered the membership of its Committees for the next academic year.

Resolved: to recommend to Court the memberships of its Committees for 2012/13 as set out in annex.

5. PENSION TRUSTEES

Resolved: (i) to recommend to Court that it approve the appointment of Mr Ian Ball as an employer-nominated trustee of the University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme (UoDSS); and

(ii) to amend the terms of reference of the Governance & Nominations Committee to include responsibility for recommendations to Court concerning employer-nominated trustees for the UoDSS.

6. LORD PROVOST

Resolved: (i) to note the departure of Dr John Letford as Lord Provost, remarking in particular on his warm friendship of and enthusiasm for the University;

(ii) to note that a new Lord Provost would be appointed following a meeting of Dundee City Council on 21 May 2012 [NB: the new Lord Provost has since been confirmed as Mr Bob Duncan]; and

(iii) to recommend that the Principal invite the new Lord Provost to visit the University to discuss, inter alia, membership on Court or the appointment of a suitable assessor [NB: an invitation has been sent and a meeting is being arranged.]

7. ATTENDANCE AT COURT BY UNIVERSITY OFFICERS

Officers noted concerns around the appropriateness of attendance by officers at Court, and the University Secretary undertook to review with the Chair of Court in time for the start of session 2012/13 who should attend and in what capacity. The issue was just as much about whether there were officers who should attend but who did not as it was about those who did attend but were felt not to be necessary.
Annex

Committee Memberships 2012/13

1. **Audit Committee (AC)**
   - Dr Howard Marriage (Convener)
   - Mr John Barnett
   - Emeritus Professor Ann Burchell
   - Mr Andrew Richmond
   - Mr Keith Swinley
   - Mr Ian Stewart

2. **Ethical Review Committee (ERC)**
   - Professor Julie Taylor
   - Dr Angela Roger

3. **Finance & Policy Committee (F&PC)**
   - Mr Richard Burns (Convener)
   - Principal
   - Professor Rami Abboud
   - Mr Jo Elliot
   - Dr Janet Lowe
   - Dr Alison Reeves
   - Mr Eric Sanderson
   - Mr Iain Wright
   - President of the Students’ Association

4. **TASC Governing Body (Tayside Medical Science Centre)**
   - Ms Christina Potter

5. **Human Resources Committee (HRC)**
   - Dr Janet Lowe (Convener)
   - Professor Sue Black
   - Ms Shirley Campbell
   - Mrs Sheila Krawczyk
   - Dr Howard Marriage
   - Professor Gary Mires
   - Ms Christina Potter
   - Dr Angela Roger
   - VP Professor Chris Whatley

6. **Remuneration Committee (RemC)**
   - Mr Richard Burns (Convener)
   - Ms Shirley Campbell
   - Mr Jo Elliot
   - Mr Eric Sanderson

7. **Governance & Nominations Committee (G&NC)**
   - Mr Eric Sanderson (Convener)
   - Principal
   - Professor Rami Abboud
   - Emeritus Professor Ann Burchell
   - Mr Richard Burns
   - Dr Janet Lowe
   - Ms Julie McGovern
   - Professor Julie Taylor
   - Mr Iain Wright
8. **University of Dundee Superannuation Scheme Employer-Nominated Trustees**

Mr Keith Swinley (Convener)  
Mr Ian Ball  
Dr Jim McGeorge  
Mr Graham McKee  
Mr Andrew Richmond

Additionally Mrs Sheila Krawczyk serves as an *employee*-nominated Trustee of the Scheme
APPENDIX 6

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS
(Minute 81)

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.

The Principal introduced his report as a summary of a very positive year for the University. He thanked staff and students, and in particular DUSA, for their efforts in a year that saw the University ranked as the best in the UK for the quality of its student experience according to the Times Higher Education survey. The Principal also referred to the encouraging levels of external research funding won by the University and congratulated staff for an exceptional performance in the difficult financial climate.

Despite the generally good news across the University the Principal warned against complacency. He gave the example of the recent disappointing ranking in The Guardian league table. He argued that this demonstrated the need for continued determination in order to grow and develop the University in accordance with its values and vision. It was, however, noted that the reliability of the Guardian league table was questionable, with some members arguing that students anecdotally paid no attention to it; and other members pointed out that despite the disappointing showing overall some disciplines, notably civil engineering, pharmacology and medicine, had performed very well in their subject rankings.

The Principal ended by making reference to the effectiveness of Senate. He reminded members that he was seeking to ensure that the Senate was a forum for genuine debate and that it would be most effective if people were prepared to challenge on issues and give a strong account of the views of the academic community.

The Senatus decided: (i) to join the Principal in congratulating staff and students of the University on their many successes during the past academic year and;

(ii) otherwise, to note the report.

2. UNIVERSITY COURT

The Senatus received a report from the University Court meeting of 23 April 2012.

The Principal asked Senate to note the developments on the collaborative agreement between the School of Education, Social Work & Community Education and the Costeas-Geitonas School (GSC) in Athens. The Dean of Education explained that the University would offer an MA as a teaching training programme at GSC and the whole initiative represented an interesting and exciting international opportunity for staff and students.

The Principal concluded by saying that the collaboration would provide an interesting model for other developments of this type.

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

3. UNIVERSITY VISION

The Senatus received a presentation on the new University Vision from the Principal.

The new Vision represented a modernisation of the principles, precepts and goals that had driven the University’s history since its inception and which had been enshrined in the Charter. It also focused on key attributes that had always been central to the values of the institution since its foundation – a broad range of subjects, with a strong impact and connection with the city and the wider world.

The new University Vision restated the core values and purpose of the University as transforming lives, both locally and internationally. The University did this through a number of characteristic approaches to all of its activities: interdisciplinarity, integrity and excellence.
The key challenges in the new Vision centred on those areas where the University was able to make the strongest impact, deliver tangible benefits and take the lead on transformational change: the sustainable use of global resources, innovative design that would shape the future and the promotion of social, cultural and physical wellbeing.

The Principal commended to Senate the long-term and inspirational goal, as stated in the new Vision, to become Scotland’s leading University.

The Senate engaged in discussion with the Principal on a number of points and put forward positive suggestions on how the document could be refined, restated and implemented.

Some senators cautioned against relying too heavily on the use of league table metrics and performance indicators as measures when it came to judging the success of the University in delivering the new Vision.

Senate expressed a strong view that the Vision should be ambitious but achievable and inspire a pride in the University. Senators also expressed a strong agreement with the focus on transformation and impact – both locally and nationally – as a powerful and challenging direction for the institution. The Principal argued that the Vision should resonate with all staff as a shared and as such would need an inclusive and authentic debate across the University community.

The Principal thanked the Senate for such a positive reaction and looked forward to further debate at the next Senate meeting in October. The Vision would now be presented to the Court at its meeting on 11 June 2012.

The Senatus decided: for its part, to welcome the new University Vision statement.

4. UNIVERSITY STRATEGY

The Senatus received a report from the Director of Strategic Planning on the University Strategy.

The Director introduced the strategy statements as representing the medium-term plans of the University over a five-year period. The University strategy was supported by a set of nine enabling strategies and had been subject to wide consultation across the University and in the Senate Committees.

Senate was asked to note that there was a proposal to establish a new Internationalisation Committee of the Senate and that full details on remit and membership would be circulated in due course.

The Director reported that more detail concerning the implementation of the Strategy would be worked out over the summer but asked Senate to approve the strategy documents at this stage before their final submission to Court.

In response to the Strategy document some members of Senate asked that the documents be improved with regard to presentation, some aspects of language and some technical aspects of the key performance indicators. The Senate also discussed the meaning of the terms ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘employability’, as well as the importance of strong and distinctive individual disciplines to the concept of ‘interdisciplinarity’.

There was a strong view that employers welcomed graduates with independence and critical thinking skills and that the University, as part of its transformative mission, should aim to equip its graduates for successful careers in a broad sense.

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

5. INTERNAL FRAMEWORK FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH REF 2014 INCLUDING THE CODE OF PRACTICE ON THE SELECTION OF STAFF (CODE OF PRACTICE)

The Vice-Principal for research introduced the latest draft of the Internal Framework and Code of Practice document. The document had been produced and developed after comprehensive consultation and discussion across the institution. The final version would be discussed at Court and then submitted to REF by the July 2012 deadline.

The Vice-Principal explained that the latest version included some points of clarification around the issue of submission of staff on teaching and scholarship contracts. Under the externally-imposed REF
rules these staff would need to agree changes to contracts with their Deans before submission was possible.

The Vice-Principal also asked Senate to note that development of a more robust procedure for assessing complex circumstances in the selection process, in a way that was consistent with quality thresholds, had now been incorporated into the Code.

Some Senate members questioned the need for a uniform quality threshold across the University and pointed out that many other institutions were not publishing a uniform threshold as part of the Code of Practice submission.

The practicalities of assessing complex circumstances, the difficulties for individuals over contractual judgments and the constitution of internal Unit of Assessment (UoA) selection panels were also discussed. The Vice-Principal confirmed that the issue of UoA Panel compositions from a diversity perspective had already been acknowledged and was being addressed.

Many members of Senate expressed positive views about the documents and reported support at School level where selection was often understood as part of a wider context and strategy – for the common good and where inclusion was seen as part of a wider package – on behalf of the whole School.

The Vice-Principal reminded Senate that the REF was fundamentally different from the previous RAE in that it was explicitly not a survey and assessment of the totality of an institution’s research outputs but rather an opportunity for each University to present those research outputs that were world class and that had the most impact. It was argued that to approach the REF any differently would have serious negative consequences for both funding and reputation from a comparative perspective.

The Principal concluded by asking Senate to note that the current document had been subject to a very wide consultation and the concerns raised at Senate related to matters of principle rather than matters of process contained within the document.

Thereafter Principal noted that there was a strong consensus both within Senate and in the wider academic community that the this was the right approach for the institution to be taking in relation to the REF.

**The Senatus decided:**

(i) to approve the report of the Research Committee;

(ii) for its part, to approve the Internal Framework for engagement with REF 2014 and The Code of Practice on the Selection of Staff.

### 6. POLICY ON WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON TEACHING AND SPORT

The Senatus received a paper from the President of the Dundee University Sports Union.

The President-elect presented the paper and asked Senate to consider the request in the paper to reaffirm the established policy on keeping Wednesday afternoons free from teaching activities so that students were able to participate in sporting activities.

The Principal commended the suggestion to Senate but acknowledged that practical problems of timetabling and the nature of clinical subjects meant that the commitment could not be absolute for all subjects.

The Deputy Principal reported that the Learning and Teaching Committee had been consulted on the issue and had expressed support but with the caveat that in some subject areas it would prove very challenging to make it happen.

**The Senatus decided:**

(i) to agree, in principle, with the policy of keeping Wednesday afternoons free from teaching, as far as possible, but with a recognition of the fact that in certain subjects it may not be achievable;

(ii) to ask that the Learning and Teaching Committee take this proposal forward and consult with the Central Timetabling Office, and others, to find a solution to problems caused by keeping Wednesday afternoon free from teaching.
7. **HONORARY APPOINTMENTS – SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM**

The Senatus decided: to approve the following nominations (all 3 years):

New Appointments
Pat O'Conor, CASS
Martin Boyce, CASE
Richard Banks, CASE
Renewal
Thomas Fahey, CMDN

8. **PROFESSOR EMERITUS**

The Senatus decided: subject to the concurrence of Court, to confer the title of

Professor Emeritus upon the following:
Professor Ian Ricketts
A meeting of the Committee was held on 21 May 2012.

**Present:** Dr J Lowe (Convenor), Professor R Abboud, Mr D Cathcart, Dr H Marriage, Professor C Whatley.

**In Attendance:** University Secretary, Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development, Director of Finance, Deputy Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development, Miss S Hunter (Minutes), Professor Doreen Cantrell (for item 5), Mrs Fiona O'Donnell (for Item 6).

**Apologies:** Mr I Leith, Dr A Roger, Professor G Mires, Ms C Potter.

The Convener acknowledged this was Don Cathcart’s last meeting and as such thanked him for the valuable contribution and support that he had given to the Human Resources Committee over the years.

1. **MINUTES**

   The minutes of the meeting of 31 January 2012 were approved subject to qualification of the amendment which had been made to the minutes of 22 November 2011 (Section 4) relating to the REF. It was confirmed that if a member of staff meets the criteria for excellence in research they should not be prevented from being submitted to the REF even if this means that a change in contract is required to ensure compliance with the REF criteria.

2. **MATTERS ARISING**

   (1) **Statute 16**

   The Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development reported that good progress had been made with DUCU in relation to reviewing the policies associated with Statute 16 and it was hoped that the review of the policies would be completed over the summer months. It was highlighted that there had also been the opportunity to begin to review a number of other policies including probationary procedures for Academic staff and it was recognised that DUCU were engaging very positively and constructively in this process.

   (2) **Pay Award 2012/2013**

   In relation to the 2012/2013 pay award negotiations it was reported that UCEA had been given a mandate to offer 0.5% on behalf of the employers however this offer had been rejected by the unions whose opening position had been 7%. A subsequent offer of 0.8% was also rejected. The final meeting in relation to the formal negotiations would take place on 22 May 2012.

   **Resolved:** to note the position.

3. **FINANCIAL UPDATE AND STRATEGIC REVIEW**

   The Director of Finance reported that the financial plan for the full financial year was built on a budget surplus of £161k. The latest forecast however indicated that the current position was more aligned to achieving a surplus of £2.2m. The surplus was accounted for, in part, by one-off sources of income including property disposals and the non-replacement of staff/removal of vacancies from budgets during the course of the year. While the £2.2m was a significant improvement over budget, at only 1% of income it was still some way short of the target of 3% while a return on income of around 6% is now believed to be required to achieve financial sustainability. It was reported that there were cash balance deposits equivalent to £35m, however the majority of these were research monies committed against future income.

   It was noted that the Finance and Policy Committee had met on 14 May 2012 and that a £2.1m investment in strategic posts had been approved.
The Director of Finance updated the Committee on auto-enrolment and confirmed that the requirement for staff to be auto-enrolled into a pension scheme would become mandatory on 1 May 2013. The number of University staff currently not in a pension scheme was reported to be 350 for USS and 460 for UoDSS; Around 200 of those not enrolled did not meet the minimum criteria of earning £8,150 per annum.

The University was currently considering whether an additional lower cost pension scheme should be offered to staff and a survey had recently been conducted to gauge level of interest. Only 60 responses had been received (out of 420); 40% of respondents stated they would withdraw when auto enrolled and 41% stated that they would be interested in a lower cost / lower benefit scheme. It was recognised that there would be significant resource implications in administering auto-enrolment.

Resolved: (i) to note the current financial position.

(ii) to recommend that the Pensions Working Group consider the survey results and the feasibility of introducing an alternative pension scheme.

4. HUMAN RESOURCES AND ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(1) Remit of Remuneration Committee

The Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development highlighted the proposed changes to the remit and procedures associated with the Remuneration Committee and confirmed that the paper outlining the changes had recently been considered by the Governance and Nominations Committee. It was agreed that the proposed document provided greater clarity on the remit of the Remuneration Committee and this was welcomed.

It was highlighted that at some other institutions professorial salaries were determined using specific criteria and it was suggested that this could be considered for future years. It was agreed that this would provide further reassurance regarding the transparency and fairness of the process.

In connection with the annual process for the review of professorial salaries, it was confirmed that staff would be notified when the process was to commence but, as in previous years, there would be no self nomination.

Resolved: to endorse the revised remit and procedures associated with the Remuneration Committee and recommend approval to Court (subject to a minor amendment) and to recommend that consideration should be given to developing a framework for professorial salaries at a later date.

(2) Flexible Retirement

The Deputy Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development reported that a flexible retirement policy (annex) had been developed in conjunction with the Pensions Office. The policy had incorporated the specific requirements of the various pension schemes and was consistent with the University’s current policies on flexible working.

The Committee discussed the application and approval process and agreed that it was important to stress to staff that they should seek independent financial advice when considering flexible retirement. The Committee was advised that Dundee City Council had included a provision whereby staff could not be financially advantaged by taking flexible retirement and there was discussion as to whether the University would want to take the same position on this. It was generally agreed that the University would not take this position unless required by the pension scheme.

Resolved: to approve the flexible retirement policy subject to confirmation that there were no restrictions to earning levels if in receipt of a pension.

(3) Organisational and Professional Development

A report was received from the OPD team updating the Committee on some of the events and workshops that had been offered to staff and research postgraduates for 2011/12 and the particular highlights for the year.
The Deputy Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development reported that in addition to the workshops provided on the OPD programme, work had also taken place to provide support to various organisational development initiatives taking place within schools and directorates. The success of the recent Venture Programme was also highlighted and although EPSRC funding for this programme had come to an end, there was a commitment to try and seek alternative funding sources to allow this training opportunity for enterprising and innovative researchers to continue. The Committee agreed that it was important to nurture such events and also that it was important to ensure that there was co-ordination with other similar initiatives taking place throughout the University. It was highlighted that elements of the Venture programme aligned well with the employability agenda and it was noted that a member of OPD now sat on the Employability Committee.

Resolved:  
(i) to acknowledged the positive feedback Organisational & Professional Development had received;  
(ii) to note the Committee’s comments regarding Venture and to capitalise on other University initiatives.

5. CONCORDAT

Professor Cantrell as Chair of the Concordat Working Group introduced her report outlining work being progressed in relation to the Concordat following the award of HR Excellence in Research. It was recognised that it was a significant achievement to have obtained the award and the work undertaken by a number of staff to ensure that the University was in this position was acknowledged. There was general discussion about the benefits of the award and a focus on the major principles of the Concordat. It was highlighted that research staff did need to have a career development plan and to take personal responsibility for this. It was also acknowledged that Colleges needed to support staff with this and that there should be clear guidelines and criteria for probation and promotion procedures.

Professor Cantrell highlighted that Athena Swan was a Charter which addressed gender inequalities in science but focused very specifically on the STEM subjects. Athena Swan had been considered by the University previously but it was felt that the Concordat addressed all the key issues at the time and gave a broader context. It was noted however that the situation had now changed in that funding bodies such as Research Council and Wellcome Trust were now requiring institutions to have achieved the award and that this would be considered as part of the funding criteria. The Committee was advised that the Bronze Award would be applied for in November and that evidence would need to be collated to support this institutional application. The College of Life Science and the College of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing would then look to achieve the silver award. These submissions would be at a College level and it was recognised that a significant amount of work would be required for the Silver Award. It was confirmed that to progress the Athena Swan agenda, senior leads had been identified in each College and a meeting had been arranged to discuss and agree an action plan.

There was general discussion about the number of women in science and the opportunities and barriers for career development and promotion. It was highlighted that in Life Sciences although 50% of PhD students were female only 1% progressed to Principal Investigator level.

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development reported that the University of York had embraced the Charter and that this had appeared to make a very positive impact to gender ratios.

Resolved:  
(i) to note the position and to request that the Committee is provided with future updates on progress towards achieving the Bronze and Silver Awards.

6. MEDIATION/edr

Fiona O'Donnell presented the end of year report for edr and highlighted key activities that had taken place both within the University and also collaboratively with other institutions. It was noted that the early dispute resolution (edr) service had achieved a 75%-80% success rate and that in total approximately 60 formal mediations had taken place over the 4 year period. It was highlighted that the aim of edr was to be a standard default position that was embedded within the University and used as good practice. It was recognised that there was a limit on the present structure of the service given that there was a finite number of eight trained mediators, providing the service on a voluntary basis. The Committee was advised that edr have submitted a joint bid with Dundee College to the SFC and if this was successful this would allow further development of the service.
It was reported that workshops were currently being developed on an edr toolkit for managers that would form part of the Organisational & Professional Development training programme for 2012/13. In addition, work was taking place on the development of an academic module that would provide students with skills in edr that would be valuable in their chosen careers.

The Committee agreed that edr had an important role in developing the University’s capabilities to be able to address disputes at an early stage and to avoid the need for more formal processes.

It was noted that the HE/FE forum was now well established and in addition to sharing best practice was being used to develop a ‘pool’ of mediators to be used when internal mediators were not appropriate. The Committee was also interested to note that edr have submitted a trademark application for edr Dundee model.

Resolved: to commend the work of the mediation team and to support edr in progressing with its forward-looking and ambitious activities.

7. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY

A report from the Equality and Diversity Officer was received. It was acknowledged that the Code of Practice for the REF had been the main work priority since the last meeting. Previous drafts of the Code of Practice had been considered by the HR Committee, DUCU and Senate. The paper had also been issued to staff for consultation. A final version of the paper was now being circulated in advance of being submitted to Senate and Court for final approval.

It was noted that feedback had been received in relation to the quality threshold however it was agreed that this was outwith the remit of the working group and remained a University decision. Views had also been expressed that 20 working days was too long for an appeals process and the suggestion was that this should be changed to 10 working days.

It was queried whether it was right that appeals would not be considered if an individual’s research performance had been assessed by the University as being below the minimum quality threshold. The Committee discussed this and agreed that that the decision around quality should be made by the panel and that this decision should be made at the time rather than as part of an appeals process; it was highlighted that this was the position taken at RAE and that the panel making the decision will be experts in that field and therefore those best placed to make that decision.

It was highlighted by one member that the REF Sub Group and associated committees lacked diversity in terms of their composition.

The Committee discussed at length, issues around ensuring staff are aware that not being submitted to REF does not mean that they will not be included in the future submissions and that appropriate guidance should be in place to support them.

Resolved: (i) to request that the composition of the various committees being used for the REF is considered by the Working Group, in terms of representation and Equality and Diversity;

(ii) to approve the Code of Practice and refer to Senate and Court for final approval.

8. HEALTH & SAFETY

A report from the Head of Safety Services and minutes from the Health and Safety Sub-Committee meeting held on 8 May 2012 were received.

The Convener commented that she was pleased that Health and Safety training was being rolled out in a sensible and measured way. The University Secretary reported that the Senior Staff workshop on 24 May 2012 would be focusing on the subject of Health and Safety. Professor Abboud reported that Mr Scragg had attended two meetings, at his request, at the School of Medicine and that this training had been very well received. It was noted that a course in compliance was in development and that this would encompass Health and Safety.
It was noted that the report in relation to the incident at the College of Life Sciences would be submitted to Court in June. The Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development acknowledged that staff at the College had responded quickly and sensibly when dealing with this incident.

The University Secretary reported that the University’s Health and Safety policy had been updated following a recent audit by KPMG. The Committee discussed the benefits of more frequent audits and the possibility that these could be developed via a reciprocal agreement with other Universities.

**Resolved:**

(i) to approve the action plan and amended University Health and Safety Policy and Safety arrangements subject to further consideration of frequency and scope of external audits.

(ii) to note that Health and Safety training was being provided to Schools and Directorates on request and that workshops were being developed for the OPD programme for 2012/13.

9. **LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEES**

(1) Draft minutes of the University/UNITE Joint Committee meeting held on 8 May 2012 were received;

(2) Draft minutes of the University/UNISON Joint Committee meeting held on 8 May 2012 were received;

(3) Draft minutes of the University/DUCU Joint Committee meeting held on 4 May 2012 and minutes of the meeting of 16 January 2012 were received.
Flexible Retirement

Flexible retirement, approved by the employer, provides qualifying members of the relevant pension scheme the opportunity to receive part or all of their pension benefits (depending on the pension scheme) from age 55 onwards. This provides flexibility regarding the age at which a member of staff begins phased retirement in the lead up to full retirement. Access to pension benefits from age 55 is contingent on the member of staff meeting the eligibility criteria for flexible retirement of their pension scheme and subject to a reduction in working hours agreed by the Dean of School/Director which suits the operational requirements of the School/Directorate.

Members of staff should follow these steps when considering an application for flexible retirement.

1. **Review the flexible retirement information**

Members of staff wishing to explore the possibility of flexible retirement should review:

   (i) the University’s application procedure and approval process for flexible retirement.
   (ii) the eligibility criteria and information provided by their pensions scheme on flexible retirement
   (iii) the pension scheme benefit modeller (if provided by the pensions scheme) which can be used to obtain a flexible retirement estimate.

   Flexible retirement is an individual decision and its potential benefits and disadvantages must be carefully considered. It is recommended that independent financial advice is sought.

2. **Have an informal discussion about possibility of reduced working hours with line manager**

Members of staff should engage in early discussions with their line manager about the possibility of reducing their working hours. The line manager should consider whether the request would meet the operational requirements of the School/Directorate and discuss the possibility with the Dean/Director.

Members of staff should consider and be prepared to discuss:

- Options for different working hours/patterns.
- Compatibility of proposed working pattern(s) with the School/Directorate’s needs.
- Implications of reducing hours on individual work objectives, activities and any possible changes to contract (it should be noted that a change to contract may also lead to a change in grade).
- Implications of reducing hours on other staff or the School/Directorate’s objectives and suggestions for addressing these implications.
- Whether a role change/role reduction is being requested. This can only be accommodated if the operational requirements of the School/directorate can still be met.

Line Managers should consider and be prepared to discuss:

- The impact upon achieving individual, team or School/Directorate objectives and meeting business needs of the School/Directorate in the short, medium and long term.
- The benefits of the proposal which may include improved productivity, morale and commitment, retention of key staff and/or salary or other cost savings.
- The feasibility and impact of the work on colleagues, the School/Directorate, students, research sponsors, service users or any other relevant third party.
- Any additional administration required to implement the proposed arrangement should be practicable and cost effective.
- Effective management of the change; this may generate efficiency gains in terms of use of office space.
- Ability to secure cover for the remaining hours and duties e.g. re-organise work amongst existing staff or recruit additional staff.
- Timing of change e.g. implications to teaching or other work commitments
- Changes to staff contract e.g. for an academic member of staff, a reduction of hours removing teaching duties may require a transfer to a research contract. Advice should be sought from HR if a change of contract is required.
- Equality considerations. The request to reduce working hours may be in relation to personal commitments such as caring for elderly relative or a person with a disability and such requests should be considered sympathetically. Agreeing part-time working requests can open opportunities for succession planning, mentoring of other staff and bringing new staff into the School/Directorate.
Where the arrangement proposed cannot be accepted for operational reasons, possible alternatives should be considered and discussed with the individual before a final decision is reached. Advice should be sought from HR in these circumstances.

3. Flexible Retirement Quotation

The member of staff may wish to obtain a Flexible Retirement Quotation by completion of Form A and returning to the Pensions Office. The Pensions Office will request a quotation from the relevant pension scheme and will provide this to the member of staff, normally within four weeks of the member of staff’s request.

4. Formal Application Procedure for Flexible Retirement

1. The member of staff should complete an Application for Part-time Working and Flexible Retirement (Form B: section 1) and submit this to their Dean/Director. The request should detail any considerations in respect of how their request will impact the work of the School/Directorate.

2. The Dean/Director must fully consider the member of staff’s request and assess the current role of the individual. Account should be taken of the member of staff’s duties, responsibilities, and regular commitments. Consideration should be given to the flexibility of the role and the possibilities for redistribution of workload.

3. Where it is felt that the role does not lend itself to the proposals made by the member of staff thought should be given to any alternative working arrangements which could be accommodated and these should be communicated to the member of staff as options.

4. Where a request is approved, a copy of Form B will be sent to the College/SASS HR Office to process the agreed reduction to working hours, salary and any other changes to contract. A copy will also be sent to the Pensions Office so implementation of the member’s flexible retirement can commence.

5. If a request is not approved i.e. if it will not meet the business needs for the School/ Directorate, the member of staff will be advised of this in writing by the Dean/Director and of their right of appeal.

6. The formal appeal route is as detailed in the University’s Grievance Procedures.

5. Notification of flexible retirement to the relevant pension scheme

Once the Pensions Office has received Form B and all necessary paperwork from HR they will contact the member of staff to complete notification of their flexible retirement to the relevant pension scheme. The notification to the relevant pension scheme must be no later than 3 months before the requested change of hours and flexible retirement date.

Useful Links

- USS flexible retirement factsheet and benefit modeller - [http://www.uss.co.uk/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.uss.co.uk/Pages/default.aspx)
- [http://www.splo.org.uk/MembersServices/EmployeeMember/WhenCanYouRetire/](http://www.splo.org.uk/MembersServices/EmployeeMember/WhenCanYouRetire/)

Forms

- Form A – Request for Flexible Retirement Quotation (Annex 1)
- Form B – Application for Part-Time Working and Flexible Retirement (Annex 2)
Request for a Flexible Retirement Benefits Quotation

To be completed by member of staff making the request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.I. Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Directorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed date of flexible retirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested working hours e.g. 60% FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for a reduced salary grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For USS Members only:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposed percentage of USS benefits to be taken at this flexible retirement event (min 20% - max 80%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is this the 1st or 2nd Flexible Retirement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Local Government Members only:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed percentage of benefits to be taken (up to 100% subject to guidance from GAD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please forward to Pensions Office, University of Dundee, Floor 2, Tower Building.

Pensions Office will request quote from relevant pension scheme.

Notes:

Applicant must be 55 years of age or over at proposed flexible retirement date and have the relevant qualifying service.

Benefits may be actuarially reduced depending on member’s age.

Multiple appointment holders and variable-time members of USS are not eligible for flexible retirement.
Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS)

Flexible Retirement

A member of staff who is a qualifying member of USS and with the agreement of the University, wishes to reduce their working hours and have access to part of their pension benefits may apply for flexible retirement. An agreed and implemented reduction accompanied by access to part pension is termed a ‘flex’.

The minimum reduction allowable is 20% full-time equivalent hours (FTE) and the maximum is 80% FTE.

The flex must apply for at least 12 months during which period no further flex is allowable. A member of staff may flex on a maximum of two occasions and continue to work, however the third reduction must result in full retirement. Once a flex has been implemented a member of staff cannot exercise an option to revert to their original or previous hours of work. This applies from the first flexible retirement.

Application for Part-time Working and Flexible Retirement (USS)

Section 1 – To be completed by member of staff making the request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.I. Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Directorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date for reduced working hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested working hours e.g. 60% FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed percentage of USS benefits to be taken at this flexible retirement event (min 20% - max 80%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this the 1st or 2nd Flexible Retirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested working pattern (no of days/week, working times/day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current working hours and pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications of change on the work of the School/Directorate and suggestions for addressing these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have noted that if the request is approved, a minimum 3 months notice after approval date is required, to allow for pension processing.

I am aware that a role change may mean a change to contract and/or grade and I have discussed this with Human Resources.

Signature

Date
Section 2 – To be completed by Dean of School or Director

| ☐ Request approved |
| ☐ Request not approved – please discuss with your HR Officer before signing the form and before writing to the member of staff to advise them of this. |

Reasons not approved (~)

*Standard template letter should be used to formally advise member of staff of decision*

Comments (i.e. nature of impact on the School/Directorate)

---

**Dean of School/Director's Declaration:**
I confirm that where approved, the request meets the operational needs of the School/Directorate.

Dean of School/Director  
(Print name)

Signature  
Date

---

**To be completed by Human Resources (only where there is a change to type of contract or grade):**
I confirm that the proposed change/reduction to role will result in a change to contract and/or grade. Details of any change to contract and/or grade are detailed below:

HR Officer  
(Print name)

Signature  
Date

**Copies of approved request to**

1. Applicant  
2. Pensions Office  
3. HR – personal file  

FORM B (USS)
Local Government Pension Schemes: Dundee City Council and Strathclyde.

Flexible Retirement

To be eligible for flexible retirement a member must have at least two years service and be of the age of 55 or over. The University can consider a request for flexible retirement provided that the request is made in accordance with the University’s published policy.

A request to simply reduce hours or to move to a position with a lower grade does not in itself constitute an application for flexible retirement.

If the employer accepts the request for flexible retirement, the member draws their accrued pension benefits (subject to guidance from the Government Actuary Dept (GAD)) while still receiving a salary for the work they continue to do.

If the member remains on the same salary grade, a reduction in FTE of at least 20% is required. If the member applies for a reduced salary grade, a reduction in FTE is not required.

Members can continue to contribute to the scheme to build up more benefits. Benefits paid before 65, may be actuarially reduced.

Local Government members may ‘flex’ once only.

Application for Part-time Working and Flexible Retirement (Local Government)

Section 1 – To be completed by member of staff making the request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.I. Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Directorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed percentage of benefits to be taken (up to 100% subject to guidance from GAD)**

| Start date for reduced working hours/reduced salary grade |  |
| Requested working hours e.g. 60% FTE |  |
| Requested reduction in salary grade e.g. from Grade 6 to Grade 4 |  |
| Requested working pattern (no of days/week, working times/day) |  |
| Current working hours and pattern |  |
| Implications of change on the work of the School/Directorate and suggestions for addressing these |  |

I have noted that if the request is approved, a minimum 3 months notice after approval date is required, to allow for pension processing.

I am aware that a role change may mean a change to contract and/or grade and I have discussed this with Human Resources.

Signature

Date
### Section 2 – To be completed by Dean of School or Director

- **Request approved**
- **Request not approved** – please discuss with your HR Officer before signing and before writing to the member of staff to advise them of this.

**Reasons not approved** –

*Standard template letter should be used to formally advise member of staff of decision*

Comments (i.e. nature of impact on the School/Directorate)

---

**Dean of School/Director’s Declaration:**
I confirm that where approved, the request meets the operational needs of the School/Directorate.

Dean of School/Director  
(Print name)  
Signature  
Date

---

**To be completed by Human Resources (only where there is a change to type of contract or grade):**
I confirm that the proposed change/reduction to role will result in a change to contract and/or grade. Details of any change to contract and/or grade are detailed below:

HR Officer  
(Print name)  
Signature  
Date

**Copies of approved request to**

1. Applicant  
2. Pensions Office  
3. HR – personal file  
FORM B (LocalGov)